# WRITINGS OF B H CARROLL

by B.H. Carroll

*A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by B.H. Carroll, compiled for study and devotional reading.*

110 Chapters

# Table of Contents


1. 01.00. Between the Testaments
2. 01.01. Lesson 1: INTRODUCTION: Between the Testaments
3. 01.02. Lesson 2: THE PERSIAN PERIOD, INCLUDING THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE GREE...
4. 01.03. Lesson 3: THE JEWS UNDER GREEK RULE...
5. 01.04. Lesson 4: THE JEWS UNDER ANTIOCHUS III, SURNAMED THE GREAT...
6. 01.05. Lesson 5: ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES
7. 01.06. Lesson 6: THE MACCABEES
8. 01.07. Lesson 7: THE JEWS UNDER THE ROMANS AND HEROD
9. 02.00. Distinctive Baptist Principles
10. 02.01. The New Testament-The Law of Christianity
11. 02.02. Individuality
12. 02.03. Freedom of Conscience
13. 02.04. Salvation Essential to Baptism
14. 02.05. The Doctrine of the Church
15. 02.06. God's Order In The Gospel
16. 03.00. ECCLESIA:: THE CHURCH
17. 03.01. Lecture 1
18. 03.02. Lecture 2
19. 03.03. Appendix
20. 04.00. INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE
21. 04.000. Foreword & Introductions
22. 04.01. Inspiration...As Believed by Baptists
23. 04.02. Question of Inspiration Re-opened
24. 04.03. Examples of Inspiration Explained
25. 04.04. Luke's Case and Other Important
26. 04.05. Qualifying Facts...
27. 04.06. Difficulties Met And Objections Answered
28. 04.07. DANIEL: AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF INSPIRATION
29. 04.08. Some Questions Answered...
30. 04.09. FOOTNOTES
31. 05.01. B.H. Carroll’s Interpretation of the English Bible Topics
32. 05.02. Introduction To An Interpretation Of The English Bible
33. 05.03. Introductory Studies
34. 05.05. The Inter-Biblical Period Introduction
35. 05.06. The Persian Period, Including The Conflict Between The Greeks And The...
36. 05.07. The Jews Under Greek Rule - 323 B.C. to 198 B.C.
37. 05.08. The Jews Under Antiochus Iii, Surnamed The Great, And His Son Seleucu...
38. 05.09. Antiochus Epiphanes 175 B.C. - 164 B.C

39. 05.10. The Maccabees 164 B.C.-65 B.C.
40. 05.11. The Jews Under The Romans And Herod 65 B.C. - The Birth Of Christ
41. 05.13. Introduction - The Four Gospels
42. 05.14. Introduction - The Fifth Gospel
43. 05.16. The Nature, Necessity, Importance, And Definition Of Repentance
44. 05.17. The Object Of Repentance
45. 05.18. Motives And Encouragements To Repentance
46. 05.19. Motives And Encouragements To Repentance (Continued)
47. 05.20. Motives And Encouragements To Repentance (Concluded)
48. 05.22. An Introduction To A Study Of Paul
49. 05.24. A Harmony Of Peter
50. 05.25. The Life Of Peter
51. 05.26. The Life Of Peter - (Continued)
52. 05.28. Analysis Of Hebrews And Our Lord's Sonships
53. 06.00. STUDIES IN ROMANS
54. 06.01. Paul's Salutation, Thanksgiving, Prayer (1:1-17)
55. 06.02. Universal Necessity of Salvation (1:18-2:16)
56. 06.03. Necessity of Salvation pt.2 (2:17-4:25)
57. 06.04. Gospel Plan of Salvation (5:1-21)
58. 06.05. Salvation in Us (6:1-8:39)
59. 06.06. Final Work of Salvation in Us (6:1-8:39)
60. 06.07. Conclusion and Climax (9:1-10:21)
61. 06.08. Conclusion: Practical Admonitions (12:1-16:27)
62. 07.00. THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA
63. 07.01. Introduction
64. 07.02. General Observations
65. 07.03. Condition of the Seven Churches in Asia
66. 07.04. PROMISES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES
67. S. A Discussion of the Lord's Supper
68. S. A Sermon to Preachers
69. S. And the Child Grew
70. S. B.H. Carroll - An Appreciation
71. S. CHRIST THE END OF THE LAW
72. S. Christ As Teacher
73. S. God Is Faithful
74. S. God's Enlargement of a Church
75. S. IF THINE EYE OFFEND TREE
76. S. Jesus Weeping Over Jerusalem
77. S. Jesus, the Christ of Prophecy
78. S. Little Christians
79. S. My Infidelity and What...
80. S. Objects of the Church

**81.** S. Observing the Commands of Christ
**82.** S. Our Church Covenant and Obligations
**83.** S. Our Lord's First Visit to Jerusalem
**84.** S. PAUL'S GOSPEL OF JESUS
**85.** S. SALVATION THROUGH THE BLOOD OF CHRIST
**86.** S. SOWING WILD OATS NOT CONDUCIVE TO SALVATION
**87.** S. Salvation Not in Church Ordinances
**88.** S. Seeking the Mind of Christ
**89.** S. THE BEWITCHING POWER OF SATAN
**90.** S. THE CASE OF SIMON MAGUS
**91.** S. THE EVILS OF RELIGIOUS COMPROMISE
**92.** S. THE NAME, THE EYES AND THE HEART OF GOD
**93.** S. THE WAR BETWEEN THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT
**94.** S. THE WAY OF CAIN
**95.** S. THE WAY OF THE CROSS
**96.** S. The Foundation of the Church of Christ
**97.** S. The Convicting Power of the Church
**98.** S. The Ever-Living Christ
**99.** S. The Glory of the Church
**100.** S. The Good, Acceptable & Perfect Will of God
**101.** S. The House of God
**102.** S. The Living Christ
**103.** S. The Sinning Christian and His Sins
**104.** S. The Three Witnesses
**105.** S. The Way to Eternal Life
**106.** S. WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? PART 1.
**107.** S. WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? PART 2
**108.** S. WHEREFORE THEN THE LAW?
**109.** S. Winning Christ
**110.** S.Judgment at the House of God

Chapter 1

# 01.00. Between the Testaments

Between the Testaments (A Class on Biblical History) by Dr. B. H. Carroll Late President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminar, Fort Worth, Texas [This work is in the Public Domain.] Table of Contents Lesson # 1 Introduction Lesson # 2 Persian Period Lesson # 3 Greek Period 1 Lesson # 4 THE JEWS UNDER ANTIOCHUS III Lesson # 5 Greek Period 3 Lesson # 6 Maccabees Period Lesson # 7 Roman Period

Chapter 2

# 01.01. Lesson 1: INTRODUCTION: Between the Testaments

Lesson # 1 INTRODUCTION: Between the Testaments

We commence this study with an introduction to the period. The Old Testament books written during the Babylonian exile are, part of Jeremiah, all of Ezekiel, all of Daniel, and possibly a few of the psalms. The Old Testament books written after the Jews' return from the Babylonian captivity are the following, in their order, as stated: Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Esther, Nehemiah, Malachi—Nehemiah and Malachi having been written about the same time. The Old Testament closes, then, about 433 B.C. with the books of Nehemiah and Malachi. The extent of the period between the Old and New Testaments, in round numbers, is over 400 years, that is, from 433 B.C. to 4 B.C., the true date of Christ's birth, four years before the time it is usually given. We may learn the history of that 400 years: First, from the Jewish historian, Josephus, Jewish Antiquities and the first part of his Wars of the Jews. Josephus was a Jewish general in the war which led to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, living forty and more years after Christ died. Second, from a radical critic, Ewald, who has written, perhaps, the most remarkable history of the Jewish people. I do not very well see how we could do without it on account of its great scholarship and research, though many things in it cannot possibly be accepted on account of his radical criticisms. One volume of his history is devoted to this period. As that book may not be accessible, I mention Stanley's Jewish Church, the third volume. He is something of a radical critic himself, and follows Ewald just about as closely as Dr. Boyce, in his theology, follows lodge. But better than all of them for brevity and clearness is a little book of the Temple Series of the Bible, entitled, "Connection Between Old and New Testaments." The author is Rev. George Milne Rea. This is the shortest, clearest, and most forcible history of the period that I know anything about. He is somewhat of a radial critic, but there is little poison in it.

Then, for a great part of the period, we find 1 and 2 Maccabees indispensable. They are apocryphal books of the Old Testament. The first book of the Maccabees is good, great, and spiritual. it is a fine history. It is not an inspired book, but many uninspired books are very valuable. I have been reading the first book of Maccabees ever since I was ten years old. The second book of Maccabees is also. good, but not quite so reliable.

Daniel's prophecies concerning the Persian, Grecian, and Roman Empires, while prophecies are really a forecast of all the history there is on the subject.

I will sum up the histories of the period: (1) Daniel; (2) Josephus; (3) Ewald's History of the Jewish People; (4) Stanley's Jewish Church; (5) Milne Rea's Connection Between the Testaments; (6) 1 and 2 Maccabees. In giving these histories let me say that Josephus on that period sometimes gives the chronology wrong—in one instance at least a hundred years. The ancient Greek historians Herodotus, Xenophon, Polybius, Appianus, Arrianus, and others, touched on the period. The ancient Roman historians, Livy, Tacitus, Diodorus, and others, touch the period. The great modern histories of ancient times which cover the period are Rollin, Rawlinson's Monarchies, Grotes' History of Greece, and Mommsen's History of Rome.

We next notice the Jewish literature during this period, i. e., what the Jews wrote during this period. We get the literature of this period to find out how the people were thinking, to what their minds were being given. A large part of that literature appears in the Septuagint Old Testament, and is incorporated in the Roman Catholic Bible. In our Bible the Roman Catholics make their insertions of the Jewish literature as follows: Just after Nehemiah they put in two books, Tobit and Judith, neither one of them historically good, and a good deal of Tobit is exceedingly silly. To the book of Esther they add ten verses to the tenth chapter, and then add six more chapters. That these additions were written in this period, and after the inspiration closed, is evident from the reading of them. Just after the Song of Solomon, they put two Apocryphal books, Wisdom and Ecciesiasticus. These books, while not inspired, make very good reading, but they are written, as I said, in that interval between the two Testaments, and rather late in that interval. Just after the Lamentations of Jeremiah, they put the book of Baruch. Baruch himself was the scribe of Jeremiah and a good man. This book, some of it, is exceedingly silly, and evidently not written by Baruch. To our book of Daniel they make the following additions: When Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were cast into the fiery furnace, they put a long song of about sixty-six verses into the mouths of these three men, and make them sing it in that furnace. At the end of the book of Daniel they put two stories: The story of Susanna, and the story of Bel and the Dragon—good stories to tell the children. Just after Malachi they put 1 and 2 Maccabees. The Romanist Bible, Douay Version, has these additions and shows just where they come in. All these books were written during the period of which I speak, and in addition to them the following which do not appear in the Romanist Bible: the Prayer of Manasseh. He was the wicked son of the good king, Hezekiah, and the record states that when he was a captive in Babylon he repented and prayed to God to forgive him. It occurred to one of these inter-biblical Jews to write out that prayer for him. It is a splendid prayer and I do not see anything wrong in it. A letter from Jeremiah to the Babylonian exiles. He had written one that we find in the book of Jeremiah, but this is falsely attributed to Jeremiah. Then, during that period, they wrote certain psalms and attributed them to Solomon, calling them The Psalms of Solomon. Most of these are good reading. But the greatest exploit of the Jewish mind during the period of which I speak was the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the Septuagint version. I will have a good deal to say about it later.

I did not include in that period two other books written by Jews, and sometimes classed in the period. One is the book of Enoch. That is an apocalypse, an imitation of Daniel, and a good deal like Revelation. Some of it is fine reading. It is barely possible that part of it was written before Christ was born, but it cannot be proved. The other books are 1 and 2 Esdras. They were certainly written after Christ, both of them, and it is not yet clear whether a Christian Jew wrote them or an unchristian Jew, but they are intolerable stuff, no matter who wrote them.

I will now restate the literature of that period. I called attention to the part of the literature incorporated in the Romanist Bible, the following books in their order: Tobit, Judith, Ecciesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Maccabees, then the additions to Esther and Daniel. Apart from what is incorporated in the Romanist Bible I gave these: The Prayer of Mannasseh, the Psalms of Solomon, the letter of Jeremiah, the great work of translating the Old Testament into the Greek language—the Septuagint. That commenced about 250 years before Christ, and it was about 100 years before all of it was done. The king of Persia at the time the Old Testament closed was Artaxerxes Longiinanus, and the book that mostly influenced the Jewish thought and hope during

that period of 400 years was unquestionably the book of Daniel. Revelation is the quickening book of the New Testament, as Daniel was the quickening book to the Jewish mind, both of them apocalypses.

There are ten great preceding events which influenced this period of 400 years, as follows:

1. The first event was 722 B.C. Sargon, king of Assyria, reigning at Nineveh, captured the capital of the Northern Kingdom, the kingdom of the ten tribes, deported the inhabitants into the Far East, and colonized their territory with heathen people from his own realm. As we go on, not only up to Christ, but beyond Christ, we will see the tremendous significance of that mixed population in Samaria—a heathen population settled there to take the place of the deported Jews, intermarrying with the remnant of Israelites left behind, and constituting what later was called the Samaritan people.

2. The second great event was in. 587 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, captured and destroyed Jerusalem, the capital of the lower kingdom, the kingdom of Judah, and deported the best and most influential of the inhabitants to Babylon. All through the period comes the echo of that event.

3. The third great preceding event was in 538 B.C. Cyrus, king of the Medo-Persian Empire, captures Babylon, and in 536 B.C., two years later, he issued a decree allowing the Jewish captives in Babylon, so many as wished to do it, to go back to their own country, instructing them to rebuild their Temple, which Nebuchadnezzar had destroyed. This event, as we will find, was mighty in influencing the inter-biblical period in several respects. Heretofore the fortunes of the people of Israel had been influenced by the Hamitic and Semitic nations, who held them in subjection. Henceforward it is the Japhetic nations that affect them. The Medo-Persians were descendants of Japhet. The Babylonians and Assyrians were descendants of Shem, as were also the Ammonites, the Moabites, and the Esau-ites. The people of Egypt were the descendants of Ham, and so were the Canaanites, including the Philistines and Phoenicians. Now, with the coming of Cyrus to Babylon the nations to affect the Jews are the descendants of Japhet. The second respect, and a very remarkable one, was that the policy of Assyria and Babylon had been to deport the inhabitants of the countries that they conquered and colonize them elsewhere. That had been the settled policy. The policy of Cyrus was exactly the opposite—to send all the exiles home, when conquering any people. Cyrus was not a Persian, but an Elamite, and hence not a monotheist, but a polytheist. He was a great man. A heathen, while he did not know God, God knew him, and God raised him up to do the work that he did. As Isaiah prophesied, "God says, I will raise up and guide Cyrus, though he knows me not." He not only sent home those of the Jews that wanted to go, but any other captive nation. The third respect was the policy of all the Hamitic and Semitic nations that when they conquered the people of Israel they destroyed their religion. Cyrus' policy was exactly the opposite; he did not want to interfere with the religion of any conquered people. lie even sent back all the captured idols in Babylon and sent the people back to their native land. He sent the Jews back and gave them all the Temple vessels, the sacred vessels of the sanctuary. No Persian king ever interfered with the religion of a conquered nation. At no time during the subjection of the Jews to the Persians, while they controlled the political end, did they interfere with their consciences. They let them worship God in their own way. The fourth respect was that the Medo-Persian policy allowed a Jew, who was qualified, to be local governor,

subject to the satrap who controlled a district, and was like a viceroy. The king appointed him and he had a great district under him. For instance, the district of Syria was ruled by a satrap, with headquarters at Damascus, but Judea was one province of this district whose local governor might be a Jew; and we know of two distinguished Jews who were local governors; Zerubbabel was one—he was the first one, who belonged to the line of David. He was not made king, but was the local governor over all the territory reoccupied by the Jews. The high priest, with a council of elders, attended to the religious matters. Nehemiah also was a local governor, but I do not know that any other Jew was local governor during that period. It is somewhat doubtful, from an expression in Nehemiah and one in Malachi, but those two were permitted to rule in civil matters.

4. The fourth great event that affected the inter-biblical period was in 535 B.C., when nearly 50,000 Jews returned to their own country with Zerubbabel as governor and Joshua as high priest, with orders to rebuild their own Temple and worship God according to their old forms. The question has often been asked why no more returned. There were forty-two thousand and some hundreds, besides some seven or eight thousand servants and some singing people, but less than fifty thousand Jews accepted the privilege conferred by Cyrus. One reason that the number was so small is that they would not allow anybody to go back—the Jews would not—who could not prove hi8 genealogy—his pure descent by the genealogical tables. His pedigree had to be traceable all the way back to Abraham. That let out a good many of them. Now, as less than fifty thousand of them returned, that brings us to a new word diaspora, the "dispersion." The Jews who remained, from that time. on till now, are called the dispersion. We find that language repeated in the New Testament. James and Peter both write letters to the dispersion.

5. The fifth great event was that these Samaritans, not being permitted to help rebuild the Temple, though claiming that they worshipped Jehovah, became bitter enemies to its rebuilding. Zerubbabel and Joshua were not counting numbers, but wanted a pure and homogeneous people. The Samaritans were a mixed race, and they refused to allow them to be associated in the work, whereupon they wrote letters back to Persia, making all sorts of accusations against the Jews, and finally securing an order for a discontinuance of the work of rebuilding the Temple, and held it suspended for fifteen years, until a new Persian dynasty received letters from the Jews asking him to search the records of the reign of Cyrus and see if he could not find that decree allowing the Jews to rebuild their Temple.

6. Darius did have the records searched, and did find it, and he used a pretty strong hand to help the Jews, and told them to go on with the building of their Temple. So, protected by him, the Temple was completed and dedicated in the year 516 B.C. The rebuilding of that Temple, the re-establishing of the old Jewish worship, can hardly be overestimated as an event bearing on the period we are discussing.

7. The seventh great preceding event was in 478 B.C. Esther, a Jewess of the dispersion, living in Babylon, became the wife of Xerxes the Great, he who is called Ahasuerus in the book of Esther. She became his wife and saved the Jews of the dispersion from being destroyed by Haman. That Ahasuerus, the husband of Esther, is the very Xerxes that invaded Greece with so great an army, but that was before he married Esther. I will tell all about it in a later chapter in showing the struggle between Greece and Persia. The war really commenced under Darius Hystaspris, and just about the time that Darius was having that Temple completed he sent the Persian soldiers to

fight the battle of Marathon, just outside the city of Athens, in which they were ingloriously defeated. When Xerxes the Great came to the throne, he led an army of over two million people against the Greeks. At the pass of Thermopylae, Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans died fighting for Greece. Then in ‘the great battle of Plataea his land forces were terribly defeated. When Attica was invaded, Themistocles caused the Athenians to take to their ships and let the city be burned, and on the sea he fought and won the great battle of Salamis. The seventh great event was in 458 B.C., when Ezra leads another caravan of Jewish exiles to Jerusalem. This was in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. He was reigning when the Old Testament closed. This was by far the most influential factor in the future of the Jews; indeed, with Ezra comes the rise of Judaism. The people are called Jews from his time on. The great factors of Ezra’s coming were: first, he brought back a copy of the Mosaic law, the Pentateuch; second, with him commenced that remarkable body of people called the scribes. Ezra was a notable scribe. They were the publishers of the Bible, not indeed by printing, but they multiplied the manuscript copies of it. We may credit the publication of the Old Testament to Ezra and the scribes. These scribes, by giving the people copies of their Bible, had more to do with the great advance in the period of four hundred years that I am going to tell about than anything else. With Ezra also commenced the Jewish Council of Elders, which afterward became the Sanhedrin, so well known in New Testament times. With Ezra’s return from Babylon came also the synagogue, and of all the potential things that preserved the Jewish faith from that time on the synagogue takes the lead. Up to that time they were temple ritualists. Theirs was a sacrificial worship. From now on, wherever three or four Jews could be found in a place, they would establish a proseuche, or "prayer-chapel," like the one that Paul found at Phiippi. Where there were more of them they established a synagogue. The synagogue is not a temple, but it is a place of public worship. Every Sabbath day, throughout the world, they come up to these synagogues and read a part of the law, and a part of the prophets, and a part of the other writings, and then expound them just as a preacher now reads a portion of the Scriptures and expounds it. Then, that synagogue was a popular assembly. For the first time, anybody in the audience that wanted to, could get up and say what was in his mind. When Christ went to the synagogue at Nazareth, they handed him the lesson to be read that day. He read it and expounded it. When Paul entered a synagogue, the leader said to him, seeing he was a visitor, a stranger, "Brother, if you have anything to say, say on." It was of tremendous importance that the people should have Bibles and places of worship. The synagogue more nearly embodies the idea of a New Testament church than the temple does, and in the Greek Old Testament, / it is sometimes called ecclesia. With the return of Ezra, idolatry by the Jews died forever. Up to that time God had scourged them continually with other nations because of their idolatry. But from the time of Ezra throughout all their history to this very hour in which I write, no Jew has been an idolater; they ceased to worship idols. Well might the Jews call Ezra the second Moses.

9. The ninth, and last, great antecedent event is this: In 445 B.C., Nehemiah, the cupbearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, asked to be appointed governor of Judea, and the Persian king, who loved him very much, made him governor. The Babylonians would call him Pekher, the Turks would call him Pasha, the Persian would say Tirshathe, but we say "governor." Nehemiah caused a wall to be built around Jerusalem to protect it from the Samaritans and Arabians, and their other enemies close by, and after staying twelve years he returned to Persia. He remained there a while, then came back and served as governor until 433 B.C.

I will briefly repeat these great events: first, the destruction of the ten tribe by Sargon in 722 B.C.; second, the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 587 B.C.; third, the destruction of Babylon by Cyrus, king of the Persians, in 538 B.C., and the marvelous advantages of his policy; fourth, in 535 B.C., fifty thousand Jews returned with Zerubbabel as governor and Joshua as high priest; fifth, the Samaritans opposed the building of the Temple and obstructed it for fifteen years; sixth, Darius Hystaspis, the head of the second Persian Dynasty, in 516 ~.; ordered the finishing of the Temple; seventh, Esther became Queen of Persia, 478 B.C.; eighth, 458 B.C., Ezra led another caravan to Jerusalem; ninth, Nehemiah was made political governor.

We have now before us the books of the Bible that were written in exile, the books of the Bible written after the exile, the histories that cover this period, the literature of the Jews during this period, and the great antecedent events influencing this period.

QUESTIONS 1. What Old Testament books were written during the Babylonian exile?

2. What Old Testament books were written after the Jews' return from the Babylon captivity?

3. What then is the extent of the period between the two Testaments?

4. From what books may we learn the history of this period?

5. What Jewish literature was written during this period?

6. Who was king of Persia at the close of the Old Testament canon?

7. What book mostly influenced the Jewish thought and hope during the inter-biblical period?

8. What is the first great preceding event which influenced this period and how?

9. What is the second, and how?

10. What is the third, and in what four respects was it mighty in influencing this period?

11. What is the fourth, and how?

12. What is the fifth, and how?

13. What is the sixth, and how?

14. What is the seventh, and how?

15. What is the eighth, and how?

16. What is the ninth, and how?

Chapter 3

# 01.02. Lesson 2: THE PERSIAN PERIOD, INCLUDING THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS

Lesson # 2 THE PERSIAN PERIOD, INCLUDING THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS The Medo-Persian Empire established by Cyrus lasted about 200 years—to be exact, 207 years. But from the close of the Old Testament Judah was under the Persian rule about 100 years. The first great event of the inter-biblical period under Medo-Persian rule ‘was the building of the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, and the establishment of a rival Jehovah worship. It was brought about in this wise: Nehemiah 13:1-31 says this (pretty vigorous language, too,): In these days also I saw that the Jews of the land had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and crushed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters for your sons, or for yourselves. . . . And one of the sons of the high priest, Eliashib, was son-in-law to Sanballat, the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me.—Nehemiah 13:23-28. That started the event that I am going to tell about. It ends the Old Testament, but it started the event. The woman that Eliashib had married was very beautiful, as famous in her day as Helen of Troy. Eliashib went to his father-in-law, Sanballat, and said, "I must give up either my priesthood or my wife, but I do not want to lose either." Sanballat says, "I will manage it for you. I will build you a temple here on Mount Gerizim, and you shall be the high priest of that temple." And he carried out his promise. That temple was built. They worshiped Jehovah, and they had for their Bible the Pentateuch only, though the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch does not agree literally with tie Hebrew Pentateuch, but nearly so. They admit, as historical value, the book of Joshua. Now, there was a Jehovah religion, with its temple, with its high priest, and with its Bible, within a few miles of Jerusalem. About 107 B.C., John Hyrcanus, one of the descendants of the Maccabees, and next to Judas Maccabeus one of the greatest of them, not only destroyed that temple, but also destroyed the city of Samaria, as he says: "So that a visitor could not even find where that city had stood"—but we will learn all about that later. I am just telling now what became of that rival temple. The destruction of the temple, however, did not stop the feud. It existed in New Testament times. In John 4:1-54 we find our Lord talking with a woman of Samaria, who insists that the worship of God ought to be upon Mount Gerizim. In the life of our Lord the Samaritans would always welcome the Jews passing through going north, but would not give any shelter to a Jew going south to worship at the temple. Because Christ was refused shelter in passing south, that son of thunder, John, wanted to call down fire from heaven on them. So that was a marvelous event as bearing on the subsequent history of the Jews. It came about in connection, as many things do, with a pretty woman. The second great event of the inter-biblical period under Persian rule was the union of civil and religious powers in one person by the satrap of the district, making the high priest to be also the governor. The duty of the governor was to collect the tribute coming to the Persian Empire. In order to simplify matters the satrap of Syria made the Jewish high priest governor. The evil

consequences, the far-reaching consequences of that act may be gathered, first, from a story in Josephus' Antiquities book XI, chapter 7. He shows that when Eliashib, the high priest, died he left two eons, Johanan the elder and Joshua the younger. Both of these wanted to be high priest, because to be high priest was also to be governor. Johanan was the one entitled to it, but a very influential general of the Persian king, Bagoses, had promised the high priesthood to the younger, son whenever the vacancy occurred, whereupon, in a row in the temple itself, Joshua the younger son was killed. The Persian general came and started to enter the temple, and they stopped him. He said, "Will I defile your temple any more than the man you murdered here in the temple?" And he put this kind of a tax on them: Fifty shekels for every lamb that was offered in sacrifice. Of course, that was a great deal more than the price of the lamb—it was 200 or 300 per cent more, and as they offered thousands of lambs we can imagine only what that tax was. It was a window tax that Victor Hugo went wild over, France taxing light, that is, the poor people could not have windows in their houses because, for every window in the house they had to pay so much more tax. So to tax the very offerings of religion was a tremendous innovation. Sup-pose every time we gave a dollar to missions, the state should tax us three dollars. That would dry up the source of contribution pretty soon, wouldn't it? The first evil was in uniting the civil and the religious powers in one person. And the second evil was, that whenever we begin to unite church and state, the state may say, "I have the right to tax all contributions of the church." The third and greatest evil that arose was that the state, from this precedent, began to claim the right to appoint the high priest, claiming that the leader of religion must be appointed by the state. The next great evil was that the office of high priest became a matter of barter and sale. The one who controlled the revenues, just so he satisfied the central government, could keep just as much as he pleased in his own pocket. For instance, if the Persian governor needed a revenue, say $100,000 a year, and this high priest were to tax them $300,000, he could send the state $100,000 and keep $200,000. Later on in the history this fearful precedent, established at this time, had evil effects more far reaching. In Christ's time, there were two living high priests. Whoever was governor would claim the right to appoint the high priest. Caiaphas and his father-in-law, Annas, were both high priests. In order to illustrate the thought: What if the Tarrant County judge claimed the right to appoint all the pastors of the churches in the county? What if the governor claimed the right to appoint our superintendent of missions, or the president of our convention? The third event of the inter-biblical period was the overthrow of the Medo-Persian Empire by Alexander the Great, consummated 330 B. C. The several periods of the struggle between the Greeks and the Persians were as follows:

Period the First: Before the Greeks were united into one government under Phillip II, king of Macedonia. This period extends from 500 B.C. to 336 B.C. The three Persian kings most concerned were Darius I, son of Hystaspis, Xerxes the Great, who married Esther; and Artaxerxes Mnemon, the last only coming within the period. Under Darius I, as I briefly discussed in the preceding chapters, came the defeat of the Persians 200,000 strong by the Athenians under Miltiades, 20,000 strong, at the battle of Marathon, right under the walls of Athens on the plain touching the sea.

Under Xerxes the Great, as I have already said, were gathered an army of 2,000,000 men for the invasion of Greece. There were 1,800,000 by measurement, not by counting. Ten thousand were made to stand in the smallest square possible, the space was marked off, and then, without any more counting, was filled 180 times. The great battles of this invasion were, first the defense of the

pass at Thermopylae by Leonidas and his Spartans; second, the decisive defeat of the Persians in the great sea fight at Salamis by the Athenian general, Themistocles; third, the decisive defeat of the Persian land forces at Platea. The battle of Marathon made such an impression on the young men of Athens that when a man said to Themistocles:

"Why is it you cannot sleep? You are restless all night long," he said, "The honors of Miltiades will not let me sleep." I have often quoted that to show the inspiring effect of a great action on the mind of young men; how an achievement by one will suggest and stimulate a like achievement by others. The Persian fleet was almost entirely destroyed.

Now, under Artexerxes Mnemon occurred a great battle east of the Euphrates River, at Cunaxa, against his brother Cyrus —Cyrus the younger. Cyrus rebelled against his brother, Artaxerxes Mnemon. He wanted to be king of Persia, and having found out how the Greeks could fight, he hired 11,000 Greeks for his army. In this great battle east of the Euphrates River, in the first charge, Cyrus was killed and all of his army defeated except the 11,000 Greeks. They swept away everybody that stood in front of them, but when the fight was over, there stood 10,000 Greeks with half a million men around them, but they would not surrender. They were asked to parley, and their generals, under a flag of truce, went to confer with the Persians and the Persians killed them. And that body of Greeks, now without officers, elected new officers, and the most masterly retreat in any history is the retreat of that body of 10,000 Greeks. We find the history of it in Xenophon's Anabasis. That column of Greeks on their march from the Euphrates to the Black Sea, going over an entirely new country, and without ever breaking ranks or being whipped in a fight, they• got safely back home. It was a great enterprise. The effect of that battle was far greater than all the others I have mentioned. It left the impression on the Greek mind that the Persians were very vulnerable, and that the Greeks could whip them under any fair circumstances, and suggested the unity of• the Greek states with the view to the destruction of the Persian Empire.

Period the Second: The conquest of Alexander the Great from 336 B.C. to 323 B.C. This is a very short time. Phillip II, king of Macedonia, united the petty Greek states into one government with himself as the commander-in-chief, and made preparations to invade Persia, but was assassinated by an enemy in 336 B.C. His nineteen-year-old boy, Alexander, succeeded him, and he devoted about a year to continuing the preparations of his father, and that same year the last Persian king came to the throne, Darius III Codomannus. Here is a world-ruling empire; there is a nineteen-year-old boy. In the spring of 334 B. C., Alexander crossed the Hellespont. Soon after crossing the Hellespont he met the Persian army at the river Granicus. Indeed, he had to ford the river to get to them. But his men, when he plunged into the stream himself, forded the river and utterly routed the much larger Persian army on the other side. That was the spring of 334 B. C. He devoted a little over a year to conquering Asia Minor, and as he moved eastward he safeguarded the seaports on the Mediterranean. In 333 B., C., that is, the next year after he started, he met the great army of Darius in a pass in the mountains between Cilicia and Syria, at Issus. It was a pass between the mountains; the mountains went up on one side and the sea was on the other. Alexander, with an equal front, cared nothing how many deep the Persians were packed. The Persian army was almost annihilated, and the mother, wife, daughter, and camp equip-age of Darius were captured.

Instead of going right on to Babylon, he determined to make all the Mediterranean coast safe, so he turned aside to conquer the city of Tyre, and all the coast cities to Gaza. Then he turned to Jerusalem and received the submission of that city, which I will tell more about directly. Then he went to Egypt and conquered it, and built a city after his own name at the mouth of the Nile, and called it Alexander, and it has been a great city from that date to this.

Then, to give the next date, in 331 B.C., he crossed the Euphrates River, and gave the final blow to the power of the Persians in the great battle of Arbela. That is a little east of where ancient Nineveh stood, and in that great battle the Persian power was ground to fine dust. Darius fled, but was soon assassinated. Alexander then turned south, and in 330 B. C. he made his triumphal entrance into Babylon. But that did not satisfy him. He marched out still into the Far East, conquering and exploring, and building cities in Afghanistan and Bokhara, crossed the great river, Indus, and conquered the Punjab section of India, and would have gone on to the other ocean but his old veterans said they did not want to go any further. So he turned around, and in 324 B. C. he re-entered Babylon to make it the capital of his empire—and the next year he died from taking too big a drink of ardent spirits. There was an immense cup called Hercules, and because somebody said that no man could drink all that was in that vessel at one time, he, believing himself a demigod, drank it all. He never recovered. That was in 323 B.C. When he died he was just thirty-two years old, and no man known to history had such a career— no Caesar, no Hannibal, no Bonaparte—a boy conquered the world in about six years, including much of the country that England now holds in India.

I have given a brief account of his history, and now we come to the important part about him—his touch with the Jews living in Jerusalem during the inter-biblical period. I will follow the account here given by Josephus. While Alexander was besieging Tyre he wrote a letter to the high priest and governor at Jerusalem, demanding that he send auxiliary troops and supplies. Jaddua replied, "I have taken the oath of allegiance to Darius. I cannot do it." Alexander said nothing, but kept it in his mind. The Samaritans sent the supplies. As soon as he had conquered Gaza he determined to look in on that Jerusalem that would refuse him. When Jaddua heard that Alexander was approaching, he formed a great procession of the priesthood and himself in full regalia, according to the Aaronic custom, marching at the head of it and holding the sacred Scriptures, without a sword or spear, coming simply with the Word of God. The conquer, of the world and the high priest met. Alexander's generals expected him to order them all to instant execution. Instead he leaped down from his horse, approached and saluted the high priest with great respect, walked with him back into the city, and paid for the sacrifices to be offered according to the Jewish law, and then turned to the high priest and said, "Ask me what you. will." The high priest said, "Our people plant no crops the seventh year; exempt us from tribute on the sabbatic year."

He said, "Granted."

"Our people want to enjoy our own religion in our own way."

"Granted."

"Our brethren of the dispersion in Babylon and Media, where you are going, want to enjoy their religion in their own way."

"Granted."

"Can we enter your army on a footing of equality?"

"Granted, and I will transport a number of you to Egypt where I am going, and when I build a city there I will give you a separate section of the city to be known as the Jewish quarter."

[Subsequent histories of certain cities tell us of the Jewish quarter. Tacitus, Paul, and the Roman poets tell us about it.1 "In your own quarter of the city you may elect your own magistrates, and have your religion as you wish it."

Parmenio, the leading general of Alexander, was astounded, and in explanation Alexander said:

"While I was in Macedon, before I started on this expedition, and was studying in my mind about this movement, one night I slept, and in my dream I saw this very man in this very dress he is wearing now, come to me and say, ‘Hesitate not; cross the Hellespont; the Persians will fall before you.’" And it is a remarkable fact that in Babylon and in every part of the country that he swayed he gave many privileges tothe Jews.

Daniel represents the transition of empire from Persian to Grecian as follows: In Daniel 2:32 he makes the body and thighs of brass of that luminous image seen by Nebuchadnezzar represent Greece, and in Daniel 7:6 the vision of the leopard with four wings, he makes Greece. And in Daniel 8:5 (we find all Grecian history for centuries forecast in Daniel), he says, And as I was considering, behold a he-goat came from the west over the face of the whole earth and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to the ram that had the two horns, which I saw standing before the river, and ran upon him in the fury of his power. And I saw him come close unto the ram and he was moved with anger against him, and break his two hems; and there was no power in the ram to stand before him; but be cast him down to the ground, and trampled upon him; and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand.

We will come to the four horns later, but just now I give the account that relates to the breaking of the one horn, the notable horn: And the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly, and when he was strong the great horn was broken, and instead of it there came up four notable horns toward the four winds of heaven.

QUESTIONS 1. How long lasted the Medo-Persian Empire established by Cyrus?

2. From the close of the Old Testament how long was Judah under the Persian rule?

3. What the first great event of the inter-biblical period under Persian Nile, and how was it brought about?

4. When and by whom was this temple destroyed, and did the destruction of the temple end the feud?

5. What and when the second great event in the inter-biblical period under Persian rule, how was it brought about, what its far-reaching developments, and what its evil?

6. What the third great event of the inter-biblical period, and how and when brought about?

7. What the first period of the struggle between the Greeks and the Persians and who the Persian kings most concerned?

8. What the author’s experience in learning Greek history?

9. What the relative sizes of the Grecian and Persian armies in this struggle, and what the great battles of the invasion of Xerxes?

10. Describe the battle of Cunaxa and the results.

11. What the second period of the struggle between the Greeks and the Persians?

12. Describe the various conquests of Alexander the Great, and his death.

13. What the relation between Alexander and the Jews, how illustrated and what Alexander’s own explanation of it?

14. how does Daniel represent the transition of empires from the Persians to the Grecians

# 01.03. Lesson 3: THE JEWS UNDER GREEK RULE...

Lesson # 3 THE JEWS UNDER GREEK RULE, FROM THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE TIME JUDEA PASSED FROM THE RULE OF THE PTOLEMIES OF EGYPT TO THE RULE OF THE SELEUCIDS AT ANTIOCH 368 B. C. to 198 B. C. This chapter covers a period of 125 years. We have briefly considered in the preceding chapter, first, the struggle between the petty Greek states and the Persians, until the consolidation of the Greek power under Phillip II, king of Macedonia, who was assassinated 336 B.C.; and second, the consummation of that struggle at the battle of Arbela, the overthrow of the Persian Empire, and the conquest of the world by Alexander the Great, who died at Babylon 323 B.C. We found Alexander to be the greatest of all military conquerors in the annals of time, whose greatness was largely attributable to one teacher, Aristotle, who had charge of his education from thirteen to sixteen years of age, and to one inspiring book, the greatest of all epics, Homer’s Iliad, which he carried with him in all his wars and explorations, putting it under his camp pillow every night.

What a lesson that is! The power of a great teacher and the power of a great book, as reproduced in a student’s life! Our concern with this marvelous ancient history is limited to a single inquiry: How did the Greek conquest of the world affect the kingdom of God? We have considered so much of that inquiry as related to Alexander himself and the Jews. We are now to continue the inquiry on the relation of the Jews and Alexander’s successors. Here we are stopped from limiting our investigation to the comparatively few Jews occupying the small territory around Jerusalem, for that territory at this time, and ever since their return from exile, was very small. Later on in this inter-biblical period, we will see an expansion of territory equal to David’s kingdom. The first thought of the lesson is that with Alexander there came into crystallized use a new term that will largely affect Jewish history for hundreds of years. In fact, it is very prominent during the New Testament period. This term was "Hellenism," or "Hellenistic," which was applied to the Jews of the dispersion, in contrast with the Hebrews living in the Holy Land. The Hellenistic were Grecianized in foreign lands, many of them so Grecianized that they could not even speak, either the Hebrew or the Aramaic language. The modification was not one of language only; the Greek cult influenced them in many ways. We find in Acts 6 and many places elsewhere, that it was a problem in the apostolic church. Some of the New Testament books are addressed exclusively to the Hellenists: James wrote to the twelve tribes of the dispersion in Asia Minor, and the letter to the Hebrews was to the same class. All the other letters of Paul concerned the Hellenists more than the Hebrews of Judea. The Jews of the dispersion constituted the overwhelming majority of the Jewish race. There had been many forced deportations of Jews by conquerors into foreign lands, few of whom ever returned to live in Palestine. Many colonies of Jews, by their own consent, were planted in various parts of the world by the rulers. Then their own restless migrations for the purposes of trade and commerce carried them everywhere. They all, however, regarded Jerusalem as their holy city, and their restored Temple as their center of unity. They paid their Temple tax, and thousands of them from every land went up to the great annual feasts. At the famous Pentecost, (Acts 2:1-47), they were present from every nation under heaven, as that

record says—Parthia, Proconsular Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Cyrene, Rome, Crete and Arabia. The Greek influence, mark you, was not limited to the Jews of the dispersion. The small Judea about Jerusalem was circled by Greek cities, multiplying points of contact with the home Jews. In Alexander's time these environing Greek cities were Gaza, Joppa, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Samaria, Hyppus; east of the Jordan, Scythopolis and Gadara in Galilee; Alexandria and others in Egypt; and under Ptolemy Philadelphus, Ptolemais on the coast was added, and the famous Rabbah of the Ammonites became the Greek Philadelphia.

These Greek cities kept multiplying in the passing years, until Jerusalem was ring-fired by them, and there was no resisting the Greek culture. So powerful was it that it conquered Rome after Rome had conquered the Grecian Empire. Generally, under the Greek rule, as it had been generally under the Persian rule, the Jews enjoyed great privileges, both at home and abroad, under Alexander himself, under Ptolemies, and for a part of the time under the Seleucids at Antioch. Code-Syria, that is, from Lebanon to Egypt, was a Greek province, of which Judea was a part. We now come to THE DIVISION OF ALEXANDER'S EMPIRE For many years after Alexander's death there were stormy times in settling the succession. The various provinces were under the most famous of the Greek generals, who battled with each other for the supremacy. When all of Alexander's children died the issue lay between Antigonus, the old general, on one side, and four other generals combined on the other side, namely: Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander. This issue was settled in the great battle of Ipsus, in Phrygia, 301 B. c. Antigonus was defeated and slain, and the four conquering generals divided the empire among themselves, that is, Lysimachus and Cassander getting the European part of the empire and the Bosporus, while Ptolemy retained Coele-Syria, which he had already held ever since the death of Alexander. This included Judea. The Ptolemies held Egypt for 300 years, succumbing to the Romans, 30 B. C. Seleucus got for his part all of Asia except Coele-Syria, and built for his capital the famous Antioch at the mouth of the Orontes. There the Seleucids reigned for 250 years, until they were broken up by the Romans, 80 B. c. This was the partition expressed in one verse by Daniel (Daniel 8:8), where he says the one notable horn being broken off, thee arose four other horns.

Now, because Judea lay directly between Egypt and Antioch, occupying the most strategically position between Asia and Africa-.--if not the most strategical position in the world— it became a bone of contention between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and thus connecting those monarchies with the kingdom of God. The Ptolemies held Egypt and Coele-Syria, as I have already said, before the original partition, and held it until 198 B. c. They had already been holding it for twenty-two years before the partition, and that partition merely confirmed the position of the Ptolemies. The Ptolemies held Coele-Syria until 198 B. c., which I will tell more particularly about a little later. Then Judea passed under the reign of the Seleucids at Antioch. That was brought about by a great battle near the head of the Jordan River, Paneas, in which the sixth Seleucid, Antiochus III, named the Great, overwhelmingly defeated the general of the fifth Ptolemy, surnamed Epiphanes, and attached Coele-Syria to his kingdom. From that date on the Seleucids held Coele-Syria and Judea until it was freed under the Maccabees—the most heroic part of the Jewish history, which we will consider later.

JUDEA UNDER THE PTOLEMIES

We are now to consider Judea under the Ptolemies, from 323 B. C. to 1~ B. c. The plan of administration was partly according to the Greek method, and partly accommodated to Jewish home rile. The high priest, assisted by a council, which afterward became the Sanhedrin, was the local governor, who collected all the taxes due the Ptolemies and remitted them to Egypt. Ptolemy Lagus, surnamed Soter, or Savior, held Judea and Coele-Syria when Alexander died, 323 B. C., and was confirmed in it after the battle of Ipsus, 301 B. c., as he had already been holding it over twenty years. Five Ptolemies have to do with this section, and I will cite only one great event in the reign of each one.

1. The first event touching the Jews was an act of treachery and inhumanity on Ptolemy's part, which called forth the most sarcastic remarks from Josephus on the misfit of his name, Savior. According to Josephus, he came to Jerusalem on the Sabbath day under the pretense of offering sacrifice to Jehovah, and was received into the city. There installed, he disclosed the purpose of his expedition to be a slave hunt on a large scale. By unresisted violence there and elsewhere in Judea and in the whole of the province, he enslaved many thousands of the Jews, and transplanted them into Egypt.

Josephus quoted a reproach from a Greek historian that so great a city should allow itself to be captured, while so well fortified, on account of a silly superstition of nonresistance on the Sabbath day. The reproach was better justified on another occasion in the later times of the Maccabees, and still later when the Romans besieged Jerusalem. This injustice perpetrated by Ptolemy Soter occurred before the battle of Ipsus, while the war of the four generals against Antigonus was going on. After the partition following that battle, the rule of this first Ptolemy was, on the whole, favorable to the Jews, in both Egypt and Judea. There was no interference with their religion, and they enjoyed many special privileges in the city of Alexandria. The first Ptolemy reigned forty years, that is, from the death of Alexander, 323 B. C.

2. The second great event—and I count it one of the most memorable in the annals of time—(or rather a series of events) occurred in the reign of his successor, Ptolemy Philadelphus. The story as given by Josephus is somewhat too marvelous, though he publishes the original documents of correspondence passing between Ptolemy and the high priest at Jerusalem. This great event was the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek—that famous version known to all subsequent ages as the Septuagint. This was an event of worldwide importance. Greek had become the vernacular of the world. No other language has ever equaled it in expressing delicate shades of thought. The world had now the Hebrew Bible, the Greek Bible, and the Samaritan Bible. In later times there were other Greek versions, but the Septuagint has easily held first. place among the versions in subsequent ages. Christ and the apostles quoted the Greek text oftener than the Hebrew. The name is derived from the number of the translators, seventy (or strictly, 72). This version is an expression of the relation between Hel1enism and Hebraism. The history of the version is on this wise: The Greeks the world over were noted for literature, arts, philosophy, rhetoric, oratory, and architecture. And this Ptolemy Philadelphus had gathered at Alexandria the world's greatest library and museum. Alexandria became the world's greatest city of learning. It was proposed to place in this famous library the Greek version of the Hebrew sacred books. But as the Jews jealously guarded the manuscripts of their sacred Scriptures, an expedient to gain their confidence was suggested, to wit: That Ptolemy, out of his own revenues, redeem from bondage, not only the great multitude of Jews enslaved by his father, Ptolemy Soter, but all Jewish

slaves in Egypt, whether brought into bondage before or since that time, including their children, to the number of more than 100,000. He paid cash to the owners of the slaves and redeemed all of them. What a contrast with the Pharaoh ruling Egypt in Moses' time!

Second, that he donate many precious utensils and priceless jewels for the Temple furniture. Third, that he make a large cash contribution for the purchase of sacrifices at Jerusalem. Fourth, that he send an honorable embassy announcing his generosities, and carrying a written petition from the king addressed to the high priest, and all the translators to be his honored guests in Alexandria while they were translating, and then to be dismissed with great honors and precious gifts to each of the scholars.

It is evident from the records that' only a version of the Pentateuch was originally contemplated, but once undertaken it finally included all the sacred books, and other Jewish literature besides. The translation began 250 B. C., and all the Pentateuch was translated in a few days, but it was not completed in all its parts until seventy-five or 100 years later. The latter part is very much inferior to the first work done, and it, moreover, included Jewish literature never considered by the Jews as a part of their sacred books. The Ptolemies were after books for their library, whether profane or sacred. Josephus makes a very clear distinction between the sacred Jewish books and other Jewish literature.

If only half the details given by Josephus be true—if we allow much for exaggeration—there is nothing in human history to compare with it. The story of Jerome's Vulgate and King James Version are tame beside it. Ptolemy Philadelphus stands immortalized as a manumitter of slaves, and as a promoter of learning, and is entitled to more enduring fame than any Greek whatsoever. But this great enterprise did not work altogether for good, because it was through the Septuagint, followed by the Vulgate, that Romanists got their apocryphal additions to the Old Testament, of which I gave an account in a preceding chapter, and it was from the Septuagint that the Greek Catholic Church got the same apocryphal additions. The Reformation restored the sanctity of the Hebrew Scriptures as the Jews themselves held it. Yet to the Greeks are we indebted for that beginning of translation which today gives to every nation our Bible in its own tongue. The story of the versions is one of the most thrilling in the annals of time.

One of the most pleasing parts of the story of Josephus is the account of the impression made on the mind of the great king by his reading of the Pentateuch in Greek. He was profoundly stirred by the sublime and divine majesty of that holy law. How incomparably superior to his Homer, Xenophon, Herodotus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Socrates, Plato, Zeno, Aristotle, and Epicurus. So ever to great and dispassionate minds do God's holy words appear. If Socrates, without gospel light, was a seeker after God, according to Acts 17:26-27, surely Ptolemy Philadelphus, who walked in the light when he saw it, was nigh the kingdom of God, and we may at least indulge the hope that through God's grace in Christ, both of these illustrious heathen may appear in the heavenly kingdom.

3. The third great event, or series of events, of Jewish history under the rule of Egypt occurred in the reign of the third Ptolemy, surnamed Euergetes, 247 B. C. to 222 B. C. The Jewish high priest, Onias II, as Josephus says, was a man of "very little soul," obstinate as a mule, and a contemptible miser who flatly refused to send any tribute to Ptolemy. In vain Ptolemy threatened; in vain the people protested that they would lose their nation and their holy city. This bull-headed

priest said, "I don’t care; let it bring ruin." He was not going to pay out any money to Ptolemy—and it was not his money, either. This brought on a crisis in Jewish affairs. His nephew, Joseph, a son of Tobias, was allowed to save the situation by an expedient that was a bad precedent, and entailed many disasters. This young Joseph went to Egypt, gained the favor of the king, and modestly had himself appointed assessor and collector of the king’s revenue in the whole province of Coele-Syria, which included Judea, at a high fixed rental. Backed by an adequate corps of Egyptian troops he returned, and by violent and oppressive methods farmed the revenue for twenty-two years. He would go to a place and select the names of the wealthiest citizens and confiscate their property until he got revenue from that place. In this way he combined in himself absolute power, both civil and ecclesiastical. Ptolemy got his revenue all right from these abundant confiscations, and Joseph in the meantime feathered well his own nest.

4. The fourth notable event under the Ptolemies was the alienation of the Jews from the Egyptian rule. There had been a smouldering fire against Egypt on account of the methods of Joseph, the son of Tobiah, in collecting revenue. Such methods will always bring revolt, if not revolution, and this prepared the way in the hearts of many Jews for swapping masters. An opportunity was presented in the bitter war being waged between the sixth Seleucid, Antiochus III, surnamed the Great, who reigned 223 B. c. to 187 B. c. and the Ptolemies. In the great battle between them, fought at Raphia, near Gaza, 217 B. c., Antiochus was defeated. Ptolemy, resenting the favors shown by some of the Jews to Antiochus, now thoroughly alienated the whole Jewish nation by two acts:

1. He went up to Jerusalem and outraged their religious feelings by thrusting himself into the most holy place of the Temple, from which he fled, as Josephus says, in superstitious terror as if he had seen some awful apparition.

2. On his return to Egypt he aggravated the general Jewish resentment by cruelty and oppression of the Jews there—quite an unusual thing for a Ptolemy to do. That is, all the ground gained in the Jewish favor under Ptolemy Philadelphus was now lost.

5. The fifth and last series of events of the period of this section was the damage done the Jews by Scopas, the general of the fifth Ptolemy, surnamed Epiphanes. With fire and sword and confiscation he swept the land. But in the decisive battle of Paneas, near the head of the Jordan, 198 B. C., Antiochus overwhelmingly defeated Scopas, and marched to Jerusalem, received him with open arms. And so Judea was lost to Egypt and passed under the rule of the Seleucids at Antioch.

QUESTIONS 1. What teacher and what book most shaped the character of Alexander the Great?

2. What concern have we with all this ancient Greek history?

3. What the extent of Judea at this time?

4. Where the overwhelming majority of the Jews?

5 What new tam came in with Alexander, and what the explanation of it.

6. Give some New Testament traces of it.

7. What cause had brought about the dispersion?

8. What their relation to Jerusalem?

9. Explain ho, Judea itself was somewhat Hellenized.

10. What the extent of the province of Coele-Syria?

11. Under what Greek general was it when Alexander died, and how long did his successors hold it?

12. Tell about the division of Alexander's Empire, the battle that decided it, and when and where fought.

13. How does Daniel in one verse foretell this partition?

14. Name the four Greek generals and the part of the empire each received.

15. With which two only are we concerned, and why?

16. How long did the Ptolemies hold Egypt, and to whom did its control pass?

17. How long did the Seleucids hold Antioch, and to whom did its control pass?

18. What the name of the first Ptolemy, and how long did he reign?

19. What great event of his reign touched Judea, and was it before or after the battle of Ipsus?

20. What unjust reproach was cast upon the Jews and Jerusalem by a Greek historian concerning this event?

21. What the second great event under the Ptolemies, and what the remarkable story as told by Josephus?

22. When did this work of translation commence, to what extent was it originally limited, and bow enlarged, and when completed?

23. What the effect on Ptolemy's mind in reading the Pentateuch in Greek?

24. What place in history do these events give Ptolemy?

25. What the importance of this version?

26. Why were apocryphal books included?

27. What the subsequent evil of this inclusion?

28. What third great event under the Ptolemies, and what its evil consequences?

29. What notable event under the fourth Ptolemy, and how brought about?

30. What the events under the fifth Ptolemy, and where and when was the decisive battle fought which transferred Judea to the rule of the

Seleucids?

QUESTIONS 1. Tell the stay of the fate of the great library at Alexandria.

2. Cite some corrupt doctrines taught in the apocryphal books, and yet fostered by Romanists.

3. How does Josephus distinguish between the sacred books and other Jewish literature? Quote the passage.

4. How does Josephus make out the twenty-two sacred books so as to include the whole Old Testament, and how do other Jews make them twenty-four?

5. What other translations of the Old Testament into Greek besides the Septuagint?

6. Origen bad in parallel column six texts called the Hexapla: What were the six texts?

Chapter 5

# 01.04. Lesson 4: THE JEWS UNDER ANTIOCHUS III, SURNAMED THE GREAT...

Lesson # 4 THE JEWS UNDER ANTIOCHUS III, SURNAMED THE GREAT, AND HIS SON SELEUCUS IV, SURNAMED PHILOPATER This period is only twenty-three years, that is, from the battle of Paneas, 198 B.C., to the beginning of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, 175 B.C. In the preceding chapter we considered the Jews under the Ptolemies of Egypt, a period of 125 years, 323 B.C. to 198 B.C. We limited our discussion to one notable event, only, touching the Jews under each of the five Ptolemies. First, the treacherous enslavement of many of the Jews by Ptolemy I, surnamed Soter. Second, the translation of the Scriptures into Greek, with the attendant generosities, under Ptolemy II, surnamed Philadelphus. Third, the stupidity and greed of the high priest, Onias II, resulting in the farming of the revenue of Coele-Syria committed to Joseph, son of Tobias, under Ptolemy III, surnamed Euergetes. Fourth, the alienation of the Jews from Egyptian rule, caused by Ptolemy IV, surnamed Philopater, after his victory at Raphia over Antiochus III of Antioch, surnamed the Great. Fifth (and in my discussion before I did not sufficiently touch this), the great damage to the Jews done by Scopas, the general of Ptolemy V, surnamed Epiphanes, terminating with the defeat of Scopas at the battle of Paneas.

We are now to consider the fortunes of the Jews under Antiochus the Great, and his son Seleucus IV. Throughout the wars of the Ptolemies with the Seleucids for the province of Coele-Syria, including Judea, the Jews were ground to powder as between the upper and nether millstones. In such a brief discussion of this period our trouble has been to condense from such vast historical material, which enlarges as we go on. We have been compelled to touch lightly the Greek historians, and from this point are embarrassed with the riches of material in the contemporaneous Roman historians—Livy, Tacitus, and others, to say nothing of great modern histories—Rollin, Rawlinson, and Brace, and Mommsen’s great History of Rome, probably one of the greatest contributions to history of modern times. The matter has been complicated by treaties between the two powers, based on intermarriages. The most notable of these, so far, was the marriage of Antiochus II to Bernice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and later to be followed by a marriage between Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus the Great, and Ptolemy V, surnamed Epiphanes. These political marriages make a great deal of trouble in history. As I have said before, the prophecies of Daniel constitute the clearest guide to this period. If we want to understand the war between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, we will find it in the interpretation of the Daniel 11:1-45, connecting Daniel 8:9-26 with Daniel 11:2-20, as both of these refer to Antiochus Epiphanes. A commentary on Daniel from the Cambridge Bible, by Driver, a pronounced radical critic, has as much poison in much of the book as there ~ meat in an egg. But his exposition of Daniel 11:1-45 and that section of Daniel 8:1-27 that touches this period is very fine, very scholarly, and very clear. Josephus is hard to follow because he makes such a mix-up of his historical matter, particularly in his dates. Sometimes he gives a date a hundred years wrong, accept where he follows the Maccabees. When he sticks to Maccabees be is generally right. THE JEWS UNDER THE SELEUCIDS

We now consider the fortunes of the Jews under Antiochus the Great. After the battle of Paneas and his welcome into Jerusalem, after his annexation of the province of Coele-Syria, he was as generous to the Jews as Ptolemy Philadelphus. When he got to Jeri~a1em and received the joyful welcome in that city, after he had defeated and captured the generals of the Ptolemies, he vas so impressed with their devotion to him and the valuable service they had rendered, that he gave a signal proof of his gratitude. I do not know just where we may find a more signal testimony of gratitude, manifested in the letters he wrote to the generals of his empire everywhere with reference to the Jews.

First, he set apart a large pension for Temple sacrifice. He used his treasury to furnish them food and supplies for a year, and seeds for planting. Now, to me that is a very pleasant bit of history to read. True, a selfish motive prompted him. He wanted these faithful Jews as a buffer between him and dangerous enemies. But even then this heathen did it more gracefully than the proscriptive Episcopalians of Virginia reluctantly endured the settlement of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the Shenandoah Valley as a buffer against the hostile Indian tribes.

I had not space in the preceding chapter to tell of the movements of Antiochus after his defeat at Raphia. He had turned his mind to the East, waging successful warfare and enriching himself with spoils until he had re-established boundaries of Alexander’s old empire. Hence, with largely increased resources he returned to defeat the Ptolemies at Paneas and to annex Coele-Syria. Now his thought is toward the West. He wants to break or block the rising Roman Empire, and aspires to restore the western boundary of Alexander’s Empire, which had been pushed east by the Romans. He intends also to absorb Egypt, but just now wants peace with the Ptolemies, that he may concentrate against Rome. To this end he makes alliance with Philip of Macedon and gives his daughter in marriage to Ptolemy, having two ends in view by this marriage—to secure peace behind him while he wars with Rome, and through his daughter to gain a quasi title to Egypt when opportunity serves to enforce it. Daniel foretells that marriage in these words: And he shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom, and with him equitable condition: and he shall perform them: and he shall give them the daughter of women to corrupt her [i. e., Egypt], but she shall not stand, neither be for him. After this shall he turn his face into the isles, and shall take many: but a prince shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; yea, moreover, he shall cause his reproach to turn upon him.—Daniel 11:17-18. In the phrase of Daniel "to corrupt her," the pronoun "her" does not refer to his daughter, but to Egypt. The thought is to use his daughter to give him a hold on Egypt. But as Daniel foreshows, the marriage, while it brought temporary peace to the Jews, did not serve the purpose of Antiochus. Like a true wife, Cleopatra stood by her husband, and she bears a glorious name in Egyptian history. She determined that if she was to be married off-hand that way, to suit the political need of her father, she would make a true marriage of it. And she lived and died in Egypt, beloved by a]l the people. It is refreshing to come to the history of a woman of high mind and a high standard of morals. That marriage, he thought, would enable him to get possession of Egypt, and then, as he was going west, to get all the zest of the old empire, but he made a mistake. That marriage did not help him with the Romans, but it did help Ptolemy. As Daniel says: "Then shall he turn his face to the isles, ath shall take many." The islands here mean the islands of the Mediterranean Sea, along the coast of Asia Minor and Greece, following the track of all the conquerors. He did strike out west with a great army and captured all of Asia Minor. Re then crossed the Hellespont, over into Macedonia. Three times he touches the

Romans. The last crushes him. At Lysimalacia the Roman legation met him in warning. He gruffly replied, putting a reproach on them: "You have no more right to inquire into what I do in Asia than I have to inquire what you do in Italy." The Romans never forgot a thing of that kind. Antiochus pursued his march, following the tracks of Xerxes the Great toward lower Greece. But in the pass of Thermopylae he had a battle with the Romans, and they whipped him. That is his second touch with them. He then fled back to Ephesus in proconsular Asia. The Romans, after the Punic wars, that is, after they had captured Carthage, were looking East, and they had already annexed the European part of Alexander's Empire, and when Antiochus came into Greece interfering with their eastward trend, they determined to carry the war into his own country. He had entered into an alliance with Philip V, king of Macedonia, to fight the Romans. The Romans easily disposed of Philip, and crossed the Hellespont, going after Antiochus. The third contact was when the two armies came together in Phrygia at Magnesia. The book of Maccabees gives a very exaggerated account of the numbers engaged and of the war elephants employed, i. e., if we may trust the more moderate estimates of the Greek historian, Polybius. In this battle, 190 B.C., the Romans entirely broke the power of Antiochus the Great, exacting the following humiliating conditions of peace:

1. The cession of all Asia Minor west of the Taurus Mountains.

2. The surrender of his floats and war elephants.

3. A crushing war indemnity that emptied his treasury and whose annual payments kept it empty. This vast war indemnity was more crushing than that which Germany exacted of France after the war of 1870. This empty treasury brought on all the woes of succeeding Seleucids until the dynasty perished.

4. They required him to give up his children and other kindred as hostages. It became a proverb: "Antiochus the Great was a king." Or, as Virgil describes Troy: Ilium fuit. Mommsen comments: "Never, perhaps, did a great power fall so rapidly, so thoroughly, so ignominiously, as the kingdom of the Seleucidae under the Antiochus the Great.

Daniel's prophecy concludes the story: "Then he shall turn his face toward the fortresses of his own land; but be shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found"—fulfilled when he was attacked and slain by the inhabitants of Elymais whose temple of Bel he sought to rob of its treasures to meet the war Indemnity exacted by Rome. "He was not found," disappearing as completely as Enoch and Elijah, but it was not a translation upward. Kings have to have money, especially when they keep up armies, and it occurred to him that the best way to get the money was to rob the temples. In Mark Twain's Innocents Abroad is one of his quaint sayings: "When I passed over Italy and saw the poverty and squalor of the people, without clothes, without food and without money, and when I saw the wealth of the ages in the churches and in the cathedrals, it was a wonder to me that they never thought to rob the churches." While the Italians never thought of it, yet Antiochus the Great thought of it.

There was a very rich temple over in the East, at Elymais. The temples were the banks of the country. They were the sanctuaries—the one place one could keep money free from 'the robber. The temple of Diana at Ephesus had all the wealth of the East stored in it. Now, this temple was full of riches, and when the priest who had charge of the temple (a heathen priest) heard of the

purpose for which Antiochus was coming, he let him and a few of his men enter the temple, then shut and barred the door, and killed them with rocks—al1 of them.

Well might Daniel say: "But he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found." He left two sons, Seleucus, the rightful heir, and Antiochus IV, called Epiphanes. Seleucus succeeded his father. Daniel describes him: "Then shall stand up in his place one that shall cause an exactor to pass through the glory of the kingdom; but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle." That is his history; twelve years he reigned. And in order to meet these annual payments to Rome he had to become a tax collector. He sent into CoeleSyria after taxes, and after gleaning all he could he still needed much money. In the meantime Judea was prosperous from the account of it in 2 Maccabees:

Now when the holy city was inhabited with all peace, and the laws were kept very well, because of the godliness of Onias, the high priest, and his hatred of wickedness, it came to pass that even the kings themselves did honor the place, and magnify the temple with their best gifts: and insomuch that Seleucus, king of Asia, of his own revenue bare all the coats belonging to the service of the sacrifice. [The reference here is to the grant of Antiochus III before the Romans broke his power. But all the treasure cannot remain hidden when the impecunious son of Antiochus is exacting taxes.] But a certain Jew, Simon, of the tribe of Benjamin, who was made governor of the temple, fell out with the high priest about disorder in the city. And when he could not overcome Onias, he got hun to Apollonius, the son of Thraseas, who then was governor of Coele-Syria and Phenice, and told him that the treasury at Jerusalem was full of infinite sums of money, so that the multitude of their riches which did not pertain to the account of the sacrifices was innumerable, and that it was possible to bring all into the king’s hand. Now when Apollonius came to the king and had showed him of the money whereof he was told, the king chose out Heliodorus, his treasurer [we will have more to say about him later], and sent him with a commandment to bring the aforesaid money. So forthwith Heliodorus took his journey, under color of visiting the cities of Coele-Syria and Phenice, but indeed to fulfill the king’s purpose. And when he was come to Jerusalem, and had been courteously received of the high priest of the city, he told him what intelligence was given of the money [what Simon had said about all that money in the temple] and declared wherefore he came, and asked if these things were so indeed. Then the high priest told him that there was such money laid up for the widows and the fatherless children: that some of it belonged to Hyrcanus, son of Tobias, a man of great dignity, and not as that wicked Simon has misinformed: the sum whereof was in all 400 talents of silver, and 200 of gold; and that it was altogether impossible that such wrong should be done unto them that had committed it to the holiness of the place, and to the majesty and inviolable sanctity of the temple, honored over all the world.

Heliodorus said: "All the same I have to have it." The high priest fell into a trance in which his face was marked; all of the priests commenced praying, the women of the city ran out into the streets, the children and the women, in view of such sacrilege as was contemplated, and while the tears ran down the high priest’s cheeks, he led this prayer: "Oh Lord God Almighty, intervene, and prevent this horrible sacrilege." Whereupon, as Heliodorus entered the temple he met two flaming angels, one of them on a horse, clothed with gold, that struck him with his hoof and knocked him down. The shock nearly took away his life. And lest Seleucus might misunderstand, the high priest then went into the temple and offered sacrifice unto heaven for the sin of Heliodorus, and asked God to forgive him and raise him up, and on the intercession of the high priest he was restored,

and returned to report to Seleucus to this effect: "If you have any man in your kingdom against whom you have a grudge—if you have a special enemy —send him to get that money, for he will meet a doom from God when he seeks to violate that Holy Place."

I cited what Daniel said about Seleucus. He died in twelve years by poison, and that brings us down to 175 B.C. When he died his brother, Antiochus Epiphanes, succeeded him.

What a temptation it is to me when I come in touch with all this ancient Jewish history and so many wonderful things related concerning it, by Greek and Roman historians, both ancient and modern, to switch off from the main point! But I am trying to limit the history to its contact with the Jews, and to do this I must condense two or three thousand pages of history to make one chapter.

QUESTIONS 1. What the scope of this chapter?

2. Who are the ancient and modern historians of Rome covering this period?

3. What complicates the history of the Ptolemies and Seleucids?

4. What prophet forecasts all the wars between these two Greek kingdoms, and what the sections of his book giving them?

5. What commentary on this part of Daniel is commended, notwithstanding the author’s objectionable radical criticism on other parts?

6. What great battle placed Judea under the Seleucide? When and where fought?

7. How did the Jews receive the new master?

8. How did Antiochus evince his gratitude?

9. Compare this heathen with Louis XIV of France and Philip II of Spain.

10. Compare the settlement of the 2,000 Jewish families with the attitude of Episcopal Virginia toward the settlement of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the Shenandoah Valley.

11. What the motives prompting Antiochus to give in marriage his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy, and how did the marriage fail of its purpose?

12. Cite the three contacts of Antiochus with the Romans, and Mommsen’s comment on the battle of Magnesia.

13. What terms did the Romans exact of Antiochus after the battle of Magnesia, what parallel in modern times, and their effect on the subsequent fortunes of the Seleucids?

14. To what expedient did Antiochus III and his successors resort for means to pay the Roman war indemnity?

15. Why were temples made to serve as banks of deposit?

16. Give Daniel’s forecast of the fate of Antiochus Ill and a Jewish account of its fulfillment.

17. Give Daniel’s forecast of Seleucus IV, successor of Antiochus 3 John 1:18. Give substance of the story in 2 Maccabees of the treasure in the temple, how Seleucus heard of it, and his failure to

get it.

# 01.05. Lesson 5: ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES

Lesson # 5 ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES 175 B.C.-164 B.C. The prophecies of Daniel forecast Antiochus IV, surnamed Epiphanes, first, in Daniel 8:9-14, interpreted by Daniel 8:23-26; second, Daniel 11:2-20. The book of Daniel covers fairly nearly all the inter-biblical period. We stop Daniel's account of Antiochus at Daniel 11:20, and do not go on to the end of that chapter, as all radical critic commentaries do, because we are unable to apply that part of the book of Daniel to the wars of the Seleucid and the Ptolemies. There is certainly no historical verification of it in the life of Antiochus Epiphanes. My theory of interpreting Daniel 11:21-45 (Daniel 12:2) is:

First, like many other prophecies, there is in this part of Daniel reference to some things near at hand and some things far distant—as when David's prophecy of Solomon's kingdom glides into the far remote Messiah's kingdom in Psalms 45:1-17 and Psalms 72:1-20. This blending of things near and remote arises from the perspective in prophecy. It may be illustrated by the appearance of a far distant mountain range. Far-off, it seems to be one mountain, but as we approach nearer, the one mountain becomes a range, and what seemed its high point is a succession of elevations, far apart if they are viewed laterally, but blended into one peak if they are in one line of vision from the observer's viewpoint

Second, so here, seen from only one angle of prophetic vision, Antioch, the antichrist of his day, enemy of the Jews, is blended with a far more remote antichrist, an enemy of the Jews, who shall try to destroy them after their final restoration to their own land, and whose own destruction results in the salvation of all the Jewish nation, which we have presented in Revelation 19:11-21, collated with Isaiah 63:1-6; Ezekiel 36:1-38; Ezekiel 37:1-28; Zechariah 12:8 to Zechariah 14:11. Now, I am showing how to study this chapter. First, study it in the light of the interpretation of that passage in Daniel. A certain part of the books of the Maccabees touches the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, viz.: 1Ma 1:1-64, 1Ma 2:1-70, 1Ma 3:1-60, 1Ma 4:1-61, 1Ma 5:1-68, 1Ma 6:1-63; 2Ma 4:1-50, 2Ma 5:1-27, 2Ma 6:1-31, 2Ma 7:1-42, 2Ma 8:1-36, 2Ma 9:1-29. There is nowhere a better statement of this discussion than in those chapters from the books of Maccabees. However, 1 Maccabees is much more trustworthy as history than 2 Maccabees, which was written much later.

Certain parts of Josephus should be read also to understand the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, viz: Antiquity of the Jews, Book XII, chapters 5-9. But 1 Maccabees is more reliable as history than Josephus.

We now take up the most notable matters in connection with the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. First, we will consider the man himself. His father, Antiochus the Great, died leaving him as hostage in Rome, after the great battle of Magnesia. While in Rome, where he grew up, he became carried away with the Roman fashion of admiring the Greek cult. The second fact about the man himself is that he was not entitled to the throne. His older brother, Seleucus, indeed had died, but Seleucus had a son, Demetrius, a little fellow, also a hostage in Rome, and that boy was the rightful king of Antioch. Daniel tells how by flattery and treachery this Antiochus usurped the place of his young nephew. The next thing about him is to consider his character. Daniel says he

was a "vile person." He is the little horn of Daniel 2:1-49. He had a very brilliant mind, but he was more impressed by the way things seemed than the way things were. He had no conscience about sacred things at all—indeed, he defied himself. In the "Cambridge Bible" are photographic copies of some of the coins he issued, and on those coins were these inscriptions: Antiochus Basilanos ("king") Theos Epiphanes ("God manifest"), Nicephorus ("victory bearer"). The last is the title of Jupiter, "Victory bearer," and he had the artist who drew the plans for these coins to make his face on the coins resemble the face of Jupiter, as presented in his statues. It needed some change to make it look like that, but he did not mind it. So much for the man. We will now consider the events. At the close of his brother's reign, Onias III, the good high priest, had gone to Antioch to remove the impression about the temple treasury that had been made by Simon, and Onias is in Antioch when Antiochus Epiphanes comes to the throne. A brother of Onias, named Joshua, who had become an infidel Jew and changed his name to Jason, then went to see Antiochus, and convinced him that he would make a good deal more money if he would depose Onias and make him, Jason, the high priest; that be was already Hellenized and believed in the Greek religion, and it would be a great help if Antiochus would make him high priest. So Antiochus kept Onias there until he died. He never saw his home any more, and this renegade Jew, Jason, was made high priest.

I am glad to notice that a great while after that, a still greater renegade Jew, Menelaus, being sent to Antioch by Jason, persuaded Antiochus to depose Jason and make him (Menelaus) the high priest, and he would get a better bargain still. So one thief turns out another, and Menelaus was made high priest. & made no pretensions to the observances of the Jewish religion. Jason, to show how much he was Hellenized, erected in the holy city, a Greek gymnasium. In these athletic days, when t~ schools are all turning almost exclusively to athletics, and the glory of a school is its athletics, we may understand what a baleful influence that gymnasium would have in Jerusalem, for both Jason and Menelaus, who succeeded him, persuaded the Jews that the best thing to do would be to attend that Greek theater and let their Temple alone. No Sunday moving picture show in modern times so nearly breaks up worship as did that Greek theater in Jerusalem. The next event in connection with the reign of Antiochus was his purpose to bring Egypt into his realm. His satrap, Apollonius, informed him that two men in Egypt had charge of the little king, the nephew of Antiochus. Cleopatra, a sister of Antiochus, was sent over there to become the wife of one of the Ptolemies. I have already shown what a good woman she was. Now, her little son at this time was king of Egypt, but those who had charge of the boy after his mother died were renegades. This satrap persuaded Antiochus that if he would make a demonstration in Egypt, he could easily capture the whole country. Now in order to make everything clear behind him, he made his first visit to Jerusalem, where the renegade high priest received him with open arms, and made great promises about what he was going to do for the Jews. He then led his first expedition into Egypt and captured Pelusium, a port of Egypt, on one of the mouths of the Nile. The young king tried to flee, but his renegade tutor betrayed him to Antiochus, who caught him and pretended to act in his name. He subjugated nearly all Egypt, and issued some of those coins I told about and had himself crowned there.

While he was over there, however, the report reached Jerusalem that he had been killed. Whereupon the superseded Jason, whom I told about, and who had fled over the Jordan, collected a thousand men, returned to Jerusalem and tried to depose Menelaus. Antiochus hears of it, and

thinks it to be a revolt of the Jews against his authority. So he comes back by Jerusalem, murders thousands of its people in cold blood, enters the Temple, takes away the sacred vessels, and among them the famous golden candlesticks, and robs the Temple of its treasure, and Menelaus helps him in all of it. He then made a second expedition into Egypt, 169 B.C., and recaptured all of the country except Alexandria, which held out.

He returns again, continuing all this time his oppression of the Jews, and makes a third expedition into Egypt. Cleopatra, that good woman I told about, had left two sons, and these two boys had fled to Rome and appealed for help. Rome sent an embassy to warn Antiochus to let the Egyptians alone. When Antiochus was within four miles of Alexandria the Roman embassy met him. The leader of it was Popilus. The Roman had nothing but his staff in his hand. He lifted his staff and said:

"In the name of the Senate of Rome I command you to go back to your own country and let Egypt alone."

Antiochus said: "I will call a council of my friends and take it into consideration.? The Roman stopped and drew a circle around him in the Band and said: "You will answer me before you get out of that circle, yes or no."

Those Romans were stern fellows. Antiochus said: "Yes," and went home, but he went home mad. The Romans made him abandon all his conquests in Egypt and the Mediterranean islands. Being exceedingly mad, he sent his general, Apollonius, to Jerusalem with instructions to make all Ceole-Syria adopt the Greek religion and particularly required the Jews to abandon their religion. The general captured Jerusalem, tore down its walls, and erected a fortification that commanded the Temple. He erected a Greek altar to Jupiter right on top of Jehovah’s brazen altar, and sacrificed a sow, the abominable flesh to a Jew, and took the broth and flung it all over the holy place, and had filth cast into the most holy place, and commanded every Jew that had a Bible to bring it to him, and he tore their holy books to pieces and burnt there fragments. He issued an order that no child should be circumcised, and when some of the women disobeye4 he had their babies killed and tied around their necks and then. murdered the women. He then made every one that professed to be a Jew come up and eat swine’s flesh.

There was one old Jew named Eleazer, so devout and venerable that even the Hellenizing Jews loved him. They told him they did not want to see him die, and to bring a piece of other meat with him and eat that so that it would seem that he had eaten the hog’s meat. But he said, "No, this is no time for compromising; if I would even seem to eat the swine’s flesh my name would be disgraced. I am an old man, and a few days more or less matters nothing to me. Kill me. I will not violate my law." And so they murdered him. A much more notable event we find in 2 Maccabees, concerning a pious widow and her seven boys. I lift my hat to them every time I think about them. This woman and her seven sons were commanded to violate the laws. She exhorted her boys to be faithful. They scalped the oldest one, and put coals of fire on his head, after taking the skin off, and then killed him, his mother looking on. But she exhorted the other six to be faithful. They killed the second one by horrible torture, and she exhorted the other five to be faithful. And they killed the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth the same way. She .turned to her baby boy, her youngest, the pride and darling of her heart, and told him that his mother was expecting him to be true to his God and his religion, and they tortured him to death, and she kept on praising Jehovah until they put her to

death.

I read that when I was ten years old, and it struck, me as being one of the heroic things in history. It is to such events that a certain passage in Hebrews 11 refers. The old proverb is: "When you double the tale of the brick, then comes Moses." So now there arose in Judea an order called Asideans, pious people who preferred religion to everything else, and they entered into a solemn covenant to stand by the faith. When they were attacked on Saturday, their Sabbath, because they would not fight on the holy day, they submitted to death without defense; 1,000 were murdered at one time, as on another occasion their priests had been done in the Temple1 who kept on offering incense and worshipping God until they were slain at the altar.

There was a man named Asmon, from whom we get the name Asmoneans. A descendant of Asmon, an old Jew, a perfect giant, named Mattathias, had five sons, vigorous men, named John, Simon, Judah, Eleazer, and Jonathan, and the history of the old man and his five sons is more memorable than the history of the woman and her five sons. He determined that ho would not be passive if they attacked him on the Sabbath, but that he would fight, and that he would not consent to the destruction of the Jewish religion. When the deputies of Antiochus came to Samaria with the demand to adopt the Greek religion, they submitted at once, and dedicated their temple to Jupiter and joined Antiochus in fighting the Jews, as usual. Finally a deputy reached the little village where Mattathias, lived, and commanded him to obey the law. He said, "I they God’s law." They then called up another Jew who offered to obey the law, and when he started to do it Mattathias killed him, and then killed the deputy, and tore down the heathern altar. He and his sons went all over the country tearing down the heathen altars. The old man, seeing he was about to die, appointed his son Judas to have charge of the army—Judas, surnamed Maccabeus. "Maccabeus" means hammerer; Judas the Hammerer. Edward II 1 England, was called "the hammerer of the Scots," and ii Westminster Abbey there is the inscription:

"Edward, Hammerer of the Scots." In Jane Porter’s Scottish Chiefs is given the history of William Wallace redeeming Scotland from the bondage to which Edward the Hammerer had subjected it. I used to read it and cry. No hero of history comes nearer king like William Wallace than Judas the Hammerer. His ilk, even as told by his enemies, and particularly the account by the Jewish historians, surpasses anything in history, showing the heroic force of a man fighting for his religion and hi country.

I remember once, when I was a schoolboy, I had to recite Fitz-Green Halleck’s poem, "Marco Boyario"—Greeks fighting Turks (just as they are doing now); that part of it where the Turk awoke to hear his sentry shriek: "To arms! They come! The Greek! The Greek!" when he awoke to hear Bouaris cry:

"Strike till the last armed foe expires!

"Strike for your altars and your fires!

"God and your native land," may be given an original turn by applying it to Judas Maccabeus. The reader should cover the whole period, and even its approaches, by giving some account in order of the following battles:

1. Marathon, Salamis, Thermopylae, Plataea, Cunaxa.

2. Granicus, Issus, Arbela.

3. Ipsus, Raphia, Paneas, Magnesia.

4. Beth-horon, Emmaus, Beth-zur, Beth-Zeeharias, Capharsalama, Adasa, Eleasa.

5. Pharsalia, Philippi, Actium.

These five series of battles give an outline of the period. The fourth series names not all but the most of the great battles fought by Judas Maccabeus. None of these, however, comes within three of his greatest campaigns, to wit, the redemption of Galilee, the conquests east of the Jordan, and the war against Edom.

Judas then brought Esau back to Jacob. He conquered Edom that had helped always in oppressing Judah, and from that time on Esau and Jacob were together. He and his brothers Crossed the Jordan and drove the armies of Antiochus out of that country; they redeemed Galilee, and brought back to Jerusalem the persecuted Jews that were there. Antiochus, in the meantime, had left a general to take charge of his army and continue the war against the Jews, while he went on a temple-robbing expedition, like his father before him, and the same temple at Elymais. When he got there the gates were shut against him and he could not rob that temple. While there he heard the account of the overthrow of his army by Judas Maccabeus.

I will close this chapter by giving an account of Antiochus' death, from 1 Maccabees, in the one hundred and forty-ninth year (not of his age, but of the Greek Supremacy):

Now, when the king heard these words [about the defeat of his armies by Judas] he was astonished and sore moved; whereupon he laid him down upon his bed, and fell sick for grief, because it had not befallen him as he looked for. And there he continued many days: for his grief was ever more and more, and he made account that he should die. Wherefore, he called for all his friends and said unto them: "The sleep is gone from mine eyes, and my heart faileth for very care. And I thought with myself into what tribulations am I come, and how great a flood of misery it is, wherein now I am! for I was bountiful and beloved in my power. But now I remember the evils that I did at Jerusalem, and that I took all the vessels of gold and silver that were therein, and sent to destroy the inhabitants of Judea without cause. I perceive, therefore, that these troubles have come upon me, and behold I perish through great grief in a strange land." Then called he for Philip, one of his friends, whom he made ruler over all his realm, and gave him the crown, and his robe, and his signet, to the end he should bring up his son Antiochus, and nourish him up for the kingdom. The account of his death in 2 Maccabees, which is not as good history as 1 Maccabees, is varied from the account in the first book and less historical.

QUESTIONS 1. What the subject and period of this chapter?

2. What sections of Daniel refer to this man?

3. Why not apply Daniel 11:20 to Daniel 12:1 to the war of the Seleucids and Ptolemies?

4. What parts of the books of the Maccabees refer to Antiochus Epiphanes?

5. What parts of Josephus?

6. How was Antiochus a usurper?

7. Give his character.

8. How does his blasphemy appear on the coins issued by him?

9. Give in order of time, the first relations of Antiochus to the Jews as presented in the history of three high priests, Onias, Jason, and Menelaus.

10. What the effect on Jewish temple worship of Jason’s Greek gymnasium? Illustrate by events of our day.

11. How and through whom was Antiochus persuaded to add Egyot)t to his realm?

12. Tell of his first visit to Jerusalem and his promises.

13. What occurred at Jerusalem while he was in Egypt to inflame his mind against that city, and what the result of his second visit on his return from Egypt?

14. Give the dramatic account of his retirement from Egypt on the third invasion.

15. In his fury against Jerusalem what fearful havoc was wrought there by his general Apollonius?

16. In this case what was the "Abomination of Desolation" spoken of by Daniel the prophet?

17. In that case how do you explain Matthew 24:15?

18. How does Daniel give the time from this desecration of the temple by Antiochus to its cleansing by Judas Maccabeus, and what is the time in years?

19. What general policy looking to uniformity in religion did Antiochus now adopt and its sweeping character toward the Jews?

20. How did Samaria respond to this religious demand?

21. Cite two notable instances of Jewish martyrdom from 2 Maccabees.

22. Who were the Asideans, and what their attitude toward this religious persecution?

23. What massacre of them occurred, and why did they not resist?

24. Tell about Mattathias and his sons, the commencement of their revolt, and their policy of fighting on the Sabbath.

25. Of whom was Mattathias a descendant, and what long line was named after this ancestor, and can you tell now the person of the line and her fate?

26. In view of death to whom did Mattathias commit the military lead, and to whom the high priesthood?

27. What the meaning of "Maccabeus" and what English king bore a similar cognomen?

28. To what Scottish hero may Judas Maccabeus be compared?

29. What great battles did he fight, and in which two was he defeated?

30. Can you name the most distinguished generals of Antiochus against whom he fought?

31. Describe some of his campaigns, particularly in Galilee, east of the Jordan, and against Edom.

32. Up to what point in his conquests did all the pious Jews support him, and for what was he striving beyond that point?

33. Where do we find two variant accounts of the death of Antiochus and which the most historical?

34. Describe his horrible death.

35. What five series of battles give a battle, history of the inter-biblical period and its approaches?

36. At the close of the study of the period be ready to date and analyze these battles, and tell their leaders and the issues decided by them.

37. By the conquest of Edom Judas Maccabeus annexed Esau to Jacob. How can you anticipate subsequent history by showing how this annexation ultimately resulted in placing both Esau and Ishmael on the throne of Jacob in one obnoxious person?

# 01.06. Lesson 6: THE MACCABEES

Lesson # 6 THE MACCABEES 164 B.C.-65 B.C.

We have about 100 years of exciting history to consider in this chapter. Our last chapter closed with Judas Maccabees in power, and with Menelaus, the renegade Jew, as high priest appointed by the Syrian king. Menelaus, having been driven out by Judas, made an appeal to the king at Antioch, and a number of the Jew8 sided with him—those who had gone into copying the Greek spirit. He went to the king at Antioch and told him that Judas had driven out all his friends and was taking the country away from the Seleucids at Antioch, whereupon the Syrian king sent against Judas the old general, Lysias, who had served under Antiochus Epiphanies, with a great army. They went down on the east side of the Jordan and around the Dead Sea, and came up on the south. It was a very strong army. Judas, at that time besieging the stronghold in Jerusalem still held by a garrison of the Syrian king, had to rush hurriedly to meet this vast invasion with a very inferior force, about 3,000 men. Many of the 3,000 advised him not to fight - that it was impossible for 3,000 Jews to overcome such a host as stood opposed to him. The battlefield was at Beth-Zecharias. But Judas fought anyhow—he always fought. A great many elephants were in the army of Lysias, and one of them being larger than the others and having more gorgeous trappings, was supposed by Eleazar to carry the commander-in-chief, Lysias So he dashed forward alone and got under the elephant and, stabbing upward, killed him. But the elephant in falling crushed Eleazar and killed him. Judas was defeated and fell back on Jerusalem. Lysias, when he got in eight of Jerusalem and saw how formidable were the preparations made by Judas, and being very much disturbed by the fear of the increasing Roman power, advised Antiochus to make peace, and so peace was made on the condition that the Jews were forever after to be free in their religion, but remain subject to the Syrian government. This peace secured the main thing for which the war was undertaken by Judas' father, Mattathias, and the Pharisees from this time on were opposed to the war. That is, they cared very little about political freedom. They were willing enough to be subordinate to another government if they were allowed to retain their religion. And about this time the renegade, Menelaus, died. From this time on the war between the Maccabees and Syria was a political rather than a religious war.

Just about this time the right heir to the throne at Antioch, Demetrius I, surnamed Soter, came to Antioch, dethroned the son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and killed him and Lysias, the general. Now comes to the front Alcimus—a man as bad as Menelaus or Jason. He wants to be high priest. He is thoroughly filled with the Hellenistic spirit, and in favor of Syrian domination. Demetrius appoints him high priest, and sends John Bacchides with an army to install him in office. The Pharisees thought they could accept him as high priest, inasmuch as he was a descendant of Aaron, in spite of the warning of Judas. But Alcimus, with Bacchides and his army to help him, killed a portion of the noblest of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in cold blood. Judas comes and drives out Alcimus, who makes a second appeal to Demetrius. Demetrius sends another great army to meet this great host of Syrians at the battle of Capharsalama, in Joshua's old battlefield at Beth-horon. Judas twice overwhelmingly defeats the Syrian general, kills him, and brings such spoils to Jerusalem as

had not been seen for years.

Just at this time Judas began to be depressed in mind, thinking how often be had to fight great armies with only a handful of men, so he made an appeal to Rome—which was a mistake on his part. Woe to the nation that ever appealed to Rome! He made an appeal to Rome and sent an embassy empowered to enter into a treaty of alliance with Rome, and also with Sparta in Greece. That treaty was made, but Judas was dead before the news came. The following is the treaty, from page 45 of 1 Maccabees:

Good success to the Romans, and to the people of the Jews, by land and by sea forever; the sword also and enemy be far from them. If there comes first any war upon the Romans, or any of their confederates throughout all their dominion, the people of the Jews shall help them with victuals, vessels, money, or ships, as it bath seemed good unto the Romans; but they shall keep their covenants without taking anything therefor. In the same manner, also, if war come first upon the Jews, the Romans shall help them with all their hearts, according as the time shall be appointed them; neither shall victuals be given them that take part against them, or weapons, or money, or ships, as it hath seemed good to the Romans, but they shall keep the covenants, and that without deceit. According to these articles did the Romans make a covenant with the Jews. Howbeit if hereafter the one party or the other shall think meet to add or diminish anything, they may do it at their pleasures, and whatsoever they shall add or take away shall be ratified. And as touching the evils that Demetrius doeth to the Jews, we have written unto him, saying, wherefore hast thou made thy yoke heavy upon our friends and confederates, the Jews? If therefore they complain any more against thee, we will do them justice, and fight with thee by sea and by land.

Now that is what is called a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive. An embassy had been sent to Sparta as well as to Rome, and here is the most singular document of history that came from the Spartans:

Areus, king of the Lacedaemonians, to Onias, the high priest, Greeting: it is found in writing that the Lacedaemoniana and the Jews are brethren, and that they are of the stock of Abraham: now, therefore, since this has come to our knowledge, ye shall do well to write unto in of your prosperity. We do write back again unto you that your cattle and goods are ours, and that ours are yours. We do commend, therefore, our ambassadors to make report unto you on this wise.

If I had that king of the Spartans before me, I would ask for a sight of the document proving that the Spartans, like the Jews, were the descendants of Abraham. I would like to see how he makes out his case. I cannot do it. That is a singular claim.

Let us now consider the death of Judas, which took place before the knowledge of the Roman treaty came to him. Demetrius had sent a still greater army under Bacchides, and sent back Alcimus, the high priest. Judas met him at Eleasa; Judas had 3,000 men, but Bacchides had 22,000 men. The men of Judas' army could not stand to face such a multitude and they went home and left him with only 800 men. He said, "It is not for me to flee; what if I am killed, I perish for my country." Never did 800 men make a braver fight than they made at Eleasa; but the little Jewish force was destroyed, except a very few, and Judas was killed. His brothers, Simon and Jonathan, rescued the body and buried it in the family cemetery, beside the aged father and the other brother that had fallen. That was in 161 B.C.; Jonathan was then made both high priest and

commander-in-chief. We have seen two of Mattathias' sons pass away—Judas and Eleazar. Jonathan is now the commander-in-chief, and about this time Alycimus died.

I must now refer to an event, one of the most important in the inter-biblical period. It took place 160 B.C.: Onias IV, the son of the good and pious Onias, whom Antiochus had killed, went to Egypt. He was entitled to the priesthood, but he did not believe there would ever be any chance to have regular worship at Jerusalem, so he asked the Ptolemies to have a temple built in Egypt. He read to him a verse from Isaiah (Isaiah 19:19): "In that day shall there be an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Jehovah." Onias quoted that passage from Isaiah, and a temple was erected at Leontopolis, or On, that stood as long as the Temple at Jerusalem. So now there are three temples: one at Jerusalem, the Samaritan temple, still standing, and the temple over in Egypt. The next important event is that Bacchides, finding out that Jonathan was as wise as Judas, and that the people were going to stand by him, made a treaty of peace with Jonathan, agreeing that Jonathan should take the office of high priest which the Jews had conferred upon him.

We now come to another very important event. In 153 B.C., Alexander, a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, claimed to be the legitimate ruler of Syria, and opposed Demetrius. Both of them, Demetrius and Alexander, began to make bids for Jonathan's help. Jonathan is now the arbitrator of the war—he has the ball at his feet and keeps it rolling between these two, and each one keeps raising his bid as to what he would do if Jonathan would lead the Jews to support him. Jonathan accepted the proposition of Alexander. To further strengthen himself, Alexander entered into a treaty of peace with Ptolemy, king of Egypt. This treaty was based upon a marriage between Alexander and Cleopatra, the daughter of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. But Ptolemy begins to change his policy of friendship toward Alexander, wishing to make himself ruler of the kingdom of the Seleucids. To this end he negotiates a treaty with Demetrius, the contestant for the throne of the Seleucids against Alexander, and promises to take his daughter, Cleopatra, away from Alexander and give her to Demetrius. I wonder how the woman felt in being swapped off that way— first to one man, then to another, for political reasons. The daughters of kings have a hard time of it on the marriage question, since they are disposed of for political reasons without regard for their own will or affections.

I have not the space to continue the history of the Maccabees in detail. It is sufficient to say that Jonathan, who succeeded Judas, was not only a great general, but a great diplomatist. He maintained his treaties of peace with the Romans and Lacedaemonians; he won many important victories and established himself thoroughly in the affections of the people, and enlarged the territory d his country. The tragic termination of his life was on this wise: A certain Trypho, minister and general of Alexander, began to aspire to be king at Antioch himself, and knowing that the most formidable adversary in his way was Jonathan and the Jewish army, he ensnared Jonathan under false pretenses to visit at Ptolemais. Jonathan accepted the invitation, taking with him only a thousand men. As soon as they entered the city the gates were closed, the thousand men were killed and Jonathan placed in prison. Jonathan's brother Simon raised an army to rescue his brother, and Trypho, dreading the result of an engagement, proffered to restore Jonathan for an immense sum of money, and provided that Jonathan's sons be left with him as hostages. Simon sent the money and the boys. Trypho kept the money and put Jonathan to death. Simon then succeeded Jonathan as both high priest and commander-in-chief. We find his great history set

forth in detail in the first book of Maccabees. He brought the Jews into great prosperity; he expelled the Syrian garrison from the tower in Jerusalem, and occupied Joppa as a seaport. The territory of the Jews was greatly enlarged. If Judas was the hero of the Maccabees, and Jonathan was the diplomatist, surely Simon was the great statesman. I have not space to tell of all his great deeds, but will give from the first book of Maccabees a pleasing bit of his history:

Then did they till their ground in peace, and the earth gave her increase, and the trees of the field their fruit. The ancient men sat all in the streets, communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He provided victuals for the cities, and set in them all manner of munition so that his honorable name was renowned unto the end of the world. He made peace in' the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. For every man sat under his vine and fig tree, and there was none to fray them; neither was there any left in the land to fight against them; yea, the kings themselves were overthrown in those days. Moreover, he strengthened all his people that were brought low. He searched out the law, and every dissenter of the law and wicked person he took away. He beautified the sanctuary and all the temple, and, multiplied its vessels. [He is the last of the Maccabean brothers. His brother John was killed by the Arabians.]

We now relate the tragic termination of Simon's life. His son-in-law, Ptolemy, was a governor of Jericho, and this son-in-law aspired to occupy the priesthood and the generalship held by Simon. He invited Simon to visit him. Simon went and took his wife, his eldest son, Judas, and his youngest son, Mattathias, with him. His most illustrious son, John Hyrcanus, was, fortunately, not with him. Ptolemy infamously murdered

Simon and the two Sons, and John Hyraces came with an army to punish him. Ptolemy led John's mother out on the walls and threa1~ied to put her to death if John did not retire from his position. His mother implored him to storm the place and not to mind her being killed. But he could not stand to bring his mother to death, and turned away. Then Ptolemy killed the mother anyhow and fled the country. I am sorry that we have no record of his being hanged.

John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon, is now made the high priest and commander-in-chief, and under him Judea wonderfully enlarged its territory. He destroyed the Samaritan temple and the city so that one could not tell where the city ever stood. He invade Edom, the home of Esau, and annexed it to Jacob. Little did he think that in thus uniting Esau with Jacob he was arranging unwittingly for the placing of an Edomite on the throne of Judea, Antipas, an Edomite, was made local governor of Edom, to be succeeded by his son Antipater, whose policy will be considered in the last chapter on this inter-biblical period. John was now at the height of his power and influence, but a quarrel was developed between him and the Pharisees.

I here stop t. make some explanation of the three Jewish sects—the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. The Pharisees were derived from the scribes. The scribes originated with Ezra, and the Pharisees were a development of the scribes. They held as binding the written Bible and the oral traditions. The oral traditions, as they claimed, were handed down from Moses, and afterward were embodied in the Talmud. Now, there are some good things about them. They believed in the resurrection of the dead, in the immortality of the soul, in the existence of angels; they kept alive the hope of a coming personal Messiah. But they became intense ritualists and formalists.

Now, the Sadducees. The word means simply Zadokites, that is, they claim to be the followers of the high priest, Zadok, away back yonder in Solomon's time. As the Pharisees were derived from the scribes, the Sadducees were derived from the priests. The Sadducees rightly held to the written Bible only, and rejected all traditions. But they were skeptics; they did not believe in angels, nor in spirits, nor in the immortality of the soul, nor in the resurrection of the body. In the next place, they were simply a political party; they believed in religion as an institution, but not as an inspiration. Like many politicians now that think they should hold on to religion to keep the people under control, but do not believe in it for themselves. The Essenes were neither a political nor an ecclesiastical party. They were rather a monastic order. They abjured marriages; they were vegetarians; they would not eat any meat, and would not let a woman come into the settlement at all. They perpetuated themselves by adopting children and training them to be monks. They would not go into trade nor commerce, and, like the Quakers, would not take an oath. They were the Pharisees gone to seed. They prayed, but, like the ancient Persians, they prayed toward the sun and not toward the temple.

I have not space to relate in detail the illustrious deeds of John Hyrcanus. He was the last great Maccabee. The illustrious members of the family were as follows: Old Mattathias, who led in the rebellion against Antiochus Epiphanes; the great Judas, who succeeded him; Jonathan, who followed Judas; Simon, who followed Jonathan; and John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon, who followed his father. John Hyrcanus died about 105 B.C. His eons were the first to crown themselves as kings. There were none of them equal to or worthy of the five great Maccabees whose names have been given above. While the sons of John were ruling, Rome comes upon the scene and history rapidly develops until the coming of our Lord.

QUESTIONS 1. What the name and extent of the period discussed in this chapter?

2. At what point did the last chapter close?

3. Describe the occasion of the battle at Beth-Zecharias.

4. Tell of the death of Eleazar, the brother of Judas.

5. What prompted Lysias to advise Antiochus to make peace with Judas, and what is the result of the peace?

6. From this time on, what the nature of the war between the Maccabees and Syria?

7. Tell how Demetrius I became king at Antioch.

8. Whom did he appoint to be high priest, and why did the Pharisees accept him?

9. What outrage was committed by this high priest which caused Judas to drive him out of Jerusalem?

10. What the occasion of another invasion of Judea by the Syrians? Describe the battle of Capharsalama.

11. What two noted embassies were sent out by Judas?

12. Give the treaty between the Romans and the Maccabees.

13. Give the transcript of the letter from the Lacedaenionians.

14. Describe the battle of Eleasa and the death of Judas.

15. Who succeeded Judas as high priest and commander-in-chief?

16. Give the history of the temple in Egypt at Leontopolis.

17. What new claimant for the throne at Antioch?

18. Describe the third marriage between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and the ultimate result.

19. Tell of the tragic death of Jonathan, and who succeeded him.

20. What the fate of John, the brother of Simon?

21. What the relative excellencies of Judas, Jonathan, and Simon?

22. Give the quotation from 1 Maccabees showing a pleasant part. of the history of Simon.

23. Give an account of the tragic death of Simon.

24. What the great achievement of John Hyrcanus, son of Simon?

25. Give some account of the three Jewish sects—the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes.

26. About what time did John Hyrcanus die?

27. Which one of his sons first became king of the Jews?

28. What may we say of the Asmonaean kings in comparison with the five preceding Maccabees?

Chapter 8

# 01.07. Lesson 7: THE JEWS UNDER THE ROMANS AND HEROD

Lesson # 7 THE JEWS UNDER THE ROMANS AND HEROD 65 B. C.—The Birth of Christ I commence this chapter with these opening remarks:

First, I have not been able, in the space allowed, to even name all of the Jewish books of the period, nor to distinguish sufficiently between them. The classifications of that literature are: The Wisdom literature, such as Wisdom and Ecciesiasticus; the Romance literature, such as Tobit and Judith; and the Apocalyptic literature, such as Baruch and Enoch—though it is doubtful if any part of Enoch was written before Christ; and the spurious prophetic literature, such as the Sibylline books and the imitation Psalter literature; the philosophic literature of the Alexandrian Jews; and the historical literature, such as 1 and 2 Maccabees; and the forged epistolary literature, such as the letter of Jeremiah; and the literature of forged prayers, such as those attributed to Manasseh and Azarias.

Second, There has not been space enough to examine critically the discrepancies between Jewish historians on the one hand and the Greek and Roman historians on the other hand.

Third, There has been such condensation of names and dates and little chance to differentiate enough to make living pictures before the mind.

It will, therefore, be understood that these seven chapters do not constitute a full discussion on the inter-biblical period, but are intended merely as a guide to a more extended study of this period.

I will now give a very brief summary of the preceding six chapters:

1. The names, "Jews" and "Judaism," came into prominence with Ezra, the scribe, called the Second Moses.

2. With him also rose the order of the scribes, who were the copyists, multipliers, and expounders of the sacred Scriptures, and the synagogues as places of worship and biblical instruction, and the council of the elders, which later became the Sanhedrin.

3. With him also came the revival of the law, the sanctity of the sabbath, the sanctity of the marriage relation, the permanent renunciation of idolatry by the Jews, and ever-increasing hopes of imn~ra1ity and of the coming of the Messiah.

4. The Judea of the restoration, after the Babylonian exile, was a small territory around Jerusalem, not as big as some of the counties of Texas, to be vastly enlarged under the Macca-bees.

5. Following the refusal to recognize the Samaritans as Jews, and the strict construction of the marriage law, arose the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, which stood until destroyed by John Hyrcanus.

6. Judea was subject to Persia until annexed by Alexander the Great, 332 B. C.

7. After his death it was subject to Egypt, from 323 B. C. to 198 B. C.

8. The greatest events under the Ptolemies were the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek and the rise of Hellenism, distinguishing the Hebrews from the Hellenists.

9. From 1983. c. to 128 B. c. Judah was subject to the Seleucids of Antioch.

10. The events of this subjection were: First, the attempt of Antiochus IV, surnamed Epiphanes, to utterly destroy the Jews' religion, bringing the kingdom of God into greater peril than ever in human history except in the days of Noah and in the days of Elijah when he stood alone against the world. Second, the heroic resistance of Mattathias and his five sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan, all of them dying violent deaths in the violent struggle, continued by John Hyrcanus, son of Simon.

11. In these Maccabean wars the following great results were obtained: (1) religious liberty by Judas Maccabeus; (2) political independence by his brothers Jonathan and Simon and by John Hyrcanus, son of Simon; (3) great expansion of the Jewish territory until it almost reached the old boundaries of David's kingdom—this expansion included Samaria, Perea, Galilee, Gilead, Iturea, Idumea, and Philistia; (4) that Aristobulus, son of John Hyrcanus, was the first to put on the royal diadem; (5) in this period came to the front the three noted Jewish sects—the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes; (6) that a Jewish temple was established in Egypt, which lasted until A.D. 70, when the Jerusalem Temple was also destroyed.

12. The kings of the Asmonaean Dynasty were unworthy of their illustrious Maccabean ancestry. The foregoing remarks refer to the preceding chapters on the inter-biblical period, and we are now to consider the last section of the period, from 65 B.C. to the birth of Christ, in which Judea is subject to the Romans, and the Asmonaean Dynasty is succeeded by Herod, sometimes called the Great, an Idumaean, whose mother was an Arabian. The countries now to the front are Rome, Pontus under Mithridates, Parthia, which Rome never conquered, and the dying kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Let us glance now for a moment at

ROME At this time Rome, as a republic, had become utterly corrupt. Indeed, it was no longer a republic in any true sense. There is the distinction between a democracy and a republic. In a pure democracy the people rule directly; in a republic they rule representatively. The United States is a republic, ever approaching a democracy. The Baptist churches are the only pure democracies in the world. The Presbyterians have a republican form of government; they govern by representatives. The senate of Rome constituted its republican feature, and had become the most corrupt oligarchy in history. They appointed the proconsuls who governed all the provinces, except those ruled by military appointees of Caesar. The tribunes, elected by the citizens, constituted the only democratic element—but the elections became a mere farce. The lands of Italy were now owned by a few corrupt landlords who used up the resources of the farms to support a vicious city life. The overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of Italy were slaves, captives of foreign wars, who tilled all the farms, built all the imposing edifices, constituted the entire class of mechanics, artisans, scribes, and domestics. These slaves were not of an inferior race, but were the nobles, patriots, the picked men and women of the conquered nations from all over the world, and in thousands of instances far superior to their masters in education and nobility. Thy had no legal rights. Their labor, their persons, their honor their lives, were absolutely at the disposal of their

luxurious, and oftentimes vicious masters. The sturdy yoemanry had passed away. Those who were counted citizens, and could vote for the tribune, did not work, and lived on gratuitous distribution of rations and free shows. Whoever could most liberally supply them with "bread and circuses" could command their votes. Only by the spoils of conquered nations, or by the spoils of robbery of subject provinces could one have means enough to thus feed and amuse the pampered and fickle body of so-called Roman citizens. Goldsmith, in The Deserted Village, well says, Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey, Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

About the beginning of our period, Cicero, the great orator, was consul exposing the Cataline conspiracy, in those famous orations which are studied as a preparation for college. Three men, by combination, controlled the world. This was the first Roman Triumvirate, that is, three-man power, or three-man government—Julius Caesar, Gnaeus Pompey, and Publius Crassus. There were two formidable enemies of Rome at this time—Mithridates, king of Pontus, and the Parthians from the shores of the Caspian Sea. Pompey conquered Mithridates, and also overthrew the last of the Seleucids at Antioch, winding up this division of the Greek Empire, and this brought him in touch with Judea. Pompey besieged and captured Jerusalem and pushed his way into the holy of holies, and was astounded at what he found. Tacitus tells what he found: "He found within no images of the gods, a vacant mercy seat, and an empty ark."

Thus passed away the Asmonaean kingdom. The Jews never forgave this impiety of Pompey. While the Asmonaean kingdom passed away, members of the family yet remained for some years, with a kind of princely dignity. The Jews were more tolerant to Pompey’s fellow triumvir, Crassus, who nine years later (54 B. c.), when governor of Syria, robbed the temple of all its treasures, amOunting in cash value to about $10,-000,000. A year later, 53 B. c., Crassus was defeated by the Parthians, his army annihilated, and himself slain at the battle of Carrhae. This downfall of Crassus the Jews interpreted as the vengeance of the Almighty for his robbery of the Temple. At any rate, this victory of the Parthians, 53 B. C., brought about two results:

1. It opened the way for them to come in touch with Judea, which I will tell about later.

2. It opened a way for the rupture between Caesar and Pompey (49 B.C.), the other triumvirs, and which led to the famous civil war which was settled at the battle of Pharsalia, in which Caesar with 22,000 of his veterans defeated and captured Pompey’s army of 50,000 men. Caesar’s grim old veterans were told that Pompey’s legions were "city dandies," and hence were instructed to strike at their faces, since they prided themselves so much on their good looks that to hit at their prettiness scared them worse than to hit at their hearts.

Pompey fled to Egypt, and was assassinated as soon as he stepped ashore. Caesar followed him, and was temporarily snared by the witchery of the famous Cleopatra. Caesar is now the ruler of the world.

ESAU AND ISHMAEL ON THE THRONE OF JACOB. IN THE PERSON OF HEROD, THE IDUMARAN, WHOSE MOTHER WAS AN ARABIAN. In a former chapter was recounted the final conquest of Idumaea, or Edom, by John Hyrcanus, and its incorporation into Judea, thus forcibly uniting Jacob and Esau. Antipas, a shrewd and powerful Idumaean, was left as local governor of the conquered Edom. He left as his successor a greater and more unscrupulous son, Antipater. This Antipater had sided with Pompey against Caesar, but when he learned the result of the battle

of Pharsalia, he flopped over to Caesar in the snap of the fingers. He hurriedly gathered an army and rushed to Caesar's help at Alexandria, where Caesar was having a time of it trying to conquer that great city, and so says Mime Rea:

"The Iduinaean mouse helped the Roman lion, and the lion was grateful." On the rupture with Pompey, Caesar had released Aristobulus, one of the contesting Maccabees, and loaned him to legions to create a diversion in Judea against Pompey. Pompey's friends poisoned Aristobulus and executed his brother Alexander. Now, for the help rendered him at Alexandria, Caesar made Antipater a Roman citizen and procurator of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. Hyrcanus II was made high priest and a Roman senator, and also was made hereditary ethnarch, that is, subordinate governor. Antipater at once began to advance his family, as fathers are wont to do. His son, Phasael, was made governor of Jerusalem, and his greater gon, known later as Herod the Great, then just twenty-five years old, was sent into Galilee to put down bands of desperadoes, robbers, and religious zealots, who as patriots, sheltered themselves in caves and warred against Rome.

Many years ago Harper's Magazine gave a richly illustrated account of Herod's successful war against these devoted Jews, who so desperately resisted the Roman supremacy. From the mountain tops Herod let down huge boxes, as big as a flat car, by chains, filled with Roman soldiers, until they were just level with the mouth of the caves, and there, swung in the air, these grim Roman soldiers gained an entrance by desperate fighting, killing and capturing these so-called robbers. If they had succeeded they would have passed into history with the fame of William Tell, Sir William Wallace, or Francis Marion, and we must not think of these men as ordinary robbers. Barabbas, who was preferred to Christ, was this kind of robber—not an ordinary highwayman—and one of the apostles was Simon the Zealot. We may, therefore, understand why the Sanhedrin summoned Herod, in this case, to answer at its bar for murdering "free Jews," who counted themselves patriots, and why they later preferred Barabbas to Christ. The two so-called thieves crucified with Christ were also of this kind. When summoned to appear before the Sanhedrin, Herod came with an armed band and overawed the court. Only one member, Shammai, dared to move his condemnation, and before the motion could be put the weak old Hyrcanus, the high priest, the mere tool of Herod's father, adjourned the court. Soon after this Rome was turned into a bedlam by THE ASSASSINATION OF CAESAR IN THE ROMAN SENATE (March 15, 44 B.C.)

Bedlam is the name for a madhouse. There was an old English madhouse called Bedlam, and ever since a madhouse has been called a bedlam. Sixty senators, led by Brutus and Cassius, participated in the murder of Caesar. Read Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Froude's Sketch of Caesar, and Mommsen's History of Rome at this period. The senate was far more corrupt than Caesar. It was impossible, out of such material, to reconstruct a republic, and this led to the second Roman Triumvirate, to wit: Octavius Caesar, a nephew of Julius, and his adopted son, Mark Antony, and Lepidus. Antipater was raising an army to help Brutus and Cassius when, in 43 B. c. the Jews poisoned him. Herod, his son, would have followed his father's course, l~it at the famous battle of Philippi the incipient republic perished, where Octavius and Antony defeated Brutus and Cassius, who both committed suicide, as did the great Cato somewhat later, in Africa. Mark Antony also captured and slew Cicero, who also favored the republic, just as he was about to get into a boat to escape. There is a great painting of Cicero stepping out of his litter to meet his murderer.

Herod now cajoled Mark Antony, who commanded in the East, and who against all Jewish accusations made both Herod and Phasael tetrarchs under the nominal sovereignty of the Maccabee, Hyrcanus II. This was 41 B.C.. Antigonus, the younger eon of Aristobulos and brother of Hyrcanus, claimed the throne, and was supported by the Parthians. They made him king, and upheld him in power for three years, 40 B.C., to 37 B.C., and for this time Judea was under control of the Parthians. With their help Antigonus, the last of the Asmonaean kings, captured Jerusalem and with it Phasael and Hyrcanus. He cut off the ears of Hyrcanus, the mutilation barring him from the priesthood, and sent him to Babylon. Phasael committed suicide; and Herod fled to Masada at the southern end of the Dead Sea, and left his women folk there with his brother Joseph, and he himself went first to Egypt, and then to Rome, telling how Antigonus welcomed the Parthians, the enemies of Rome, and so cajoling both Octavius and Antony, and by a decree of the senate was made king of Judea. Thus passed away the Asxnonaean line—or Maccabee line—and thus Herod, the descendant of Esau, whose mother was a descendant of Ishmael, takes his seat on the throne of Jacob. Herod returned with two Roman legions, and swelled the number to about 100,000 by enlisting renegade Jews, and besieged and captured Jerusalem on the twenty-sixth anniversary of its capture by Pompey. He also captured Antigonus, whom the Parthians had put in power, and sent him to Antony at Antioch, who executed him. Antony called him "Antigona," which is the female name for Antigonus. He thus changed his name to a woman’s name because he cried and whined, but I have known some women who would neither whine nor cry. Antony executed him, and that was the first time in history that a sovereign of a nation suffered death under the ax of the Roman lictor. THE REIGN OF HEROD, 37-4 B.C.

We now take up the reign of Herod from 37 B.C. to the birth of Christ. Before he captured Jerusalem he had married the beautiful Asmonaean princess, Mariamne, hoping to secure thereby the support of the favorers of the Maccabean line. The marriage was unfortunate for this beautiful woman, for she was persecuted by Herod’s sister, Salome, and by Cypros, his Arabian mother. In the end—for these two women never stopped—Herod was induced to murder his beautiful wife, the only woman he ever loved—and he married a great many women—and later to murder his two sons by this wife. Remorse for murdering the woman that he loved kept biting him like an undying worm, and kept stinging him like a scorpion as long as he lived.

Here we can do no more than summarize his reign.

1. When he captured Jerusalem he put to death forty-three members of the Sanhedrin, which had once summoned him to trial.

2. He made Ananel, an obscure Jew of Babylon, high priest, and when this raised a clamor he yielded and appointed the brother of his wife, Mariamne, a boy seventeen years of age, very popular and very much beloved of the people.

3. There was an appeal by the people, by the Maccabean women, to Cleopatra, who had completely ensnared Antony. Influenced by Cleopatra, Antony summoned Herod to appear before him at Alexandria, but having heard him, notwithstanding that Cleopatra was against him, he dismissed the charges against him, and added Coele-Syria to his kingdom. Nearly everybody would be willing to be put on trial if followed by such a verdict as that.

4. When on the death of Lepidus civil war was waged between the two remaining triumvirs, Herod sided with Antony, but the great sea battle at Actum decided the war in favor of Octavius, 31 B.C.

5. Herod instantly flopped over to the other side, sought Octavius in the Island of Rhodes, cajoled him, was confirmed in his kingdom, and in the next year Octavius enlarged his territory by adding Gadara, Hyppo, Samaria, and the seaports of Joppa, Anthedo., Gaza, and a place called Straton's Tower, which afterward became the Caesarea of the New Testament.

6. Soon after this, Herod, as I have said, put to death his wife, the beautiful Maccabean princess, and mother of two sons, 28 B. C., and one year later he executed her mother, Alexandra.

7. He began to Hellenize the country by erecting in Jerusalem a Grecian theater, and an enormous amphitheater, and instituted Grecian games and gladiatorial combats. He erected heathen temples in all the new cities that he built, particularly Caesarea and old Sainaria. Herod rebuilt that and called it Sebaste, in honor of Augustus. He erected a splendid palace in Jerusalem, whith we read about in the New Testament, and he also erected that famous tower of Antonia, which we also read about in the New Testament, and which commanded the approach of the Temple.

8. Feeling that he was hated of all men, he sought to regain popularity by the Roman method of free distribution of bread, and as this was in the time of both famine and pestilence, he did thereby regain much popular favor.

9. But his greatest exploit in this direction was the restoration and enlargement of the Temple built five centuries before by Zerubbabel. This mighty enterprise, far superior to either Solomon's Temple or the one by Zerubbabel, was commenced 20 B.C., and was not finally completed until A.D. 65, which was just five years before Titus destroyed it. This is the famous temple whose huge stones excited the wonder of the apostles, and called forth our Lord's great prophecy in Matthew 24:1-51, Matthew 25:1-46, and which Christ twice purified, once at the beginning and once at the end of his ministry.

10. Herod murdered his two sons by Mariamne, where their mother before them had been murdered.

11. He was now the subject of a loathsome disease, somewhat like what we now call the bubonic plague. His life was miserable.

12. He put to death his son, Antipater, by his first wife Doris, which caused Octavius (now Augustus Caesar) to say, "It is safer to be Herod's swine than his son," for a superstition kept him from killing a hog.

13. In 4 B. c. he slaughtered the infants at Bethlehem, so graphically told in Matthew 2:16-18, in an effort to destroy him who was "born King of the Jews," and for whom the angels sang their great Christmas hymn. His own death was as horrible as that of Antiochus Epiphanes, or that of his grandson, Herod, told about in Acts 12:1-25, who died eaten up by worms, while the word of God lived and prospered.

HEROD'S CHARACTER

Just a glance at his character. He is not entitled to be called "the Great." He was a shrewd politician, easily cajoling greater men than himself, as he did Julius Caesar and Antony, and Augustus Caesar, and was never himself cajoled by Cleopatra, though she tried her best on him, and she did captivate Julius Caesar and Antony, though she failed when she tried her charms on Augustus Caesar. Herod wanted to kill her in the interest of Antony when she visited him some time before this near Jerusalem. And he doubtless regretted that he allowed his friends to over persuade him not to kill her. He was a fearless man, and a really great soldier.

He was a great builder. Look at the great city he built up at the source of the Jordan. Look at the city of Samaria. Look at the city of Caesazea. Look at that great temple and the tower of Antonia. He was an unscrupulous murderer. He was not a persecutor of the Jews' religion, like Antiochus Epiphanes, though he had no religion himself, and had no respect for any religion. My last remark is concerning his descendants mentioned in the New Testament. The tetrarch, Philip of Luke 3:1, the Archelaus of Matthew 2:22, the Herod Antipas who murdered John the Baptist (Mark 6:14) and who mocked Christ when sent to him by Pilate—these were all his sons. The Herod who murdered James (Acts 12:1-25) was his grandson. The Drusilla who sat with Felix when Paul was tried (Acts 24:1-27), and the Agrippa and Bernice, before whom Paul appeared, were his great-grandchildren.

QUESTIONS 1. Give the title and extent of the last section of the inter-biblical period.

2. Why may not these seven chapters constitute a full course on the inter-biblical pediod?

3. Classify the Jewish literature of the period.

4. Give a summary of the six preceding chapters.

5. What nations to the front in this last section of the period?

6. State the conditions at Rome at the beginning of this section.

7. Who constituted the first great Triumvirate at Rome?

8. What the results of the war with Mithridates?

9. Describe the end of the Seleucids' Empire at Antioch and its effect on Judea.

10. When did Pompey capture Jerusalem?

11. Of what sacrilege was he guilty, and how does Tacitus describe what he found?

12. How many Jews did Pompey deport as slaves to Rome, and how did this possibly affsst the citizenship?

13. Who nine years later robbed the temple of all its treasures?

14. What the fate of the triumyir, Crassus, and what the two great results?

15. When and where was the issue between Caesar and Pompey decided, and what the fate of Pompey?

16. What the last division of this section of the inter-biblical period?

17. When Edom was incorporated into Judea, what Idumaean was made local governor?

18. Who his greater and more unscrupulous successor?

19. What the part played by Antipater in the war between Caesar and Pompey, and by what rapid change and help extended did he secure the friendship of Caesar?

20. State the honors conferred upon Antipater by Caesar.

2i. State how Antipater advanced his family.

22. What magazine a few years ago gave a richly illustrated account of Herod's war against the Galilean Jews, and how was the war conducted to a successful issue?

23. If these zealots and so-called robbers had been successful, with what illustrious names would they have been classified?

24. What the result of the Sanhedrin's summoning Herod to answer for destroying these Galileans?

25. What great event March 15, 44 B.C., converted Rome into a bedlam?

26. Give the names of the second Roman Triumvirate.

27. What four illustrious Romans opposed the Triumvirate?

28. When and where was decided the great issue between the Republicans and the Triumvirate?

29. What the fate of Brutus, Cassius, Cato, and Cicero respectively?

30. With what party did Antipater sympathize?

31. After the assassination of Antipater, how did Herod, who succeeded his father, cajole Mark Antony, and what honors were received?

32. Show how the Parthians came in touch with Judea, and whom they placed on the throne at Jerusalem.

33. When Antigonus became the governor of Jerusalem, what the resuit to the Herodian family?

34. By what experiment did Herod turn the scales? How did he conquer Jerusalem, and what the fate of Antigonus?

35. What the period of the reign of Herod?

36. Tell the story of Mariamne, his Maccabean wife, and of her two eons by Herod.

37. When Herod captured Jerusalem, how did he avenge on the Sanhedrin their once summoning him to trial?

38. Give the relations between Herod and Cleopatra, queen of Egypt.

39. When on the death of Lepidus civil war was waged between Octavius Caesar and Antony, with which side did Herod align himself?

40. What great sea battle decided the war in favor of Octavius, and what its date?

41. After this battle, how did Herod cajole Octavius and what new honors were conferred upon him?

42. How did Herod attempt to Hellenize the country?

43. By what two great expedients did Herod seek to placate the hatred of the people?

44. What loathsome disease now came upon him?

45. What remark was made by Augustus Caesar when Herod put to death his son Antipater, by his first wife Doris?

46. What his last murderous exploit, and where in the New Testament do we find an account of it?

47. Give a summary of Herod’s character.

48. Give the proofs that he was a great builder.

49. Name his descendants and their part in New Testament history.

Chapter 9

# 02.00. Distinctive Baptist Principles

Distinctive Baptist Principles

By Dr. B. H. Carroll DISTINCTIVE BAPTIST PRINCIPLES

"A declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us."- Luke 1:1. "It was needful for me . . . to exhort you that ye should ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints."- Jude 1:1. THE distinctive principles of the Baptists are those doctrines or practices which distinguish its from other Christian denominations. It is held by some that no doctrine or practice should be classed as distinctive which has at any time been shared in whole or in part, by any other denomination. But this limited sense of the word distinctive is too narrow for ordinary speech or common sense. For example: The Greek church and the Baptists both practice immersion, but their doctrine of baptism is widely different from ours. Authority, subject, and design all enter as much into the validity of this ordinance as the act itself. More than mere immersion is necessary, to constitute New Testament baptism. Again, the Congregationalists agree with Baptists in the form of church government, but their doctrine of the church is widely different from ours. Yet again, the statement of Chillingworth. "The Bible, and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants." is widely different from the Baptist principle, "The New Testament, the only law of Christianity."

Moreover, this entire subject has an historic aspect, which may not be ignored. There has been great progress in Baptist principles since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Throughout the Protestant world there has been steady approximation by nearly all other denominations to many Baptist principles, very materially narrowing the once broad margin dividing us from other people. So that the distinctive in history is much more marked than the distinctive of the present day. Notable among the Baptist doctrines towards which there has been this steady approximation are "Freedom of Conscience" and "Separation of Church and State." It is one of the best established facts of history that Protestants equally with Romanists once held to the unchristian and horrible maxim: "Whose is the government-his is the religion." Geneva, Germany, Holland, Old England and New England shared it with Italy, Spain and France, as Baptists found to their cost. While, therefore, the more recent approximations towards our principles are warmly welcomed, and while the hope of still greater approximation is fondly cherished, we are not thereby estopped from entrance into the domain of history in discussing distinctive principles.

Before coming to affirmative statements allow me to clear away the brush obstructing a fair view by disclaiming as distinctive the only two doctrines which in the world’s estimation constitute the sum of our distinctive principles:

(1) Immersion is Baptism

Immersion is not disclaimed as a Baptist doctrine, but it is disclaimed as a distinctive tenet. Think of it. For the first thirteen hundred years all Christendom held this belief. Even today other Christian denominations, aggregating nearly one hundred million people, believe and practice it as

the only baptism. How, then, can it be our most distinguishing tenet? If, indeed, it be distinctive of our people, it is the least distinctive and the least important of all our principles. In this discussion it will not even be named as a distinctive principle.

(2) Baptism is Essential to Salvation So far from being distinctive, this is not now and never has been a Baptist doctrine. More than all other people do they repudiate it. Indeed, on the contrary, the Baptists are the only people in the world who hold its exact opposite: Salvation is essential to baptism. On these premises and disclaimers we may now announce in order the distinctive Baptist principles:

Chapter 10

# 02.01. The New Testament-The Law of Christianity

THE NEW TESTAMENT-THE LAW OF CHRISTIANITY

Doubtless many of my fellow-Christians of other denominations may be disposed to smile at the announcement of this as a distinctive Baptist principle. But let us not smile too soon. Patiently await the development of the thought. To expand the statement: All the New Testament is the Law of Christianity. The New Testament is all the Law of Christianity. The New Testament will always be all the Law of Christianity. This does not deny the inspiration or profit of the Old Testament, nor that the New is a development of the Old. It affirms, however, that the Old Testament, as a typical, educational and transitory system, was fulfilled by Christ, and as a standard of law and way of life was nailed to the cross of Christ and so taken out of the way. The principle teaches that we should not go to the Old Testament to find Christian law or Christian institutions. Not there do we find the true idea of the Christian church, or its members, or its ordinances, or its government, or its officers, or its sacrifices, or its worship, or its mission, or its ritual, or its priesthood. Now, when we consider the fact that the overwhelming majority of Christendom today, whether Greek, Romanist or Protestant, borrow from the Old Testament so much of their doctrine of the church, including its members, officers, ritual ordinances, government, liturgy and mission, we may well call this a distinctive Baptist principle. This is not a question of what is the Bible. If it were, Baptists would not be distinguished from many Protestants in rejecting the apocryphal additions incorporated by Romanists in their Old Testament. Nor is it a stand with Chillingworth on the proposition, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants." If it were, Baptists would not be distinguished from many Protestants in rejecting the equal authority of tradition as held by the Romanists. But when Baptists say that the New Testament is the only law for Christian institutions they part company, if not theoretically at least practically, with most of the Protestant world, as well as from the Greeks and Romanists.

We believe that the church, with all that pertains to it, is strictly a New Testament institution. We do not deny that there was an Old Testament ecclesia, but do deny its identity with the New Testament ecclesia. We do not deny the circumcision of infants under Old Testament law, but do deny their baptism under New Testament law. We do not deny that there were elders under the Mosaic economy, nor even deny the facts of uninspired history concerning the elders of the Jewish synagogue. We simply claim that the New Testament alone must define the office and functions of the elder in the Christian church. Christ himself appointed its Apostles and its first seventy elders. We not only stand upon the New Testament alone in repelling Old Testament institutions, in repelling apocryphal additions thereto, in repelling the historic synagogue of the inter-biblical period as the model of the church, but to repel the binding authority of post-apostolic history, whether embodied in the literature of the ante-Nicene fathers or in the decisions of councils, from the council at Nice, A. D. 325, to the Vatican Council, A. D. 1870. We allow not Clement, Polycarp, Hippolytus, Ignatius, Irenaeus Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Jerome, Eusebius. Augustine, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Henry VIII., Knox or Wesley either to determine what is New Testament law or to make law for us. In determining the office and functions of a

bishop, we consider neither the Septuagint episcopos, nor the Gentile episcopos, nor the developed episcopos of the early Christian centuries.

We shut ourselves up to the New Testament teaching concerning the bishop. But recently the Christian world has been invited to unite on the historic episcopacy of the early Christian centuries. We made no response to this unscriptural invitation. Yet more recently, the eccentric, and I may add, the heretical, higher critic, Dr. Briggs, seeks, it seems, to unite the Christian world on the word katholikos (universal) as applied to the church and as defined In these same early Christian centuries. We utterly disregard this invitation, not only because his word katholikos is found nowhere in the Greek of either Old or New Testament, but because the idea of catholicity must not be learned from post-apostolic fathers, but from the inspired New Testament, and because it was this word, katholikos, which led to the idea of the church as an organized general body having appellate jurisdiction over the particular congregations, and led to the union of church and state under Constantine. We are willing enough to enter the domain of uninspired history as a matter of research, and ready enough to concede all its fairly established facts, whatever sound proof may show them to be, but we recognize as the only ground of union, now or hereafter, the impregnable rock of the New Testament. And mark you the first form of the expanded statement: All the New Testament is the law of Christianity. To apply this thought: One Christian denomination, in determining the law of pardon, would shut us out of the four Gospel narratives up to the resurrection of Christ and shut us up to the latter half of the New Testament. Here we say, give us all the New Testament. The cases of forgiveness of sin, at the mouth and hand of our Lord himself, must be considered in determining the law of pardon. The New Testament is the law of Christianity. All the New Testament is the law of Christianity. The New Testament is all the law of Christianity. The New Testament always will be all the law of Christianity, Avaunt, ye types and shadows! Avaunt, Apocrypha! Avaunt, 0 Synagogue! Avaunt, Tradition, thou hoary-headed liar. Hush! Be still and listen! All through the Christian ages-from dark and noisome dungeons, from the lone wanderings of banishment and expatriation, from the roarings and sickening conflagrations of martyr fires, there comes a voice-shouted here, whispered there, sighed, sobbed, or gasped elsewhere-a Baptist voice, clearer than a silver trumpet and sweeter than the chime of bells, a voice that freights and glorifies the breeze or gale that bears it. O Earth, hearken to it: The New Testament is the law of Christianity! Let the disciples of Zoroaster, Brahma, Confucius, Zeno and Epicurus hear it. And when Mahomet comes with his Koran, or Joe Smith with his book of Mormon, or Swedenborg with his new revelations, or spirit-rappers, wizards, witches and necromancers with their impostures, confront each in turn with the all-sufficient revelation of this book, and when science-falsely so called (properly speculative philosophy)-would hold up the book as moribund, effete or obsolete, may that Baptist voice rebuke it. Christ himself set up his kingdom. Christ himself established his church. Christ himself gave us Christian law. And the men whom he inspired furnish us the only reliable record of these institutions. They had no successors in inspiration. The record is complete. Prophecy and vision have ceased. The canon of revelation and the period of legislation are closed. Let no man dare to add to it or take from it, or dilute it, or substitute for it. It is written. It is finished.

# 02.02. Individuality

II. INDIVIDUALITY This New Testament law of Christianity segregates the individual from his own family, from society with all its customs and requirements, from race and nationality, from caste, however exclusive, from all governmental control or intimidations, from all the bonds of friendship, though dear as the tie between David and Jonathan or Damon and Pythias, then isolates him from every external influence, strips him of every artificial distinction arising from wealth or poverty or social status, and then shuts him upp in an exclusive circle alone with God, who is no respecter of persons, and there demands of his naked and solitary personality a voluntary surrender of his will to God’s will and an immediate response of obedience to all its demands. There are no sponsors, or proxies. Enforced or insincere obedience counts nothing at all. The sole responsibility of decision and action rests directly on the individual soul. Each one must give account of himself to God. This is the first principle of New Testament law-to bring each naked soul face to face with God. When that first Baptist voice broke the silence of four hundred years it startled the world with its appeal to individuality: "Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father. Behold, the axe is laid at the root of the trees, and every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." Do thou repent. Do thou confess thy sins. Do thou be baptized. It was the first step of Christianity, and what a colossal stride! Family ties count nothing. Greek culture nothing. Roman citizenship nothing. Circumcision nothing. O soul, thou art alone before God! The multitude shall not swallow thee up. "If thou shalt be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it." Family relationship intruded upon our Lord’s busiest hour. "Behold, thy mother and thy brothers seek thee." Once before he had said: "Woman, what have I to do with thee ?" and now like a flash of lightning comes his scathing reply: "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers? Whosoever doeth the will of my heavenly Father, the same is my mother, my brother, my sister."

Another time it intruded upon him to call forth his crucial statement: "If any man hate not his, father and mother and brother and sister he cannot be my disciple." In his dying hour, on the way to the cross, he heard its voice once more: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps which gave thee suck," and once more he replied. "Yea, rather blessed is she that doeth the will of God." Superiority for the twelve over Paul was claimed because they had known the Lord in the flesh. But Paul rejoined: "Where henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more."

How often in history has the question been propounded by some wishing to shun personal responsibility! May I not refer this matter to the magistrates? May I not consult the customs of my country? May I not seek the guidance of my priest and put on him the responsibility of interpreting this book? Nay, verily. Do thou interpret. It is God’s letter to thy soul. Thy right of private judgment is the crown jewel of thy humanity. Sometimes even Baptists falter on this point. I have heard one of them excuse himself from an acknowledged duty of co-operation in missions, because his church was opposed to the mission work. Not even thy church can absolve thee from individual duty. Churches are time organizations and are punished in time. They do not stand before the

great white throne of judgment. But thy soul shall appear before the judge. Well did our Lord know that there could be no evangelization of the world if ancestors, families, customs, government, commerce and priests could stand between the individual soul and God. Thy relation to God is paramount. His law takes precedence of all and swallows up all. In giving emphasis to this doctrine of individuality our Baptist fathers have suffered martyrdom at the hands of the heathen, the Romanist, the Greek, and the Protestant alike.

# 02.03. Freedom of Conscience

III. FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE This follows from individual responsibility. If one be responsible for himself, there must he no restraint or constraint of his conscience. Neither parent, nor government, nor church, may usurp the prerogative of God as Lord of the conscience. God himself does not coerce the will. His people are volunteers, not conscripts. As has been stated, the prevalent theory in the days of the Reformation was: "Whose is the government-his is the religion." Louis XIV. revoked the Edict of Nantes, signed by his grandfather, the great Henry of Navarre. Calvin burned Servetus at the stake. Luther loosed all the hounds of persecution upon the Baptists in his day. Holland, the little republic that tore her lowlands from the ocean flood, and for eighty years, by pike and dike, repelled the Spaniard with his Inquisition, did herself destroy her greatest statesman, John of Barneveldt, and banish her great historian Grotius for conscience' sake. Henry VIII., in England, and his successors, delighted to persecute for conscience' sake. John Knox, of Scotland, so tarnished his great name. The Congregationalists of New England and the Episcopalians of Virginia alike denied freedom of conscience to their fellowmen. There was not a government in the world that allowed full liberty of conscience to all men until a Baptist established the colony of Rhode Island. At a great dining in England John Bright asked a Baptist statesman beside him: "What special contribution have your people made to the world? "Civil and religious liberty," replied the statesman. "A great contribution," replied John Bright. Bancroft, in his history of America, declares: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was from the first the trophy of the Baptists." On November 5, 1658, these Baptists thus instructed their agent in England: " Plead our case in such sort as we may not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences; we do judge it no less than a point of absolute cruelty." In their petition to Charles II. they thus urged: "It is much in our hearts to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, with a full liberty of religious concernments." And so when their charter came it provided: "No person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be in any wise molested, punished, disquieted or called in question, for any difference in opinion in matters of religion; every person may at all times freely and fully enjoy his own judgment and conscience in matters of religious concernment." And the charter of their great school, now Brown University, has a clause of equal import, a thing unknown at that time in the chartered schools of the whole world.

Freedom of conscience in our day, especially in this country, is a familiar thing. It was not so in earlier days. Pagan, Papist and Protestant ground liberty of conscience into powder under the iron heel of their despotisms.

# 02.04. Salvation Essential to Baptism

IV. SALVATION IS ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM AND CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

Here, if nowhere else, Baptists stand absolutely alone. Thee foot of no other denomination in Christendom rests on this plank. Blood before water-the altar before the laver. This principle eliminates not only all infant baptism and membership, but locates the adult's remission of sins in the fountain of blood instead of the fountain of water. When the author of the letter to the Hebrews declares: " It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins," he bases the impossibility on the lack of intrinsic merit. Following the precise idea Baptists declare: "It is not possible that the water of baptism should take away sins." There is no intrinsic merit in the water. The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, alone can cleanse us from sin. True, the water of baptism and the wine of the Lord's Supper may symbolically take away sins, but not in fact. "Arise and he baptized and wash away thy sins." "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." Both declarations are beautiful and impressive figures of antecedent fact. A brother of another denomination once objected: "You Baptists have no method of induction into Christ. My people baptize a man into Christ." The reply was two-fold: (1) It is not enough to get a man into Christ; you must also get Christ into him, as he says, "I in you and you in me." If you insist that baptism really, and not figuratively, puts a man into Christ, how will you meet the Romanist on the other half of it, "Eating the wafer of the Supper really puts Christ into the man. He eats the flesh of the real presence"? You must admit that the words are stronger for his induction than yours.

(2) Baptists have a method of double induction: "We have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." Faith puts us into Christ. "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me." "Christ in you the hope of glory." "Ye are manifestly declared to be an epistle of Christ, . . . written with the Spirit of the living God . . . in fleshly tables, of the heart." "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Thus the Holy Spirit puts Christ in us. We get into him by faith. He gets into us by the Holy Spirit, thus fulfilling his words: "I in you and you in me." This great, vital and fundamental Baptist principle, Salvation must precede ordinances, does, at one blow, smite and blast those two great enemies of religion, sacramentalism and sacerdotalism. If ritualism saves, priests are a necessity. If my salvation is conditioned on the performance of a rite, then also it is conditioned on the act and will of a third party who administers the saving rite. The doctrine of salvation by rites is the hope of the priest who alone can administer the rite. This gives both importance and revenue to his office. He multiplies the sacraments. "Two are too few. Let us have seven. The more, the better for us, and thus we will control our subjects not only from the cradle to the grave, but from conception in the womb to eternity." Not only does our great principle destroy both sacramentalism and sacerdotalism, but it alone draws a line of cleavage between the church and the world. To perpetuate the baptism of the unsaved, whether infant or adult, tends to blot out from the earth the believer's baptism which Christ appointed. It is a question of discipleship. John the Baptist made disciples before he baptized them. Jesus made disciples before he baptized

them. (John 4:1) John made disciples by leading them to repentance and faith. (Acts 19:4) Jesus made disciples by repentance and faith. (Mark 1:15) Jesus commanded: "Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them (the discipled)." Draw a perpendicular line. On the right of it write the words, Believers in Christ, Lovers of Christ. On the left of it write the words, Unbelievers in Christ, Haters of Christ. Now, from which side of that line will you take your candidates for baptism? Will you baptize the hating and the unbelieving? You dare not. If from the other side you take them, then already are they God’s children, for what saith the Scriptures: "Whosoever believeth has been born of God. Whosoever loveth is born of God."

Baptists do not bury the living sinner to kill him to sin. But they bury those already dead to sin. For devotion to this principle you may trace our people back by their track of blood, illumined by their fires of martyrdom.

# 02.05. The Doctrine of the Church

V. THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH The church is not the expression of one idea, but of many. Only the most salient and distinctive ideas are here cited:

(1) The church is a spiritual body. None but the regenerate should belong to it. It is not a savior, but the home of the saved. I once heard a preacher say: "Join the church if you have no more religion than a horse. Join the church to get religion." When my own soul was concerned about salvation, a preacher urged me to partake of the Lord’s Supper in order that I might be converted thereby.

(2) Separation of church and state. The state, a secular body for secular ends, can never be united to the church, a spiritual body for spiritual ends, without irreparable injury to both. United with the state, the church can never obey Christ. "Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers, What part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Come out from among them and be ye separate." There cannot be union of church and state without persecution for conscience’ sake. There cannot be a pure and converted ministry when politicians appoint the preachers. There cannot be free speech by the church against national sins when the state holds the purse, See the awful consequences of Luther’s mistake on this point in Germany. There, today, the owner of all licensed sins, gambling houses, race tracks, saloons, houses of prostitution, must exhibit certificate of church membership. The blackest pages of American history are those which record the evils of the union of church and state in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Virginia. And in everyone of them Baptists were persecuted unto blood, stripes, imprisonment and confiscation of property. Massachusetts whipped Obadiah Holmes, imprisoned Clark and banished Roger Williams. At Ashfield, in Connecticut, our Baptist fathers had the choicest parts of their farms and gardens sold under the sheriff’s hammer to raise a fund for building a house of worship for another denomination and for the support of its preacher, who had virtually no congregation in that community. In Virginia, Craig, Lunsford, Waller and others were imprisoned. The products of Baptist farms were seized to support a cock-fighting, horse-racing, hard-drinking Episcopal ministry. In England and on the continent of Europe time would fail to tell the story of their wrongs, scourgings, cruel mockings, imprisonment and bloody death at the hands of the state church. In every age of the world they have testified for a free church in a free state. From its spiritual nature the church cannot rightfully become a political factor. Its members, indeed, as individuals and citizens merely, may align themselves at will with political parties according to each several judgment. On this very account the politician does not court the Baptist church. But any general organization called the church that becomes a mighty political factor, controlling the vote of its members through its clergy, they will court. They censure that church only with hated breath and in confidential whispers. They laud it from the housetops and often make occasion for public eulogiums.

(3) The church is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination. This idea of the church is fundamental and vital and yet least of all understood by the rest of the world-even the religious world. Here, therefore, I would make everything clear and plain. With Greeks, Romanists,

Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists and many others the church is an organized denomination having appellate jurisdiction over its particular congregations. In history, the church as an organized general body, or denomination, has assumed the following forms:

(a) Papistical or autocratic.

It starts with the idea of an earthly head. This autocrat must be the successor of some apostle, himself a primate. Inspiration must rest upon him. All Christendom must be under him. Commencing with the union of church and state under Constantine, the idea reached its final development in the Vatican Council, A. D. 1870, which declared the Pope infallible.

(b) Practical or episcopal. That is, the church is a general body, governed by the bishops, bishop now having lost its New Testament meaning.

(c) Presbyterian. That is, the church is a general body or organized denomination, governed by its presbyters, through synods and general assemblies. In all of these the particular congregation is under the appellate jurisdiction of the higher power, the General Assembly for the Presbyterians, the General Conference for the Methodists, the Bishops for the Church of England, the Pope for the Romanists. It follows that all these general organizations must have a graded series of courts, ending with a supreme court whose decisions bind all the denomination. And of course these higher courts provide for regular trials, with all necessary forms of law. And also, of course, the sessions of these high courts must last quite a long time in order to attend to all these trials. With all of them the church is an organized denomination having appellate and final jurisdiction over all particular congregations.

Now, in opposition to all these, the Baptists hold that the New Testament church is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination. According to the New Testament: "In Christ, each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into holy temple in the Lord." Each congregation is complete temple in itself, and has final jurisdiction over all its affairs. This is the church, to which grievances must be told, and whose decision is final. (Matthew 18:15-18) The most forceful and popular objection urged against this idea of the church is that it will be powerless to secure unity of faith, uniformity of discipline, and co-operation in general work among the churches. This objection comes from the viewpoint of human reason. And we frankly admit that whatever theory of the church fails necessarily and generally to secure these great ends discounts itself in probability as scriptural in favor of any other theory which does secure these great ends, simply because we cannot conceive of God’s wisdom failing. On this account, once in the Northern States of our Union, and more recently in the Southern States, there have been tendencies among Baptists which if they had been successful and followed to their logical consequences would have resulted in this idea of the church:

(d) A federation, like the United States. In this the representative system prevails. Each state selects its representatives, delegates powers to them, projects its sovereignty into the general body, and there merges it into a supreme government for national affairs. These mistaken brethren, North and South, started out with the contention that a Baptist general body, whether district association, state convention or national convention, must be composed of churches alone, represented by delegates having delegated powers. But a Baptist church cannot project or merge its sovereignty into a general body of any kind, nor delegate its powers. There is not and cannot be

a Baptist federal body.

Read again Dr. Wayland’s great book, The Principles, and Practices of the Baptists, and there see how the unscriptural idea perished before the wisdom of the brethren. As the good doctor says, "we now wonder that anybody ever supposed that there could be a representative Baptist general body." In like manner, in the South, all attempts to reduce our Southern Baptist Convention or state bodies to this basis have failed for similar good reasons. Our general bodies are purely voluntary, and composed of individuals, not churches. They are solely for counsel and co-operation. They cannot have trials, seeing they possess no ecclesiastical powers. Their sessions have no time for trials, lasting only three or four days. In considering the one question of eligibility for membership in the body they must necessarily act in a summary way on account of time. Their declining to seat any man in no way affects his ecclesiastical status. To ask for regular trial before a Baptist general body, or to claim all the legal forms of procedure in regular courts, whether ecclesiastical or civil, is all absurdity on its face and betrays ignorance of fundamental Baptist principles.

It is just upon this point the world, with its graded courts, and other denominations, with their graded courts and regular forms of trial, fail to understand Baptist principles. They look upon any decision of our general bodies touching membership as similar to the decision of their courts and marvel at our lack of regular forms of trial. The average man thinks of the Methodist Conference and of the Presbyterian Assemblies or of the courts of the country in deciding upon the merits of a decision on membership by a Baptist general body, and wonders why we do not observe the usual forms of regular courts. They fail to see that a Baptist general body, unlike a Methodist Conference or Presbyterian Assembly, is not and cannot be a court, because with Baptists the church is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination. The particular church is a court and does have its regular forms of trial. No Baptist general body could complete one trial, according to forms of law, in ten years, considering the time at its disposal and the multitude and magnitude of legitimate work that must be considered in its short sessions. The supreme question then arises, can we with our ideas of the church secure unity of the faith, guard against hurtful schisms, bring about substantial uniformity of discipline, and, above all, secure co-operation in the great departments of work beyond the ability of a single church, namely, missions, education, religious literature and philanthropy?

It is simply stated as all historical fact, without argument here, that Baptists come nearer to uniformity of faith and discipline and have fewer hurtful schisms than the denominations which seek to secure these results by their iron general organizations. With history before us we are willing to compare results. As to the success of co-operation by our simple methods, we may here in Texas point to a denomination. Since our session in San Antonio in 1897, which eliminated non-cooperation and obstruction, this State Convention has raised more than a million dollars in cash for education, missions, orphanage, Church building and other departments of work. We can find no building that will hold our Convention when assembled. Spiritual power, mighty faith, melting prayer and marvelous unanimity characterize our assemblies. While the world stands this demonstration will avail for justification of our theory of the church.

(4) The church is a pure democracy.

Indeed, it is the only one in the world. There is no disbarment of franchise on account of race, education, wealth, age or sex. In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, bond or free, man or woman or child. All its members are equal fellow-citizens, and the majority decides. It is of his people, for the people, by the people. This democracy receives and dismisses its members, chooses or deposes its own officers, and manages its own affairs.

(5) It is the supreme court in Christ's kingdom.

All cases of discipline come before it, and its decisions are final and irreversible by any human power apart from itself. Of course, it is under law to Christ. It possesses judicial and executive but no legislative powers. Christ is the only lawmaker and the New Testament is his law. Its judicial powers cover all cases of grievances and fellowship. It is Christ's court. Our Lord foresaw the inadequacy of secular courts to adjudicate religious differences. The very atmosphere of secular courts is adverse to the religious spirit. Our Lord himself was a victim before the courts of Pilate and Herod. He warned his people that, in every age, they would he dragged before these courts, and clearly foretold what they must expect at the bar of these tribunals.

One of his most impressive lessons of the New Testament is the recital of the trials of his ministers before them. Nearly every one of his apostles was put to a violent death by their decisions. Who has not thrilled at the story of Paul before the magistrates at Philippi, before Gallio, Felix, Festus, Agrippa and Nero? Our Lord carefully provided for the settlement of religious differences before his own court. Hear the indignant protest of his apostle against the violators of his law in this respect: "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before his saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? How much more things that pertain to this life! If then ye have judgment of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are at least esteemed in the church. I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? No, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?"

(6) The officers of the church are bishops and deacons, the first charged with spiritualities and the second with temporalities. The idea of a metropolitan bishop, having charge of all the churches of a great city, or of a diocesan bishop, having charge of a province, or state, is of post-apostolic origin and subversive of the scriptural idea of the bishop.

(7) The ordinances of the church are but two, baptism and the Lord's Supper, neither as a means of grace, but both purely figurative and commemorative. The elements of validity in baptism are: (a) it must be by proper authority; (b) its subject is a penitent believer or saved person; (c) the act is immersion; (d) the design is a declaration or confession of faith, symbolizing the cleansing from sin and commemorative of the resurrection. The Supper is a festival observed by the church as a body, and commemorates the atoning death of our Lord and anticipates his second advent. Who may deny that this doctrine of the church is a distinctive principle of the Baptists? Allow me to sum up in one sentence the complex idea of the church: It is a spiritual body; it must be separated from the state; it is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination, whether Papistical, Episcopal, Presbyterian or federal; it is a pure democracy; it is Christ's executive and judiciary on

earth; its officers are bishops and deacons; its ordinances are baptism and the Lord's Supper. And now, brethren, allow me to put before you a mental diagram embodying the most of what has been said and which itself as a whole is distinctive of the Baptists. We will call it

# 02.06. God's Order In The Gospel

VI. GOD'S ORDER IN THE GOSPEL OF HIS SON

Conceive of a circle; in it a man on his knees is reading the New Testament. Both the open book and the man's heart are illumined by the shining of the Holy Spirit. Outside the circle are the man's family, kindred and friends, society and the government. That illumined book is the law of Christianity. The man is individuality, isolated from family, kindred, society and government and shut in with God the Holy Spirit. His conscience is free to decide without embarrassment or hindrance from all external forces or influences. By the Spirit, through the book, his free conscience leads him to an opening in the circle which leads him to salvation. Conviction, changing of his mind, giving of faith on the Spirit's part; the exercise of contrition, repentance and faith on the man's part. These are the constituent elements of regeneration from both divine and human sides. The man is now justified-saved-a child of God. Here is Christian fellowship.

Across the saved man's path runs a river, called baptism. Up through its waters he comes to a door in another circle. This circle is the church, Christ's executive and judiciary. In the center of this circle is the Lord's table. Here is church fellowship and communion. This church is a single congregation, a spiritual body, a pure democracy. Here is the elder or bishop, a simple pastor chosen by the church, and the deacons, who attend to temporal matters. Here is the church conference or court to which brethren bring their grievances for final settlement. Outside in the outlying world are the secular courts. All along the windings of that river of baptism and its tributaries are other church circles, each complete in itself, each with the Lord's table, and the conference, and the bishop and the deacons. Comity prevails among these churches. There is one law, one Lord, one baptism. A brother in one church, aggrieved against a brother in another church, must carry its case to the church of the offending brother. There is no way to arraign the offending brother before the world's courts without breaking down God's barriers of law and putting religion to open shame. Out here in territory filled with churches is a convention, state or national, It is a purely cooperative and advisory body. It is composed of individuals, not churches. It is a method, without an iron organization which would swallow up the churches, to elicit, combine and direct the energies and resources of the willing-hearted in all the churches in order to push great movements of evangelization, establish Christian schools, eleemosynary institutions and devise agencies and means for filling the world with Christian literature, all these mighty enterprises lying beyond the power of a single church.

One successful demonstration that all these great things can be done by a simple and harmless agency of voluntary co-operation of individuals refutes forever the idea of the church as an organized denomination or general body. There is no necessity for it. There is tyranny in it. There is the subversion of Christ's church in it. There is hierarchy in it. My heart exults! My soul leaps for joy that this Convention has furnished proof beyond all successful contradiction that there is no necessity for a hierarchy in order to promote harmony, secure unity of faith and discipline, and to obtain cooperation broad enough and strong enough to do anything God's people ought to do.

That demonstration lifts itself up like a granite mountain. Transient clouds of angry criticism hang around its outskirts and splinter their petty lightnings on its adamantine sides. Foul aspersion and misrepresentation may spatter their mud and slime around its base. In the caves of its foothills a few skulking wolves of prejudice may make their dens and render night hideous by their howlings. But the mountain itself stands immovable and serene. No mists gather about its summit, far above the range and rage of storms. By night the stars silver its crest and by day its halo of sunlight is like the smile of God. This is God’s order in the gospel of his Son, and the order is itself a distinctive Baptist principle.

Chapter 16

# 03.00. ECCLESIA:: THE CHURCH

ECCLESIA:

THE CHURCH BY

B. H. CARROLL

# 03.01. Lecture 1

Lecture 1

“And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven ...” - Matthew 16:18-19 This passage, Matthew 16:18-19, has been for many centuries a battle-ground of theological controversies. Though millions of the disputants have passed away, the questions which arrayed them against each other still survive to align their successors in hostile array. The most important of these divisive questions are:

What is the church?

Who established it and when?

What is the foundation?

What are the “gates of hell?”

What are the “keys?”

What is the “binding and loosing?”

In this lecture there will be time for answer to the first question only:

WHAT IS THE CHURCH? From the given list of passages, taken from the Englishman’s Greek Concordance, and which you may verify by reference to the Bible, it appears that the word Ecclesia, usually rendered “church” in our version, occurs 117 times in the Greek New Testament (omitting Acts 2:47 as not in the best texts). Our Lord and the New Testament writers neither coined this word nor employed it in any unusual sense. Before their time it was in common use, of well understood signification, and subject like any other word to varied employment, according to the established laws of language. That is, it might be used abstractly, or generically, or particularly, or prospectively, without losing its essential meaning. To simplify and shorten the work before us, we need not leave the New Testament to find examples of its classic or Septuagint use. Fair examples of both are in the list of New Testament passages given you.

What, then, etymologically, is the meaning of this word? Its primary meaning is: - An organized assembly, whose members have been properly called out from private homes or business to attend to public affairs. This definition necessarily implies prescribed conditions of membership.

This meaning, substantially, applies alike to the ecclesia of a self governing Greek state (Acts 19:39),

the Old Testament ecclesia or convocation of National Israel (Acts 7:38), and

to the New Testament ecclesia.

When, in this lesson, our Lord says: “On this rock I will build MY ecclesia,” while the “my” distinguished His ecclesia from the Greek state ecclesia and the Old Testament ecclesia, the word itself naturally retains its ordinary meaning.

Indeed, even when by accommodation, it is applied to an irregular gathering (Acts 19:32; Acts 19:41) the essential idea of assembly remains. Of the 117 instances of use in the New Testament certainly all but five (Acts 7:38; Acts 19:32; Acts 19:39; Acts 19:41; Hebrews 2:12) refer to Christ’s ecclesia. And since Hebrews 2:12, though a quotation from the Old Testament, is prophetic, finding fulfillment in New Testament times, we need not regard it as an exception. These 118 uses of the word, including Hebrews 2:12, refer either to the particular assembly of Jesus Christ on earth, or to His general assembly in glory (heaven).

Commonly, that is, in nearly all the uses, it means: The particular assembly of Christ’s baptized disciples on earth, as “The church of God which is at Corinth.” To this class necessarily belong all abstract or generic uses of the word, for whenever the abstract or generic finds concrete expression, or takes operative shape, it is always a particular assembly. This follows from the laws of language governing the use of words. For example, if an English statesman, referring to the right of each individual citizen to be tried by his peers, should say: “On this rock England will build her jury and all power of tyrants shall not prevail against it,” he uses the term jury in an abstract sense, i. e., in the sense of an institution. But when this institution finds concrete expression, or becomes operative, it is always a particular jury of twelve men, and never an aggregation of all juries into one big jury. Or if a law writer should say: “In trials of fact, by oral testimony, the court shall be the judge of the law, and the jury shall be the judge of the facts,” and if he should add: “In giving evidence, the witness shall tell what he knows to the jury, and not to the court,” he evidently uses the term “court,” “jury” and “witness” in a generic sense. But in the application the generic always becomes particular; i.e., a particular judge, a particular jury, or a particular witness, and never an aggregate of all judges into one big judge, nor of all juries into one big jury, nor of all witnesses into one big witness. Hence we say that the laws of language require that all abstract and generic uses of the word ecclesia should be classified with the particular assembly and not with the general assembly. As examples of the abstract use of ecclesia that is in the sense of an institution, we cite Matthew 16:18; Ephesians 3:10; Ephesians 3:21.

Matthew 18:17 is an example of generic use. That is, it designates the kind (genus) of tribunal to which difficulties must be referred without restriction of application to any one particular church by name. I mean that while its application must always be to a particular church, yet it is not restricted to just one, as the church at Jerusalem, but is equally applicable to every other particular church. As when Paul says: “The husband is the head of the wife,” the terms “husband” and “wife” are not to be restricted in application to John Jones and his wife, but apply equally to every other specific husband and wife. But while nearly all of the 113 Instances of the use of ecclesia belong to the particular class, there are some instances, as Hebrews 12:23, and Ephesians 5:25-27, where the reference seems to be to the general assembly of Christ. But in every such case the ecclesia is prospective, not actual. That is to say, there is not now, but there will be a general assembly of Christ’s people. That general assembly will be composed of all the redeemed of all time.

Here are three indisputable and very significant facts concerning Christ’s general assembly:

Many of its members, properly called out, are now in heaven.

Many others of them, also called out, are here on earth.

An indefinite number of them, yet to be called, are neither on earth nor in heaven, because they are yet unborn, and therefore non-existent.

It follows that if one part of the membership is now in heaven, another part on earth, another part not yet born, there is as yet no assembly, except in prospect. And if a part are as yet non-existent, how can one say the general assembly exists now?

We may, however, properly speak of the general assembly now, because, though part of it is yet non-existent, and though there has not yet been a gathering together of the other two parts, yet, the mind may conceive of that gathering as an accomplished fact. In God's purposes and plans, the general assembly exists now, and also in our conceptions or anticipations, but certainly not as a fact. The details of God's purpose are now being worked out, and the process will continue until all the elect have been called, justified, glorified and assembled.

Commenting on our lesson, Broadus says:

"In the New Testament the spiritual Israel, never actually assembly, is sometimes conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly, and this is denoted by the word ecclesia." Here Broadus does not contrast "spiritual Israel" with a particular church of Christ, but with national or carnal Israel. The object of the gospel, committed to the particular assembly in time, is to call out or summon those who shall compose the general assembly in eternity. When the calling out is ended, and all the called are glorified, then the present concept of a general assembly will be a fact. Then and only then actually, will all the redeemed be an ecclesia. Moreover, this ecclesia in glory will be the real body, temple, flock of our Lord. But the only existing representation or type of the ecclesia in glory (i. e., the general assembly) is the particular assembly on earth. And because each and every particular assembly is the representation, or type, of the general assembly, to each and every one of them is applied all the broad figures which pertain to the general assembly. That is, such figures as "the house of God," "the temple of the Lord," "the body," or "flock." The New Testament applies these figures, just as freely and frequently, to the particular assembly as to the general assembly. That is, to any one particular assembly, by itself alone, but never to all the particular assemblies collectively.

There is no unity, no organization, nor gathering together and, hence, no ecclesia or assembly of particular congregations collectively. So also the term ecclesia cannot be rationally applied to all denominations collectively, nor to all living professors of religion, nor to all living believers collectively. In no sense are any such unassembled aggregates an ecclesia. None of them constitute the flock, temple, body or house of God, either as a type of time or a reality of eternity. These terms belong exclusively either to the particular assembly now or the general assembly hereafter. A man once said to me, How dare you apply such broad terms as "The house of God," "The body of Christ," "The temple of the Lord," to your little fragment of a denomination? My reply was, I do not apply them to any denomination, nor to any aggregate of the particular congregations of any or of all denominations, but the Scriptures do apply every one of them to a particular New Testament congregation of Christ's disciples.

Hear the Word of God: In the letter to the Ephesians, Paul says: "In whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together

for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Ephesians 2:21-22, Revised Version) Here are two distinct affirmations:

First - Each several building or particular assembly groweth into a holy temple of the Lord That is, by itself it is a temple of the Lord.

Second - What is true of each is true of the church at Ephesus, "In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit."

Just before this he had written of the church as an institution, or abstractly, in which Jew and Gentile are made into one. But the abstract becomes concrete in each several building. To the elders of this same particular church at Ephesus he said: "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20:28). This flock, this church of the Lord, purchased by His own blood, is a particular assembly.

Again to the particular church at Corinth Paul wrote: "Ye are God's building - ye are a temple of God and the Spirit dwelleth in you - now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof." (1 Corinthians 12:27.) When concerning the body of Christ he says: "And whether one member suffereth all the members suffer with it," he is certainly not speaking of the Ecclesia in Glory, all of whose members will be past sufferings when constituting an ecclesia.

Again concerning the particular church at Ephesus, he writes to Timothy whom he had left in that city:

"These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know, how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." He is certainly not writing of behavior in the general assembly in glory. The things he had written touching behavior were, when and how the men should pray, how the women should dress and work, and the qualifications of bishops and deacons. Even that remarkable passage, so often and so confidently quoted as referring exclusively to some supposed now existing "universal, invisible, spiritual church," namely: Ephesians 1:22-23, "And gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all" - even this very body, "filled unto all the fullness of God," is presently applied, in his prayer, to the particular congregation (Ephesians 3:19).

It may be asked, but why, if already filled, pray that each particular congregation might be filled unto all the fullness of God? The reply is obvious. Each particular assembly is an habitation of God, through the Spirit. The Spirit occupies each several building. Into each he enters not with partial power, but in all the fullness of Omnipotent power. But though the fullness is there, the church is so dim eyed - so weak in faith - so feeble in graces - it does not realize and lay hold of and appropriate this fullness of God. Hence the prayer that the eyes of their understanding might be open to see the fullness, their faith increased to grasp and appropriate it, their graces enlarged to corresponding strength to stand and work in that fullness. So fulfilled they realize in experience that fact that the Holy Spirit in all the fullness of God had already entered this particular body of Christ, and was only waiting to be recognized . It is like the expression, "Being justified by faith, let us have peace with God," etc., Romans 5:1. That is, we are entitled to it, let us take it. In a great revival of religion we see Paul's prayer fulfilled in the particular body of Christ. Gradually the

church warms up to a realization of the fullness of God dwelling in them through the Spirit. Their spiritual apprehension becomes eagle-eyed. The grasp of their faith becomes the grip of a giant. Presently they say, we “can do all things.” No barrier is now insurmountable. And as more and more they comprehend the height and depth and width and length of the love of God, they glow like a spiritual furnace. Thus it is proven that all these broad terms appertaining to the future general assembly, are equally applied to the present particular assembly, and that, too, because it is the only existing representation of the prospective general assembly. This leads to another conclusion: All teaching in the direction that there now exists a general assembly which is invisible, without ordinances, and which is entered by faith alone, would likely tend to discredit the particular assembly, which does now really exist and which is the pillar and ground of the truth.

More than once when I have inquired of a man, “Are you a member of the church?” The reply has been, I am a member of the invisible, universal, spiritual church. To make faith the exclusive of admission into the general assembly is more than questionable and naturally generates such replies. The general assembly, by all accounts, includes all the saved. But infants, dying in infancy, are a part of the saved. Yet never having been subjects of gospel address they are saved without faith. But it may be said that such use of the term faith is only a way of saying “a new heart,” and dying infants are not without regeneration. To which we may rejoin that regeneration alone is not sufficient to qualify for membership in the general assembly. All the regenerates we know have spots and wrinkles while the general assembly is without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. Nor does complete sanctification of soul go far enough. There must also be glorification of body. Enoch, Elijah and probably those who rose from the dead after Christ’s resurrection are the only ones as yet qualified for membership in the general assembly. And they must wait until all whom God has called and will yet call have arrived with like qualifications, before there can be a general assembly in fact. As has been intimated, all organized assemblies have prescribed terms or conditions of membership. In the Greek state Ecclesia membership was limited to a well defined body of citizens. Not all residents of the territory could participate in the business of the ecclesia. So with the Old Testament ecclesia or national convocation of carnal Israel. One must have the required lineal descent and be circumcised or become a proselyte and be circumcised. Correspondingly the conditions of membership in the church on earth are regeneration and baptism. But for the church in glory the conditions of membership are justification, regeneration and sanctification of soul and glorification of body.

We submit another conclusion:

Some terms or descriptives commonly applied to the church by writers and speakers are not only extra Scriptural, that is, purely human and post apostolic, but may be so used as to become either misleading or positively unscriptural. For example, to put visible, referring to the particular assembly alone, over against spiritual as referring to the general assembly alone, as if these terms were opposites or incompatible with each other. The particular assembly or church that now is, is both visible and spiritual. To confess Christ before men, to let our light shine before men, to be baptized, to show forth the Lord’s death in the Supper, are both visible and spiritual acts of obedience. And when the general assembly becomes a reality instead of a prospect, it, too, will be both visible and spiritual.

Speaking of the general assembly, John says: I saw the holy city, the New Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband." When the King came to the earth in His humiliation He was visible. And when He appears in glory every eye shall see Him. A city set upon an earthly hill cannot be hid. And the New Jerusalem on Mt. Zion, the city of the living God, will be the most conspicuous and luminous object the universe ever saw. The confusion wrought by these human appellatives is manifest in the growth of what is commonly miscalled "the Apostle's creed." In its earliest historic forms it says: "I believe In the holy church." Later forms say: "I believe in the holy catholic, i. e., universal church." Still later: "in the holy catholic and apostolic church." Still gathering increment from other creeds it becomes: "The holy Roman catholic and apostolic church." Then comes "visible vs. invisible," or "visible, temporal, universal vs. invisible, spiritual, universal," and so ad infinitum. But the Bible in its simplicity knows nothing of these scholastic refinements of distinction. In that holy book the existing church is a particular congregation of Christ's baptized disciples, and the prospective church is the general assembly. But mark you:

These are not co-existent.

ONE CANNOT BE A MEMBER OF BOTH AT THE SAME TIME. WHEN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY COMES THE PARTICULAR ASSEMBLY WILL HAVE PASSED AWAY. To impress more deeply the scripturalness of these reflections, let us consider the subject from another viewpoint: A house is built for an inhabitant. Unless the tenant is hard pressed, he will not move in until the building is completed. God is never hard pressed. A long time may be consumed in getting out and gathering together and preparing the material of a house. It is not a house, however, except in purpose, plan or prospect, until it is completed and ready for its occupant. In this light let us take a look at some Bible houses:

(a) The house that Moses built. This was the Tabernacle of the Wilderness, or tent for God. Exodus 40:1-38 tells of the completion of this house. When it was finished and all things ready for the occupant it became a house, and then the cloud, that symbol of Divine glory, moved in and filled the tabernacle.

(b) The house that Solomon built.

1 Kings 6:1-38, 1 Kings 7:1-51 and 1 Kings 8:1-66 tell us about this house. When it was finished and furnished and dedicated, it also being now a house, then the cloud symbol of divine presence and glory, that had inhabited the tabernacle, left the tent as no longer useful and moved into and filled the new house.

(c) The house that Jesus built. The gospel histories tell us about it. John the Baptist prepared much material for it. Receiving this material from John, and adding much of His own preparation, Jesus built a house. That is, He instituted His ecclesia on earth. At His death the veil of Solomon's restored house was rent in twain from top to bottom. Henceforward, it was tenantless, and, being useless, soon perished. But though the new house was built, it was empty until our Lord ascended into heaven, and fulfilled His promise to send the Holy Spirit as the indweller of this new habitation. Acts 2:1-47 tells us how this house was occupied. The useless temple of Solomon now passes away as the useless tabernacle of Moses passed away for its successor. The only house of God now existing on earth is the particular ecclesia of our Lord. But it in turn must have a successor In

the general assembly, or, (d) The house Jesus will build. The tabernacle, the temple and the church on earth are all forecasts of the coming church in glory. The work of gathering and preparing material for the general assembly has been in progress for six thousand years. But material, much of it yet in the quarry or forest and much of it fully prepared, does not constitute a house. God is not hard pressed. His patience is infinite. Millions and millions have already been called out to be members of this prospective assembly. God is calling yet and will continue to call throughout the gospel dispensation. His mind is fixed on having a general assembly indeed; a great congregation; “a great multitude that no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, to stand before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and with palms in their hands.” The time of the constitution of this assembly is at the second coming of Christ and after the resurrection of the dead and the glorification of the bodies of Christians then living. The processes of constitution are clearly set forth in 1 Corinthians 15:51-54; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17, Ephesians 5:27; Revelation 21:2-9.

It has now indeed become a church; a glorious church, or church in glory; to be presented to himself. When He comes He will be glorified in His saints and admired in all them that believe. That ecclesia, like the one on earth, will be both visible and spiritual.

Recurring to the figure of a house, Revelation 21:1-27, Revelation 22:1-21 exhibit it as at last completed and occupied. At last completed God Himself inhabits it, for says the Scripture, “Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall be with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.” Mark that, brethren, “The former things are passed away.” Former and latter things are not co-existent. The tabernacle of the wilderness passes away for the more glorious temple of Solomon. The temple then passes away for the still more glorious church on earth. In like manner the church on earth must pass away for the infinitely glorious church in heaven. There is a Jerusalem on earth, but the heavenly Jerusalem is above. It is free, and the mother of all the saved. But, brother, the general assembly is not yet. The church on earth, the house that Jesus has already built, the house of the living God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth; this house has the right of way just now. It is the only existing assembly. Honor the house that now is.

Quite naturally, if tabernacle and temple had been co-existent, one then living would have preferred the temple and discredited the tent.

Equally so if the particular assembly and general assembly are now co-existent, side by side on earth, could you seriously blame a man for resting content with membership in the greater and more honorable assembly? But as the Scriptures represent these two assemblies, one existing now on earth, the other prospective in heaven, if a man on earth and in time, not qualified by either sanctification of spirit or glorification of body for the heavenly assembly, shall despise membership in the particular assembly because claiming membership in the general assembly, is not his claim both an absurdity and a pretext? Does he not hide behind it to evade honoring God’s existing Institution, and the assuming of present responsibilities and the performing of present duties? Yet again, if one believes that there are co-existent on earth and in time, two churches, one only visible and formal, the other real, invisible and spiritual, is there not danger that such belief may

tend to the conviction that the form, government, polity and ordinances of the inferior church are matters of little moment? Has not this belief oftentimes in history done this very thing? And is it not an historical fact that, since Protestant Pedobaptists invented this idea of a now existing, invisible, universal, spiritual church, to offset the equally erroneous Romanist idea of a present visible, universal church, reverence and honor for God's New Testament particular church have been ground to fine powder between them as between the upper and nether millstones? Today when one seeks to obtain due honor for the particular assembly, its ordinances, its duties, is he not in many cases thwarted in measure, or altogether in some cases, by objections arising from one or the other of these erroneous views? And when some, endeavoring to hedge against the manifest errors of both these ideas, have invented middle theories to the effect that the church on earth is composed either of all professing Christians living at one time, considered collectively, or of all real Christians so living and so considered, or of all existing denominations considered as branches of which the church is the tree, have they not multiplied both the absurdities and the difficulties by their assumed liberality of compromise?

Finally, replying to some of your questions:

1. (Q) When our Lord says, On this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, does He refer to the church on earth or to the church in glory?

(A) My answer is, to the particular assembly on earth, considered as an institution. The church in glory will never be in the slightest danger of the gates of hell. Before it becomes an assembly, both death and hell, gates and all, are cast into the lake of fire. (Revelation 20:14 and Revelation 21:4). It is the church on earth that is in danger, from the fear of which this glorious promise is a guaranty.

2. (Q) Does your idea of a "general assembly" depend exclusively upon that phrase of doubtful application in Hebrews 12:28, which many good scholars, including prominent Baptists. construe with "myriads of angels" instead of with "the church of the First Born?"

(A) Certainly not. Though I myself strongly hold with our English versions in referring both the panegyros (general assembly) and the ecclesia (church) of that passage to saved men and not to angels. The idea of general assembly is clearly in other passages as Ephesians 5:25-27; Revelation 7:9 and Revelation 21:2-4.

3. (Q) If the figure, "body" applies to each particular church, does not that teach that Christ has many bodies?

(A) My answer is, first, that your objection, or supposed difficulty, lies not against my view, but against the express teaching of many Scriptures. What the Scriptures teach is true, and difficulties and objections may take care of themselves. But, second, the objection is specious and the difficulty only apparent, since each particular assembly is a representation or type of the general assembly, and therefore the broadest figures of the anti-type may be applied to all its types without being obnoxious to the criticism. There may well be many representations of the body of Christ.

4. (Q) Do you dis-fellowship your Baptist brethren who teach the present existence of "an universal, in visible, spiritual church?"

(A) Most certainly not so long as they duly honor the particular assembly and its ordinances, as multitudes of them do, in spite of the natural tendency of their theory to discredit it. Many of them, known to me personally, are devoted to the particular church and its ordinances, responsibilities and duties.

It will take a wider divergence than this to make me dis-fellowship a Baptist brother, though I honestly and strongly hold that even on this point his theory is erroneous and tends practically to great harm. Yes, I do most emphatically hold that this theory is responsible for incalculable dishonor put upon the church of God on earth. I repeat that the theory of the co-existence, side by side, on earth of two churches of Christ, one formal and visible, the other real, invisible and spiritual, with different terms of membership, is exceedingly mischievous and is so confusing that every believer of it becomes muddled in running the lines of separation. Do let it sink deep in your minds that the tabernacle of Moses had the exclusive right of way in its allotted time and the temple of Solomon had the exclusive right of way in its allotted time; so the church of Christ on earth, the particular assembly, now has the exclusive right of way, and is without a rival on earth or in heaven; and so the general assembly in glory, when its allotted time arrives, will have exclusive right of way. Had I lived in the days of Moses I would have given undivided honor to the tabernacle; in the day of Solomon to the Temple alone; and when the general assembly comes, that shall be my delight. But living now I must honor the house that Jesus built. It is the house of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. To it are committed the oracles and promises of God. To it is given the great commission. It is the instructor of angels and in it throughout all the ages of time is the glory of God. If I move out of this house, I must remain houseless until Jesus comes. It is the only church you can join in time.

5. (Q) What is the distinction, if any, between the kingdom and the church?

(A) My answer is that the kingdom and church on earth are not co-terminous. Kingdom, besides expressing a different idea, is much broader in signification than a particular assembly or than all the particular assemblies. The particular church is that executive institution or business body, within the kingdom, charged with official duties and responsibilities for the spread of the kingdom. In eternity and glory, church and kingdom may be co-terminous. Like the church, the kingdom in both time and eternity has both visible and spiritual aspects.

6. As a sufficient reply to several other questions:

Let it be noted that this discussion designedly avoids applying certain adjectives to the noun “church,” not merely because the New Testament never applies them to Ecclesia, but because they are without distinguishing force when contrasting the particular assembly with the general assembly. For example: “Local,” “visible,” “spiritual.”

Locality inheres in Ecclesia. There can be no assembly now or hereafter without a place to meet. When existing in fact, both the particular assembly in time, and the general assembly in eternity, are both visible and spiritual. Why attempt to distinguish by terms which do not distinguish?

Katholikos (Catholic or Universal) is not a New Testament word at all and hence is never applied by inspiration to Ecclesia. Nor is it a Septuagint word at all. In post apostolic times it crept without authority into the titles of certain New Testament letters, as “The First Epistle General (Katholikos) of Peter.” And even there it could not mean “universal,” since Peter, himself, four times limits his

address:

First to Jews (not Gentiles).

Then to “elect” Jews (not all Jews).

Then to elect Jews of the Dispersion (not to Jewish Christians in Palestine).

Then to elect Jews of the Dispersion in ‘Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia,” i. e., the comparatively small district of Asia Minor (not in the rest of Asia, Europe and Africa). Neither in the sense of every place, nor of every person in the universe, can the English word “universal” be applied to Ecclesia.

# 03.02. Lecture 2

Lecture 2

It was not the original purpose to extend the discussion of the question, What is the Church, into a second lecture. It was supposed that you would be able of yourselves to classify all New Testament uses of ecclesia under the several heads of abstract, generic, particular and prospective, by applying the principles of the first lecture. But the nature and variety of your new questions constrain me to enlarge the discussion somewhat and to supply you with a wider usage of the word than the New Testament affords. Of the great number of instances from the classics, read to you, at my request, by Mr. Ragland, our Professor of Greek, your attention is recalled to a few, specially pertinent.

Those which so clearly show the distinction between ecclesia as an organized business body and all unofficial gatherings, e. g.,

“Pericles seeing them angry at the present state of things - did not call them to an ecclesia or any other meeting.” - Thucydides.

Again, “When after this the ecclesia adjourned, they came together and planned - for the future still being uncertain, meetings and speeches of all sorts took place in the market They were afraid the ecclesia would he summoned suddenly.” - Demosthenes. Compare this distinction with the town clerk’s statement in Acts 19:39-40.

Those concerning the ecclesias of the several petty but independent Greek states, Sparta, Athens and others, bringing out clearly the business character of these assemblies, their free and democratic

deliberations, their final decisions by vote, and reminding us so forcibly of the proceedings of independent Baptist churches of our day.

Those showing the discriminating character of the Greek mind in the use of panyegyros, as distinguished from ecclesia. Ecclesia was the particular and independent business assembly of any Greek state, however small. Panegyros was the general assembly of the people of all the Greek states. It was a festive assembly looking to rest, joy, peace, glory, and not to business and war. Let not the Lacedaemonians come up armed to this assembly.

It was a happy Greek conceit that all the Heavenly beings were present at these Olympian meetings. How felicitously does the inspired author of the letter to the Hebrews adapt himself to this discrimination, when in contrast with the particular ecclesia on earth, he writes of the general assembly and church of the first born in glory - panegyros kai ecclesia. There, not Zeus, but God the judge. There not a pantheon of inferior deities and demi-gods, but myriads of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect. There war and toil have ceased, and peace and rest reign forever. There are bestowed not fading laurels, but everlasting crowns of life, righteousness, joy and glory. (See 1 Corinthians 9:25; 2 Timothy 4:8; James 1:12; 1 Peter 5:4; Revelation 2:10;

Revelation 9:7.)

That general assembly is not bound by the limitations of the one Greek nation but infinitely transcends the Olympian gatherings in a countless multitude out of every nation, tribe, tongue and kindred. Jew, Greek, Roman, Scythian, barbarian, bond and free mingle in one tide of brotherhood. (Revelation 7:9)

SEPTUAGINT USAGE

Some of your questions induced me to supply you with the entire Septuagint usage. You have before you now all the instances of this use of ecclesia, including the readings of the several texts, in both the canonical books and Apocrypha. To these have been added the additional instances from other Greek versions of the Old Testament, Aquila (A. D., 130). The odotion (A. D. 160), Symmachus (A. D. 193). et al.; i. e., so far as they are cited in the concordance of Abraham Trommius (A. D. 1718) and the new mammoth concordance of Hatch Redpath, Oxford (1893). These instances, about 114 in all, nearly equal the New Testament number, giving us a total of about 230 uses of the word not counting the classics. This is every way sufficient for inductive study. Of course the post apostolic versions of Aquilla, Theodotion and Symmachus had no influence in determining the earlier New Testament usage, but as the work of Jews in the second century they confirm that usage.

It was to the classic and Septuagint usage the first lecture referred in saying that the New Testament writers neither coined the word nor employed it in an unusual sense.

They wrote in Greek, to readers and speakers of Greek, using Greek words in their common acceptation in order to be understood. With this usage before us let us seek an answer to your new questions:

I. (Q) As in the Septuagint ecclesia translates the Hebrew word gahal, does it not mean, “All Israel, whether assembled or unassembled?”

(A) My reply is, I see not how this question could have risen in any mind from a personal, inductive study of all the Septuagint passages, since in every instance of the 114 cited the word means a gathering together - an assembly.

You can see that for yourselves by the context of your English version. The Septuagint usage is as solidly one thing as the Macedonian phalanx. Unfortunately in our broad theological reading our minds become so preoccupied with the loose generalizations of the great Pedobaptist scholars, Harnack, Hatch, Hort, Cremer and others, that we unconsciously neglect to investigate and think for ourselves. Let not admiration for distinguished scholarship blot out your individuality. Accept nothing blindly on mere human authority. In determining this question, have nothing to do with the meaning of gahal in its other connections. Rigidly adhere to the passages where ecclesia translates it. Because a word sometimes serves for another, do not foist on it all the meanings of the other word.

It is well enough to illustrate by synonyms, but do not define by them. Definition by supposed synonyms was the curse of the Baptismal controversy. Because a question about purifying arose between a Jew and John’s disciples, Edward Beecher must write an illogical book to show that Baptizo means only to purify, and, of course, by any method. Study Carson on Baptism and you

will learn much about the principles of accurate definition.

II. (Q) “But,” another question asks, “do not some of these Septuagint passages justify the meaning of unassembled?”

(A) While I accepted Pedobaptist ideas, I thought so, but never since I looked into the matter for myself. I do not know of even one such passage. I never heard of a definite claim being set up to more than four out of 114. Turn now to these four in your revised English Bibles. They are:

1 Kings 8:65

1 Chronicles 28:8

Ezra 10:8;

Ezekiel 32:3.

The first two settle themselves by a mere reading. In Ezra “the assembly of the captivity” might be supposed to refer, in a loose way, to the people while captives in Babylon. But in fact it has no such reference as the context shows. It simply means the 42,360 who returned from captivity as a definite Jerusalem assembly, repeatedly called together. In Ezekiel 32:3, an unreliable reading has ecclesia for the English word company. But even then the idea is the same. “Many peoples” in that sentence signify nothing against the usual meaning of the word. They do not constitute an ecclesia until gathered into a company. Xerxes, Timour, Napoleon, the White Tzar, and many others have formed a great company out of the contingents of many people.

Heretofore the advocates of the present existence of “an universal, invisible, spiritual, unassembled church” have boldly rested their case on the Septuagint usage. The premise of their argument was, that the New Testament writers must have used the word in the sense that a Jew accustomed to the Greek Old Testament would understand. A fine premise, by the way. But to save the theory from total collapse some new line of defense must be invented. And that is intimated in your next question:

III. (Q) “As Christ was establishing a new institution, widely different from the Greek state ecclesia, or the Old Testament ecclesia, was not ecclesia in the New Testament used in a new, special and sacred sense? Does not the word in the New Testament commonly mean the same as the Kletoi, or the called, without reference to either organization, or assembly?”

(A) On many accounts I am delighted with the opportunity to reply to this question. The reply is couched in several distinct observations:

(1) This question demonstrates hopeful progress in the controversy and prophesies a speedy and final settlement. It not only necessarily implies a clean cut surrender of the old line of defense, but also narrows a hitherto broad controversy into a single new issue, susceptible of easy settlement. If this new position proves untenable there is no other to which the defense can be shifted. This is the last ditch. And the fact that it is new indicates the extremity of its advocates.

(2) Like the former contention, this, too, is borrowed from the Pedobaptists. They tried hard and long to make it serve in the Baptismal controversy. Their contention then was that though Baptizo meant to dip or immerse in classic Greek, yet in the Bible it was used in a new and sacred sense.

The scholarship of the world rebuked them. Words are signs of ideas. To mean anything they must be understood according to the common acceptation in the minds of those addressed. I know of no more dangerous method of interpretation than the assumption that a word must be taken to mean something different from its real meaning. Revelation in that case ceases to be revelation. We are at sea without helm, or compass, or guiding star.

(3) There is nothing in the difference between Christ's ecclesia on the one hand, and the classic or Septuagint ecclesia on the other hand, to justify a new sense in the word. The difference lies not in the meaning of the word, but in the object, terms of membership and other things.

(4) This proposed new sense destroys the two essential ideas of the old word, organization and assembly, and thereby leaves Christ without an institution or official, business body in the world. From the days of Abel the Kletoi, or called, have been in the world.

If, therefore, the New Testament ecclesia means only the "called," then what did Christ establish in His time?

(5) If by ecclesia, only the called in their scattered capacity are meant, why use both ecclesia and Kletoi?

How can there be a body of Kletoi if the essential ideas of ecclesia are left out? If there be no organization, no assembly, how can there be a body? Miscellaneous, scattered, unattached units do not make a body.

(6) Finally there is not the slightest evidence that ecclesia has any such arbitrary meaning. But this will more clearly appear if you examine the usage passage by passage.

IV. (Q) "But when Paul says, I persecuted the church, surely that can only mean that he persecuted the disciples?"

(A) But it does mean much more. It means exactly what it says. The mere individuals as such counted nothing with Paul. It was the organization to which they belonged, and what that organization stood for. As proof of this our Lord arrested him with the question: "Why persecutest thou me? I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Jesus was not persecuted in person by Saul. So when "Herod the King put forth his hand to afflict certain of the church" he aimed at the organization, in what it stood for, though directly his wrath fell only on James and Peter.

V. (Q) "But if the church means assembly does not that require it to be always in session?"

(A) No ecclesia, classic, Jewish or Christian, known to history, held perpetual session. They all adjourned and came together again according to the requirements of the case. The organization, the institution, was not dissolved by temporary adjournment.

VI. (Q) "But if the earthly ecclesia exists now, though many of its members forsake the assembling of themselves together, and if it continually receives new members, why may we not say the general assembly exists now, though all be not actually assembled, nor all its members yet born?"

(A) This is the most plausible objection yet offered, and one that greatly perplexes some minds. Your rigid attention, therefore, is called to the reply. It is admitted that the particular assembly on earth is not always in session either as a worshipping or business body. The word ecclesia never

did require perpetual session. Nor does it now. There has been no change of requirement in that respect from the days of Pericles till now. Nor does the word require that all its Kletoi or members shall be present at every session. Nor does the word itself forbid the accession of new members.

Moreover, a particular ecclesia might continue as an historic institution so long that there might be an entire change in the personnel of its members many times. There are particular Baptist churches now existing in which these changes have actually occurred. Seldom does the roll of members remain the same even one year. Some die, some are excluded, some move away into other communities, new members are received. The attendance upon the sessions for worship and business continually varies. Some are sick, some travel, some backslide. Conditions of weather, politics or war affect the attendance. Yea, more, storms, plagues, or persecution may for the time being scatter the members of a particular church over a wide area of territory. None of these things in the slightest degree affect the meaning of the word.

Ecclesia remains throughout an organized assembly whose members are properly called out from their private homes or business to attend to public affairs. The difference between the earthly and heavenly ecclesia in regard to the foregoing mutations does not arise at all from the word but from the nature of the case. By its very nature the earthly ecclesia is imperfect. It is a time institution. By the conditions of its earthly existence there are fluctuations in attendance and membership. By its location in a world of lost people and by its commission to save them, there is constant accession of members. The changed nature of the case and of the conditions make these things different with the general assembly. It cannot increase in members because there is no salvable material from which to gain accessions. Character has crystallized and probation ended. The lost then, are forever lost, and Hell admits of no evangelism. The word would not forbid evangelism but the nature of the case does. Not only the word, but the nature of the case renders present existence of the general assembly impossible. Into the earthly house material enters according to credible evidence of regeneration as men judge. There is no absolute guaranty against self-deception or hypocrisy. Moreover, this material even when the profession of faith is well founded, is never in a perfect state, but must be continually made better by progressive sanctification of soul. The earthly ecclesia is a workshop in which material is being prepared for the Heavenly house. Death is the last lesson of discipline for the soul. The resurrection and glorification of the body, its last lesson. No rough ashlar goes into the Heavenly House, no unhewn, unpolished, unadorned cedar timber. No half stone or broken column would be received. If a soul, even one of the spirits of the just made perfect, were now put into that wall, the building would have to be reconstructed and readjusted to admit the body part of that same living stone after the resurrection. There is no sound of hammer, ax, or chisel when that building goes up. All preparatory work of every stone in that building, and of every timber, must be completed before that building goes up.

It was this heavenly ecclesia, which as a coming event, cast its shadow before David and Solomon and constituted their inexorable plan for the typical temple. Because the plan given them was a shadow of better things to come they were not allowed to vary a hair’s breadth from the pattern of the Divine Architect.

There is nothing in the word ecclesia itself to forbid its application to “the Spirits of the just made perfect” now in heaven and continually receiving accessions. They are an assembly in fact. And Thayer seems to so understand Hebrews 12:23. I do not agree with him in making “general

assembly and church of the first born" synonymous with "the spirits of the just made perfect." To my mind, they represent two very distinct ideas. But he is certainly right in supposing that the assembled spirits of the righteous dead may be called an ecclesia. But when one defines the general assembly to be the aggregate of all the elect, and then affirms its present existence, he does violence to philology, common sense and revelation. The earthly ecclesia is an organization now, an assembly now, though not always in session. The general assembly is not an organization now, is not an assembly now, and therefore exists only as a prospect.

VII. You ask for a particular explanation of several Scriptures which seem difficult to harmonize with the contentions of the first lecture, all of which in turn will now receive attention:

(1) Acts 9:31 - "So the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace, being edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, was multiplied" (Revised Version) To my mind, this is the only use of ecclesia in all Biblical or classic literature that is difficult of explanation. The difficulty is frankly confessed. Nor am I sure that such explanation as I have to offer will be satisfactory to you. In any event, nothing is ever gained for truth by lack of candor. Judging from the uniform use of the word elsewhere one would naturally expect here a plural noun with plural verbs as we have in the King James Version. And this expectation would be entirely apart from a desire to serve a theory. The difficulty here does not help the theory of "the now existing universal, invisible, spiritual church."

It is quite easy to explain it so far as any comfort would accrue to that theory. The difficulty lies in another direction entirely, and seems to oppose a Baptist contention on another point, in whose maintenance my Baptist opponents in the present controversy are fully as much concerned as myself. On its face the passage seems to justify the provincial or state-wide or national use of the word church on earth which all Baptists deny. That is the only difficulty I see in the passage. All the context shows that the reference is to the earth church and not to the heavenly. The limits of this lecture forbid a discussion of the text question. The texts vary. Some manuscripts and versions have the very plural noun with its plural verbs that one would naturally expect from the uniform usage elsewhere. The King James Version follows these. The oldest and best manuscripts, however, have the singular noun with corresponding verbs. The Revised Version follows them.

Now for the explanation:

(1) The reading, "Churches," followed by the common version may be the right one, leaving nothing to explain. In all other cases, whether in Old or New Testament, where the sense calls for the plural, we have it in the text. Not to have it here is an isolated, jarring exception. See Acts 15:41; Acts 16:5; Romans 16:4; Romans 16:6; 1 Corinthians 7:17; 1 Corinthians 11:26; 1 Corinthians 14:33-34; 1 Corinthians 16:1; 1 Corinthians 16:19; 2 Corinthians 8:1, 2 Corinthians 8:18, 2 Corinthians 8:23; 2 Corinthians 11:8; 2 Corinthians 11:28; 2 Corinthians 12:13; Galatians 1:2; Galatians 1:22; 1 Thessalonians 2:14; 2 Thessalonians 1:4; Revelation 1:4; Revelation 1:11; Revelation 1:20; Revelation 2:7; Revelation 2:11; Revelation 2:17; Revelation 2:20; Revelation 2:23; Revelation 3:6; Revelation 3:13; Revelation 3:22; Revelation 22:16; Psalms 26:12; Psalms 68:26. It is well to note that Murdock's translation of the Peshito Syriac cites a Greek plural in the margin.

(2) But accepting the singular, according to Revised Version, then, says Broadus, “the word probably denotes the original church at Jerusalem, whose members were by persecution widely scattered throughout Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and held meetings wherever they were, but still belonged to the one original organization. When Paul wrote to the Galatians nearly twenty years later, these separate meetings had been organized into distinct churches; and so he speaks (Galatians 1:22), in reference to that same period, of the churches of Judea which were in Christ.”-(Commentary on Matthew, page 359) This was the church which Saul persecuted and of which he made havoc. Concerning the effect of this persecution the record says “they were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria.” (Acts 8:1) “Now they who were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word.” (Acts 11:19) So, when in the paragraph just preceding our Scripture, there is an account of Saul, as a convert, worshipping and preaching with the church he had formerly persecuted, we may not be surprised at the statement “So the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace.” Meyer says the “So draws an inference from the whole history in vv. 3:30: in consequence of the conversion of the former chief enemy and his transformation into the zealous apostle.” But you may say, when they are thus scattered does not that break up the assembly idea in the word? This question has been previously answered in this lecture. It has been said that a storm, like that which swept Galveston, or a plague, like the yellow fever in Memphis, or war, as during the colossal strife between the states, or persecution, as in this case, might scatter far and wide, for the time being, the members of a particular church, but that would not change the meaning of the word church. When Tarleton made a dash at the Virginia legislature the members fled in every direction. When Howe moved on Philadelphia the Continental Congress dispersed and sought rest in safer places, but who would infer from these cases a change of meaning in legislature or congress? Under the advice of Themistocles the entire Athenian ecclesia abandoned their sacred city and sought safety from Persian invasion on their ships, but ecclesia retained its meaning.

(3) There is a third explanation possible. You may like it better than I do. It is not in harmony with one statement of my first lecture. It certainly, however, excludes comfort from the theory of the invisible general church.

Meyer understands ecclesia in Acts 9:31 in a collective sense, not of Christians collectively, but of churches collectively. His language is: “Observe, moreover, with the correct reading ecclesia (singular number) the aspect of unity, under which Luke, surveying the whole domain of Christendom comprehends the churches which had been already formed, and were in process of formation.”

Note that he says that the word church “comprehends the churches,” not Christians. Some Baptists follow Meyer. Hovey, in Hackett on Acts, seems to quote Meyer approvingly. This explanation necessarily implies the existence, at this time, of many organized assemblies in Judea, Samaria and Galilee of which we have no definite historic knowledge. True, Philip had evangelized the city of Samaria and there was time enough, in the three years since Paul’s conversion for forming some churches, if only the record would say as much. If Meyer be right, of course, I was wrong in saying that ecclesia could not be used in the collective sense of comprehending many particular churches. My own explanation is given in (1) and (2). Now, if a theory harmonizes all of 231 uses of a word but one, and gives a possible explanation of that one,

the theory is demonstrated.

VIII. The next class of Scriptures which you wish explained is represented by:

Ephesians 1:22-23

Colossians 1:18;

1 Peter 2:5

Hebrews 3:6;

John 10:16.

My first remark is that the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians were circular letters, meant to be read to other churches with equal application. Hence the use of the term church in a more general way than in other letters. The general use, however, does not forbid, but even requires, specific application to any one particular church, as

Ephesians 2:21-22, (Revised Version), shows. In like manner Peter's first letter was written to Jewish saints of the dispersion in Asia Minor, but not specifically to any particular church. Hence, when he says, "Ye, also, as living stones are built up a spiritual house," he does not mean that all the Jewish saints in Asia Minor constitute one church. To say the least of it, that is certainly an unbaptistic idea. It also contradicts the record in Acts showing the planting of many particular churches in this section, made up of Jews and Gentiles, and also ignores the seven churches of Revelation, all in the same section. But Peter means, using the word "house" in a generic sense, that whenever and wherever enough of you come together to form a particular church, that will be a spiritual house in which to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. Just as in Ephesians 2:21-22 (Revised Version), the apostle in the same breath converts the general or abstract idea of church into particular churches. Murdock's translation of the Syriac Peshito reads: "And ye also, as living stones, are builded and become spiritual temples" in 1 Peter 2:5.

It is characteristic of circular letters to use terms in general form that must find concrete expression in particular forms. A man writing a circular to Texas Baptists at large, or to all Baptist churches of Texas would find it difficult to refrain from using some general expressions which must be left to the common sense of each particular church for making specific application. It is a matter of congratulation that since the circular, called the letter to the Ephesians, employs more of these general terms than any other letter, we have been so thoroughly safeguarded from misconstruction of its generalities by three distinct instances of specific application, in Acts 20:28-29; Ephesians 2:21-22; 1 Timothy 3:14-15, to this Ephesus church. The epistle to the Hebrews is even more general in its address than the two just considered, and we have only to apply the same principles of interpretation heretofore set forth to understand Hebrews 3:6 - "Whose house are we." The writer certainly never intended to convey the impression that all Hebrew Christians constituted one church. That also, to say the least of it, is an unbaptistic idea. We know it to be an unscriptural one, because it contradicts Paul in Galatians 1:22. It is utterly illogical to claim either Hebrews 8:6 or 1 Peter 2:5 for examples of the so-called "universal church" idea. If the advocates of this idea insist on denying the particular church in these cases because one letter was addressed to all the Hellenist converts of Asia Minor, and the other was addressed

to all the converted Palestinean Hebrews, then I demand that they also stick to the text, and claim for either case Jews and Jews only. This not only shuts them off from the general assembly in which Jew and Gentile form one new man, but forces them to the absurdity of having on earth one Jewish church big as Asia Minor - that big - no more - and the other big as Judea, that big, no more, and that leaves still running at large all the rest of the converted Jews of the dispersion, and puts them in conflict with Scripture history which shows many particular churches in these sections. To show you the difference between the general use of the term “church’ in a circular of miscellaneous address and its direct and particular use in a document addressed to specific churches, compare the use of church in Revelation with the use of church in the letter to the Ephesians. In the twenty times of Revelation we have more than one sixth of the New Testament usage. A few words will dispose of John 10:16 - “other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.” This passage is strong confirmation of my first lecture. Considering the church abstractly, that is, in the sense of an institution, Christ purposed to make of twain, Jew and Gentile, one new man. In each particular church where Jew and Gentile blend, Christ’s purpose is partially fulfilled. But in the general assembly in glory it is completely fulfilled. When in some of the foregoing Scriptures, Christ is represented as head over all things to the church; His body, you easily meet all the requirements of the language by saying:

He is head over all things to His earth church as an institution.

He is head over all things to any particular earth church.

He is head over all things to His general assembly in glory.

There remain for consideration only two other Scriptures and then all your questions are answered, Ephesians 5:25-27; Hebrews 12:18-24. And these will receive particular attention because they were cited in the first lecture as referring to the general assembly. On Hebrews 12:23, you inquire, Does not the tense of the verb “Ye are come * * to the general assembly, etc.,” prove the present existence of the general assembly? How else can it be said, ye are come to it? To which I reply: In Galatians 4:1-31, Paul says that Hagar and Sarah, under an allegory, represent the two covenants. Hagar, or Mt. Sinai, in Arabia, answering to the Jerusalem that now is, is the law covenant gendering to bondage. Sarah, or Mt. Zion, answering to the Jerusalem above, is the grace covenant gendering to freedom.

So, when in Hebrews 12:1-29 it says, “Ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched” (i. e., Mt. Sinai), it simply means ye are not under the law covenant, with its threats and horrible outlook. And when it adds: “Ye are come to Mt. Zion, etc.,” (perfect tense), it simply means that we are under the grace covenant with its promises and glorious outlook. In other words, what we have actually reached is a covenant, a regime, a standard of life, and are under its requirements and incited by its glorious prospects. But an exegesis, based on the tense of that verb, which claims that Christians have already attained unto all the alluring elements of the outlook of the grace covenant, enumerated in that passage, is as mad as a March hare. That Jerusalem is above, and because not yet, is contrasted with the Jerusalem that now is. It is the city and country set forth in the preceding chapter, toward which the faith and hope of the patriarchs looked. It was a possession to them only in the sense that they were the heirs of a promised inheritance reserved in Heaven. Abraham, with the other heirs of that promise, patiently dwelt in tents, “for he looked for

a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And all the patriarchs "died in faith," not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them afar off, yea, "and these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better things for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect." Hebrews 11:1-40. And so we also (Hebrews 12:1) run the race set before us, not yet having attained the goal or received the prize. Compare 1 Corinthians 9:25-27; Php 3:7-14; 2 Timothy 4:6-8. Our Lord Himself held out the promise, "The pure in heart shall see God." But not yet have we actually come "to God, the judge." But John, in his apocalypse of the Heavenly City, with its general assembly, tells the time of attainment: "And they shall see his face." Revelation 22:4. The imagery of Hebrews 12:1-29, is that of the Olympic races. A goal marked the terminus of the race. There sat the judge, who, when the races were over, awarded the prize to the victor. In the Christian race the goal is the resurrection and then only comes the prize. (See Php 3:7-14 and 1 Timothy 4:6-8.) It is then we come to God the judge who awards the prize. The example of our Lord is cited, Hebrews 12:2, "The joy set before him" was prospective and reached when he sees the travail of his soul and is satisfied. The angels of that category, make unseen visits to us now in our earthly home, but then we shall in fact go to the myriads of shining ones in their celestial home.

Now, on earth, with the blood of Christ, our consciences are cleansed from dead works to serve the living God. But there, we enter the true Holy of Holies, and behold where Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, did place the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things for us than the blood of Abel, on the true Mercy seat to make atonement for sin. As our fore-runner, the Lord, Himself, has passed through the veil. But to us, this safe passage, is as yet only a glorious hope, and we "have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us; which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast". Hebrews 6:17-19.

We, yet in our bodies, have not joined "the spirits of the just made perfect" nor entered "the general assembly and church of the first born, who are written in heaven." When we read Revelation 21:1-27, Revelation 22:1-21, we sing: "0 when, thou city of my God, shall I thy courts ascend!" Your question on Ephesians 5:25-27 is similar.

(Q) "Ephesians 5:29 declares that Christ nourishes and cherishes the church, as a husband does his wife. Does not this demand the present existence of the general assembly?' To which I reply:

(A) (1) The nourishing and cherishing of Ephesians 5:29 refer 'to after marriage conduct, as the context shows, and Christ's marriage with the bride is far away in the future. (See Revelation 19:7-9; Revelation 21:2; Revelation 21:9-10.) But let it be misapplied to the prenuptial state, it matters not. The force of any argument in the question is all in the tense of the verbs "nourisheth and cherisheth." Let us turn that argument loose and see what it proves. In the whole passage, Christ and the church come before us under the figures of bridegroom and bride. The church is conceived of as a unit, a person, and all the verbs employed, namely, "loved, gave himself for, might cleanse, might present, nourishment and cherisheth" follow the requirements of the figure. But when we come to historical facts we find:

That the love, in eternity, preceded the existence of any part of the church.

The giving Himself preceded the existence of the greater part of the church.

The cleansing (and the nourishing and cherishing if misapplied) applies to the process of preparing the members, as each in turn comes upon the stage of being throughout the gospel dispensation from Adam to the second advent.

The presentation of the completed and perfected church follows the second advent.

The nourishing and cherishing (rightly applied) of the perfected church follows the presentation.

Now if the present tense of the nourishing proves present existence of the general assembly, does not the past tense of “loved” prove past existence of the general assembly before man was created? Why should the tense of one of the verbs have more proof force in it than another in the same connection? To grant this, however, proves too much and so the argument based on tense is worthless in this case.

# 03.03. Appendix

Appendix The object of this appendix is to enable the “average” preacher with few books, and who knows nothing of Greek, to form his own conclusions as to the meaning of ecclesia, based upon an inductive study of the usage of the word. A few instances only are cited from the classics, out of the great number read to my class in second lecture, but enough for the purpose. These citations will be particularly helpful in showing the distinction between the particular ecclesia, or business body of even the smallest Greek state, and panegyros (general, festive assembly) when the people of all the Greek states assembled. By this means even an uneducated preacher may understand the fitness of calling the great heavenly gathering in glory the “general assembly and church of the first born” (panegyros kai ecclesia) in contra distinction to the particular business assembly on earth. The New Testament usage is given entire because so few country preachers have the Englishmen’s Greek Concordance. The Septuagint usage is also given entire so far as the Trommius Concordance (A. D. 1718) cites instances. This usage is regarded as particularly valuable for three reasons:

(1) Only about one preacher in a thousand has access to a Septuagint concordance.

(2) Nearly all their ideas of the meaning of the word in the Greek Old Testament have been derived from the loose generalizations of the great Pedobaptist scholars, Harnack, Hatch, Hort, Cremer, et al., who seeing that ecclesia sometimes translates the Hebrew word “qahal,” foist upon ecclesia all the meanings of qahal in other connections. You have nothing to do with qahal except where ecclesia translates it. By an inductive study of all the ecclesia passages, you will see for yourselves that in the Septuagint it never means “all Israel whether assembled or unassembled”, but that in every instance it means a gathering together, an assembly.

(3) This classic, and particularly this Septuagint usage, are specially valuable to you, because as the first lecture states, the New Testament writers neither coined this word nor employed it in an unusual sense. The apostles and early Christians were more familiar with the Septuagint than with the Hebrew Version. From it they generally quoted. They wrote in Greek to a Greek speaking world, and used Greek words as a Greek speaking people would understand them.

It is a fiction of Pedobaptists that they used “baptizo” in a new and sacred sense. Equally is it a fiction that ecclesia was used in any new, special sense. The object of Christ’s ecclesia, and terms of membership in it, were indeed different from those of the classic or Septuagint ecclesia. But the word itself retains its ordinary meaning. In determining this meaning we look to the common, literal usage. If occasionally we find it used in a general or figurative way, these few instances must be construed in harmony with the common, literal signification.

CLASSIC USE Ecclesia - Primary meaning: An organized assembly of citizens, regularly summoned, as opposed to other meetings.

Thucydides. 2,22: - “Pericles, seeing them angry at the present state of things * * did not call them to an assembly (ecclesia) or any other meeting.”

Demosthenes 378,24: - “When after this the assembly (ecclesia) adjourned, they came together and planned * * For the future still being uncertain, meetings and speeches of all sorts took place in the marketplace. They were afraid that an assembly (ecclesia) would be summoned suddenly, etc.” Compare the distinction here between a lawfully assembled business body and a mere gathering together of the people in unofficial capacity, with the town clerk’s statement in Acts 19:35; Acts 19:40.

Now some instances of the particular ecclesia of the several Greek states:

Thucydides 1,87: - “Having said such things, he himself, since he was ephor, put the question to vote in the assembly (ecclesia) of the Spartans.”

Thucydides 1,139: - “And the Athenians having made a house (or called an assembly, ecclesia) freely exchanged their sentiments.”

Aristophanes Act 169: - “But I forbid you calling an assembly (ecclesia) for the Thracians about pay.”

Thucydidcs 6,8: - “And the Athenians having convened an assembly (ecclesia) * * voted, etc.”

Thucydides 6,2: - “And the Syracusans having buried their dead, summoned an assembly (ecclesia) .” This historical reading concerning the business assemblies of the several petty but independent, self-governing Greek states, with their lawful conference, their free speech, their decision by vote, whether of Spartans, Thracians, Syracusans or Athenians, sounds much like the proceedings of particular and independent Baptist churches today.

Panegyros - A general, festive assembly of the people of all the Greek states.

Decret. ap. Demos: 526,16 - “Embassies to the festal assemblies (panegyros) in Greece.”

Plato,Hipp. 363: - “Going up to Olympia, the festal assemblies (panegyros) of the Greeks.”

Pindar: - “The general assembly (panegyros) in honor of Zeus (Jupiter).”

Isocrates 41 A: - “I often wondered at those who organized the general festivals (panegyros) .”

Aeschylus Theb. 220: - “May this goodly, general company (panegyros) of gods never fail the city in my life time.”

Thucydides 5,50: - “And fear was produced in the general assembly (panegyros) that the Lacedaemonians would come in arms.” Upon this usage note how bright and discriminating the Greek mind. This general assembly was not for war but peace. Let not the Spartans come to it with arms in their hands. It was not for business but pleasure, a time of peace, and joy and glory. In the happy Greek conceit all the heavenly beings were supposed to be present. How felicitously does an inspired apostle adapt himself to the Greek use of the word, and glorify it by application to the final heavenly state. God the judge, not Zeus, is there. Myriads of angels, not Greek demi-gods and inferior deities, are there.

There is a general assembly in magnitude, multitude and constituency, transcendentally above the poor limitations of a small Greek nation, this is made up of every tribe and tongue and kindred, Jew, Roman, Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free. Here warfare is over and rest has come.

Here crowns are awarded, not of fading wreaths of time, but crowns of life, righteousness, joy and glory.

ECCLESIA - USAGE IN SEPTUAGINT

Cited in the concordance of Abraham Trommius (1718). Chapters and verses here given according to Revised Version for Canonical books; and according to Haydock's Donay Bible for Apocryphal books.

Greek text used for verification Henry Barclay Sweet - Cambridge, 1891. The underscored English word is the translation of Ecclesia.

Leviticus 8:3 - "Assemble thou all the congregations."

Here the verb (ecclesiazo) is used. Though Trommius cites a reading which has the noun.

Deuteronomy 18:16 - "In the day of the assembly" (referring to the convocation at Sinai).

Deuteronomy 23:1-8 - "Shall not enter into the assembly of the Lord." Here four times used to proscribe certain specified classes from admission into the Lord's assembly."

Deuteronomy 31:30 - "And Moses spake in the ears of all the assembly of Israel the words of this song."

Joshua 8:35 - "Joshua read before all the assembly of Israel."

Judges 20:2 - "And the chiefs of all the people presented themselves in the assembly of the people of God." The place of this assembly was Mizpah.

Judges 21:5 - "And the children of Israel said, Who is there among all the tribes of Israel that came not up in the assembly unto the Lord."

Judges 21:8 - "There came none to the camp from Jabesh-Gilead to the assembly."

1 Samuel 17:47 - David said, "That all this assembly may know there is a God in Israel."

1 Samuel 19:20 - And when Saul's messenger "saw the company of the prophets prophesying."

1 Kings 8:14; 1 Kings 8:22; 1 Kings 8:55; 1 Kings 8:65 - "Blessed all the congregation" - "in the presence of all the congregation" "blessed all the congregation" - "and all Israel with him, a great congregation."

1 Chronicles 13:2; 1 Chronicles 13:4 - "David said unto all the assembly of Israel" - "And all the assembly said."

1 Chronicles 28:2 - "David stood up upon his feet - (in the midst of the assembly) ." Nothing in Hebrew text for the words in parenthesis, and hence nothing in English version.

1 Chronicles 28:8 - "In the sight of all Israel, the congregation of the Lord."

1 Chronicles 29:1 - "The King said unto all the congregation."

1 Chronicles 29:10 - "David blessed the Lord before all the congregation."

1 Chronicles 29:20 - “David said to all the congregation.”

2 Chronicles 1:3-5 - “Solomon, and all the congregation with him.” “Solomon and the congregation sought unto it” (the altar).

2 Chronicles 6:3-13 - “The King turned his face and blessed all the congregation.” “He stood * * in the presence of all the congregation.” “He kneeled down * * before all the congregation.”

2 Chronicles 7:8 - “Solomon held the feast * * and all Israel with him, a very great congregation.”

2 Chronicles 29:5; 2 Chronicles 29:14 - “Jehosaphat stood in the congregation.” “Then upon Jahaziel * * came the spirit of the Lord in the midst of the congregation.”

2 Chronicles 23:3 - “And all the congregation made a covenant with the King.”

2 Chronicles 28:14 - “So all the armed men left all the captives and the spoil before the princes and all the congregation.”

2 Chronicles 29:23; 2 Chronicles 29:32 - “And they brought * * the sin offering before the King and the congregation” - “And the number of the burnt offerings which the congregation brought.”

2 Chronicles 30:2-4; 2 Chronicles 30:13; 2 Chronicles 30:17; 2 Chronicles 30:23-25 - “The King, his princes and all the congregation.” “In the eyes of the King and all the congregation.” “A very great congregation.” “Many in the congregation who had not sanctified themselves.” “And the congregation took counsel.” “Hezekiah did give to the congregation.” “And all the congregation.”

Ezra 2:64 - “The whole congregation together was 42,360.”

Ezra 10:1 - “There is gathered together a very great congregation.”

Ezra 10:9 - “That whosoever came not within three days * * should be himself separated from the congregation of the captivity.”

Ezra 10:12 - “Then all the congregation answered.”

Ezra 10:14 - “Let * * rulers of the congregation stand” (Sinaiatic).

Nehemiah 5:7 - “And I held a great assembly against them.”

Nehemiah 5:13 - “And all the congregation said Amen.”

Nehemiah 7:66 - “The whole congregation together was 42,360.”

Nehemiah 8:2 - “Ezra brought the law before the congregation.”

Nehemiah 8:17 - “And all the congregation of them * * made booths.”

Nehemiah 13:1 - “An Ammonite and Moabite shall not enter the congregation.”

Job 30:28 - “I stand up in the assembly and cry for help.”

Psalms 22:22 - “In the midst of the congregation will I praise.”

Psalms 22:25 - “Of thee cometh my praise in the great congregation.”

Psalms 26:5 - “I have hated the congregation of evil doers.”

Psalms 26:12 - “In the congregations will I bless the Lord.”

Psalms 35:18 - “I will give thee thanks in the great congregation.”

Psalms 49:9 - “I have published thy righteousness in the great congregation.”

Psalms 68:26 - “Bless ye God in the congregations.”

Psalms 89:5 - “Thy faithfulness in the assembly of the holy ones.”

Psalms 107:32 - “Let them exalt him in the assembly of the people.”

Psalms 149:1 - “Sing his praise in the assembly of the saints.”

Proverbs 5:14 - “In the midst of the congregation and assembly.”

Jeremiah 31:8 - “A great assembly” - instead of “company” is a variant reading.

Lamentations 1:10 - “They should not enter into the congregation.”

Ezekiel 32:3 - “Here Codex A has assembly (ecclesia) instead of “company.”

Joel 2:16 - “Sanctify the congregation.”

Micah 2:5 - “Cast the line by lot in the congregation of the Lord.”

APOCRYPHA

Judith Jdt 6:2 - “Ozias took him from the assembly to his house.”

Jdt 7:29 - “Great weeping in the assembly.”

13:29 - “In the assembly of the people.”

Jdt 14:6 - “Saw the head of Holofernes in the hand of one of the assembly.” (A reading.)

Ecclesiasticus Sir 15:5 - “In the midst of the assembly she shall open his mouth.”

Sir 21:20 - “The mouth of the prudent is sought after in the assembly.”

23:34 - “This woman shall be brought into the assembly.”

Sir 24:2 - “Wisdom shall open her mouth in the assemblies of the Most High.”

Sir 26:6 - “My heart hath been afraid of the assembly of the people.”

Sir 31:11 - “And the assembly shall declare his alms.”

Sir 33:19 - “Hear me, ye rulers of the assembly.”

38:37 - “They shall not go up to the assembly.”

Sir 39:14 - “The assembly shall show forth his praise.”

Sir 44:15 - “Let the assembly declare his praise.

Sir 50:15 - “Before all the assembly of Israel.”

Sir 50:22 - “Lifted up his hands over all the assembly of the children of Israel.”

I Maccabees 1Ma 2:56 - “Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation.”

1Ma 3:13 - “Judas had assembled a company of the faithful.”

1Ma 4:59 - “Judas, his brethren and all the assembly.”

1Ma 5:16 - “A great assembly met.”

1Ma 14:19 - “Read before the assembly in Jerusalem.”

REMARK ON SEPTUAGINT USAGE The testimony here is univocal. It is as solid as the Macedonian phalanx. Some have tried to make it appear that four of these ninety-two instances refer to an unassembled ecclesia. Look at them, read the context and judge for yourselves. The four passages are:

1 Kings 8:65;

1 Chronicles 28:8;

Ezra 10:8;

Ezekiel 32:3. The first two settle themselves. In Ezra “the assembly of the Captivity” simply means the 42,360 that returned from the captivity and are repeatedly gathered together. In Ezekiel 32:3 an unreliable reading has ecclesia in the place of company. But whether company or ecclesia the idea is the same. The “many peoples” signify nothing, they do not constitute an ecclesia until formed into one company. Xerxes, Timour, Napoleon and many others formed one great company out of the contingents of many nations.

Observe prescribed conditions of membership in Deuteronomy 23:1-25 and Nehemiah 13:1-31. The new and mammoth Septuagint Concordance of Hatch and Redpath, five folio volumes, Oxford, 1893, gives the following additional instances (not cited by Trommius) from one text or another:

CANONICAL BOOKS Deuteronomy 4:10; Deuteronomy 9:10;

1 Kings 12:3 (from Codex A.) 2 Chronicles 10:8; 2 Chronicles 29:28-31; all rendered assembly in our Revised Version, and Ezekiel 32:28 (from Codex A.) rendered company.

APOCRYPHAL BOOKS Jdt 6:19; Jdt 6:21, assembly.

1Ma 14:9 (assemblies instead of streets). FROM OTHER GREEK VERSIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT Leviticus 4:14; Leviticus 4:21; Leviticus 16:17;

Psalms 40:9-10;

Proverbs 26:26;

Jeremiah 26:17; Jeremiah 44:14. All rendered assembly in our Revised Version. And Ezekiel 23:47; Ezekiel 26:7; Ezekiel 27:27; Ezekiel 32:22, all rendered company. This makes the Old

Testament usage amount to about 114 cases, nearly equal in number to New Testament usage. In no one of the 114 instances does it mean an unassembled ecclesia.

NEW TESTAMENT USAGE OF ECCLESIA (COMMON VERSION) Matthew 16:18 - “I will build my church.”

Matthew 18:17 - “Tell (it) unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church.”

Acts 2:47 - “the Lord added to the church daily.”

Acts 5:11 - “fear came upon all the church.”

Acts 7:38 - “he, that was in the church.”

Acts 8:1 - “the church which was at Jerusalem.”

Acts 8:3 - “He made havoc of the church.”

Acts 9:31 - “Then had the churches rest.”

Acts 11:22 - “the church which was in Jerusalem.”

Acts 11:26 - “assembled themselves with the church.”

Acts 12:1 - “to vex certain of the church”

Acts 12:5 - “without ceasing of the church unto God.”

Acts 18:1 - “Now there were in the church.”

Acts 14:23 - “elders in every church, and had” - Acts 14:27 - “had gathered the church together.”

Acts 15:2 - “on their way by the church.”

Acts 15:4 - “ they were received of the church.”

Acts 15:22 - “elders, with the whole church.”

Acts 15:41 - “confirming the churches.”

Acts 16:5 - “so were the churches established.”

Acts 18:22 - “gone up, and saluted the church.”

Acts 19:32 - “for the assembly was confused.”

Acts 19:39 - “determined in a lawful assembly.”

Acts 19:41 - “thus spoken, he dismissed the assembly.”

Acts 20:17 - “called the elders of the church.”

Acts 20:28 - “to feed the church of God.”

Romans 16:1 - “is a servant of the church.”

Romans 16:4 - “all the churches of the Gentiles.”

Romans 16:5 - “the church that is in their house.”

Romans 16:23 - “mine host, and of the whole church.”

Romans 16:16 - “The churches of Christ salute you.

1 Corinthians 1:2 - “Unto the church of God which.”

1 Corinthians 4:17 - “I teach everywhere in every church.”

1 Corinthians 6:4 - “least esteemed in the church.”

1 Corinthians 7:17 - “so ordain I in all churches.”

1 Corinthians 10:32 - “nor to the church of God.”

1 Corinthians 11:16 - “neither the churches of God.”

1 Corinthians 11:18 - “come together in the church.”

1 Corinthians 11:22 - “or despise ye the church of God.”

1 Corinthians 12:28 - “God hath set some in the church.”

1 Corinthians 14:4 - “that prophesieth edifieth the church.”

1 Corinthians 14:5 - “the church may receive edifying.”

1 Corinthians 14:12 - “to the edifying of the church.”

1 Corinthians 14:19 - “in the church I had rather speak.”

1 Corinthians 14:28 - “The whole church be come together.”

1 Corinthians 14:28 - “keep silence in the church.”

1 Corinthians 14:33 - “as in all churches of the saints.”

1 Corinthians 14:34 -”keep silence in the churches.”

1 Corinthians 14:35 - “for women to speak in the church.”

1 Corinthians 15:9 - “I persecuted the church of God.”

1 Corinthians 16:1 - “to the churches of Galatia.”

1 Corinthians 16:19 - “The churches of Asia salute you.” - “with the church that is in their house.”

2 Corinthians 1:1 - “unto the church of God which.”

2 Corinthians 8:1 - “on the churches of Macedonia.”

2 Corinthians 8:18 - “gospel throughout all the churches.”

2 Corinthians 8:19 - “was also chosen of the churches.”

2 Corinthians 8:23 - “the messengers of the churches.”

2 Corinthians 8:24 - “to them, and before the churches.”

2 Corinthians 11:8 - “I robbed other churches, taking.”

2 Corinthians 11:28 - “the care of the churches.”

2 Corinthians 12:13 - “were inferior to the churches.”

Galatians 1:2 - “unto the churches of Galatia.”

Galatians 1:13 - “I persecuted the church of God.”

Galatians 1:22 - “unto the churches of Judea.”

Ephesians 1:22 - “gave him (to be) the head over all (things) to the church.”

Ephesians 3:10 - “might be known by the church.”

Ephesians 3:21 - “glory in the church by Christ Jesus.”

Ephesians 5:23 - “Christ is the head of the church.”

Ephesians 5:24 - “the church is subject unto Christ.”

Ephesians 5:25 - “as Christ also loved the church.”

Ephesians 5:27 - “to himself a glorious church.”

Ephesians 5:29 - “even as the Lord the church.”

Ephesians 5:32 - “concerning Christ and the church.”

Php 3:6 - “Concerning zeal, persecuting the church.”

Php 4:15 - “no church communicated with me.”

Colossians 1:18 - “the head of the body, the church.”

Colossians 1:24 - “body’s sake, which is the church.”

Colossians 4:15 - “the church which is in the house.”

Colossians 4:16 - “in the church of the Laodiceans.”

1 Thessalonians 1:1 - “unto the church of the Thessalonians.”

1 Thessalonians 2:14 - “followers of the churches of God.”

2 Thessalonians 1:1 - “unto the churches of the Thessalonians.

2 Thessalonians 1:4 - “in you in the churches of God.”

1 Timothy 3:5 - “take care of the church of God.”

1 Timothy 3:15 - “the church of the living God.”

1 Timothy 5:16 - “let not the church be charged.”

Philemon 1:2 - “to the church in thy house.”

Hebrews 2:12 - “in the midst of the church.”

Hebrews 12:23 - “assembly and church of the first-born.”

James 5:14 - “call for the elders of the church.”

3 John 1:6 - “thy charity before the church.”

3 John 1:9 - “I wrote unto the church.”

3 John 1:10 - “castest (them) out of the church.”

Revelation 1:4 - “John to the seven churches.”

Revelation 1:11 - “unto the seven churches which.”

Revelation 1:20 - “the angels of the seven churches.”- “are the seven churches.”

Revelation 2:1 - “the angel of the church of Ephesus.”

Revelation 2:7 - “the Spirit said unto the churches.”

Revelation 2:8 - “the angel of the church in Smyrna.”

Revelation 2:11 - “the Spirit saith unto the churches.”

Revelation 2:12 - “to the angel of the church in Pergamos.

Revelation 2:17 - “the Spirit saith unto the churches.”

Revelation 2:18 - “the angel of the church in Thyatira.”

Revelation 2:23 - “all the churches shall know.”

Revelation 2:29 - “the Spirit saith unto the churches.”

Revelation 3:1 - “angel of the church in Sardis.”

Revelation 3:6 - “the Spirit saith unto the churches.”

Revelation 3:7 - “to the angel of the church in.”

Revelation 3:13 - “the Spirit saith unto the churches.”

Revelation 3:14 - “the angel of the church of the Laodiceans.

Revelation 22:16 - “these things in the churches.”

REMARK ON THE NEW TESTAMENT USAGE Only four of these passages present any difficulty in either classification or exposition, namely:

Acts 9:31 (Revised Version);

Ephesians 1:22;

Colossians 1:18; Colossians 1:24, and these with “flock” in John 10:16, and “house” in 1 Peter 2:5, are considered in Lecture 2.

# 04.00. INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE

INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE A Discussion of the Origin, the Authenticity and the Sanctity of the Oracles of God BY B.H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D.

Founder, and First President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary COMPILED AND EDITED By J. B. CRANFILL, M. D., LL.D.

INTRODUCTION BY GEORGE W. TRUETT, D.D., and L. R. SCARBOROUGH, D.D. To CHARLES C. CARROLL, only surviving son of B.H. Carroll, and himselfa ripe scholar and great preacher, this volume is lovingly dedicated by THE EDITOR

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Most informed Christians know that many teachers, writers, and other leaders of many major denominations raise serious questions about the infallibility of the Bible. Some claim to believe that the Bible is "authoritative in dealing with the faith and practice of the Christian religion," but not in many other matters such as in science, history, and the recording of many events such as miracles of the Bible. They believe the Bible contains errors.

Some of those who deny Biblical inerrancy erroneously claim that the idea is new to our day. They boldly, even though falsely, claim that Christian scholars and leaders of yesteryear did not believe in verbal inspiration, nor in an infallible Bible.

Frankly, their claims force me to do one of several things: First, I doubt they have read church history, for it gives abundant evidence that practically every Christian, until recent decades, believed in an infallible Bible. This fact was declared by Dr. Kirsop Lake, a professor at the University of Chicago, who wrote in THE RELIGION OF YESTERDAY AND TOMORROW, published by Houghton, Boston, 1926, page 61:

"It is a mistake often made by educated persons who happen to have but little knowledge of historical theology, to suppose that fundamentalism is a new and strange form of thought. It is nothing of the kind; it is the partial and uneducated survival of a theology which was once universally held by all Christians. How many were there, for instance, in Christian churches in the eighteenth century who doubted the infallible inspiration of all Scripture? A few, perhaps, but very few.

No, the fundamentalist may be wrong; I think that he is. But it is we who have departed from the tradition, not he, and I am sorry for the fate of anyone who tries to argue with a fundamentalist on the basis of authority. The Bible and the corpus theologicum of the Church is on the fundamentalist side."' In the second place, any person declaring that belief in an infallible Bible is a new idea" either proves his ignorance of church history or his lack of education and/or integrity.

No educated person would deny that Dr. B.H. Carroll, the founder and first President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary of Ft. Worth, Texas, was great scholar who had great

knowledge of what the Bible teaches about itself, and of what Bible-believing Christians believe about Biblical infallibility. The book you hold in your hand gives positive evidence that Dr. B.H. Carroll believed in verbal inspiration and in an infallible Bible! The book contains Scriptural arguments about Biblical inerrancy which NO CAREFUL READER can reject. When this book, published over 50 years ago but now out of print, came to my attention, I immediately felt that it should be reprinted for wide distribution among all who want to know the truth about God's HOLY WORD. Although Dr. Carroll was a brilliant scholar, he presents the truth in such a plain manner until the most unlearned can understand it! The book is sent forth with a fervent prayer that it may help multitudes of Baptists, and other Christians, NOT TO BE MISLED by the heresy of liberalism that is poisoning millions in the major denominations of our day. We encourage readers to help us distribute the book to every possible Christian! Satan is doing a good job of destroying the faith of multitudes by getting so-called "scholars," professors, writers, and religious leaders, to PUT QUESTION MARKS regarding the infallibility and trustworthiness of the Bible.

E.J. Daniels Christ for the World, Publishers P.O. Box 3428 Orlando, FL 32802

Chapter 21

# 04.000. Foreword & Introductions

EDITOR'S FOREWORD THE estimate of the character and greatness of B.H. Carroll, voiced by George W. Truett in his Introduction to this discussion of the Inspiration of the Bible, is neither fanciful nor exaggerated. I join him in appraising the author of this volume as the most commanding figure that has ever marched through the history of American ecclesiasticism. For almost twelve years he was my pastor, but prior to that time I had sensed his greatness and in a limited degree had begun publishing his work. Since then it has been my happy privilege to edit four of his books, Carroll' s Sermons, Baptists and Their Doctrines, Evangelistic Sermons, and The River of Life. In addition to these books I have edited Carroll' s Interpretation of the English Bible, comprising thirteen octavo volumes that contain luminous discussions of the Old and New Testaments.

B.H. Carroll was the founder of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary and was its first President. His heart was aflame with an affectionate desire to furnish opportunity for the cultural and theological equipment of that great and loyal army of young preachers to whom had been denied the privilege of college training.

Indeed, this desire and purpose was the germ from which the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary came into being, and Carroll' s Interpretation of the English Bible was and is the most edifying discussion of the Bible extant in any tongue.

B.H. Carroll was rock-ribbed in his reverent belief in God's Word, and this present discussion is the crowning expression of his unyielding faith in the oracles of God. If there was ever a time when our wobbling world needed to hear a clamant voice calling it back to the changeless verities of the Word of God, that time is now.

Due acknowledgment is herein accorded Professor J. W. Crowder, long-time student of B.H. Carroll and his loving and admiring fellow-worker, for invaluable aid in the preparation of this book. Due recognition is also given President L. R. Scarborough, successor to B.H. Carroll, for his sympathetic co-operation and his gracious words of commendation that accompany this book. And now Inspiration of the Bible begins its mission to our needy world. It is so brief it can be read at one sitting and so profound that its complete study and assimilation will take an entire lifetime.

While its author was a Baptist he loomed so large that his big heart and life took in all the world.

I published his first sermon in 1884. That was forty-six years ago. I am now older than he was when he passed into rest, and I wonder, as these words are done, if my service in the editing and compilation of these works of B.H. Carroll is not my crowning contribution to the world.

J. B. CRANFILL. Dallas, Texas.

SOME WORDS OF INTRODUCTION

IT gives me much pleasure to write these brief introductory words concerning Dr. B.H. Carroll's delayed volume on the Inspiration of the Bible. Speaking quite personally, by the reader's generous forbearance, I would say that it was my privilege to know Dr. Carroll intimately for many years. It was my inexpressibly happy privilege to be a member of his household and live in his home for several years. I am more indebted to him for my reverence for God's Holy Word than I am to any other human being. His was the greatest personality I ever knew and, unlike some historic characters, he ever increasingly loomed largest to those nearest him. During my student days at Baylor University, I was a member of his class in English Bible the department in Baylor which afterwards eventuated in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Much of the material in the present volume was used in his lectures to his classes in Baylor and, later, repeated to his students in the Seminary. The chapters of this book, having thus been first delivered as lectures, appear in a flowing familiar style that adds to the interest and value of the volume. While now and then, some Greek and Latin terms are used, the greater portion of this book is clothed in direct and simple speech that all can understand. Every word in Inspiration of the Bible is of easy comprehension to the common mind, which adds much to its value. Along with many other young ministers who were students in Baylor, I was privileged for four consecutive years to sit at the feet of this remarkable Bible teacher and interpreter, and regularly to hear his expositions of the Holy Scriptures. Such expositions have become more real and precious to me, with my own direct study of the Bible, through all the unfolding years. Whatever may be one's views concerning the Divine authorship and integrity of the Bible, it is my deep conviction that the candid reader anywhere and everywhere will get untold good from the reading of this volume. I am profoundly glad that these long-delayed messages from Dr. Carroll are thus being given permanent form, and it is my earnest hope that this volume will speedily find a place in the library of preachers, teachers, and other Bible students everywhere. The expression, "Mighty in the Scriptures," could be applied to Dr. Carroll as to few other men of his own or any other age. It will indeed be a glorious result if this volume shall be the challenge to a renewed and widespread study of the Bible. May God grant it, for His Name's sake! GEORGE W. TRUETT. Dallas, Texas.

## A FURTHER INTRODUCTION

AMONG the many preachers and teachers who have helped me in the study of God's Word, two have the primary place-my father, Rev. George W. Scarborough, and Dr. B.H. Carroll. Around the family fireside in a Western cow ranch and farmer's home, my father unfolded God's Word and often talked about the Bible. He preached to the cowboys of the West, and I heard him gladly. He was a doctrinal, but deeply spiritual preacher. When I left home for Baylor University my father asked me to promise him that I would hear Dr. Carroll preach every Sunday morning and in the afternoon write him what he preached about. For four and a half years I kept this promise many Sundays. Meagre were the reports at first, but voluminous as the years went on. This great pastor of the First Baptist Church at Waco, in those four and a half years, implanted in my soul very largely my conception of the truth. My faith is the faith of a simple, plain Baptist. I accepted from my father and Dr. Carroll the verbal inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Jesus Christ, His perfect humanity, His atoning death, His bodily resurrection, His second coming. All my studies since have confirmed the simple faith I received from them. I greatly joy in the publication of this volume of Dr. Carroll's sermons on the inspiration of the Bible. His interpretative authority has great weight with me, but I have never had occasion to depart from his teachings on these great themes. The

logic, piling Scripture upon Scripture, coming from his great brain, made irresistible the force of his pronouncements. He was the greatest preacher and the mightiest soul I ever knew. He made deep tracks in Christ's kingdom in Texas and the South-tracks that time cannot wear out. I trust that the messages he brings on this great theme will be quietly studied by multitudes of religious leaders, and I am sure the power of his messages will live long in their hearts and effectively in their lives. L. R. SCARBOROUGH. President' s Office, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

Chapter 22

# 04.01. Inspiration...As Believed by Baptists

1. INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES AS BELIEVED BY BAPTISTS

We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions shall be tried." This is the first Article of Faith of a great many Baptist churches in our Southland. The first statement is, "We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired." This brings us at once to the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures. The word inspiration is derived from the Latin word inspiro, which means to breathe on or to breathe into. That is the literal meaning of the word. The theological meaning is to breathe on or to breathe into for the purpose of conveying the Holy Spirit, in order that those inspired may speak or write what God would have spoken or written. That is inspiration. A Scriptural example of this is found in John 20:22 : "And when he said this he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit." That gives us the true conception of inspiration. Following that, John 20:23 gives the result: "Whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." That is, an inspired man can declare exactly the terms of remission of sins, and the terms upon which sins cannot be remitted, because he is speaking for God. The book that a man, so breathed on, writes is called theopneustos, a Greek word meaning "God-inspired." Example:

"From a babe thou hast known the sacred writings, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus. Every scripture is inspired of God…" 2 Timothy 3:15-16.

After God breathed into man the Holy Spirit in order that he should accurately write the things which God wanted written, then the book that he wrote was called theopneustos. So that this second passage is a very important one in discussing inspiration, probably the most important in the whole Bible.

If the book is God-inspired, then it is God's book and not man's book. Another illustration is found in the second chapter of Genesis:

"And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The body was present, but it was dead. It had no vitality. The distinction between a body that is in-breathed and a body that is not in-breathed is the distinction between death and life. Therefore, a man's book is a dead book. I don't care how lofty its thought, how fine its argument, or how perfect its rhetoric, the book will pass away. It has not the principle of eternal life. But books that are God-breathed are called "living oracles" (Acts 7:38). It is impossible for a God-book to die. The oldest book that was ever God-inspired is as much living as the latest one, and it will be unto the end of time a living oracle. But what is an oracle? In Greece there were certain shrines - certain deities-such as the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. There

was a priestess that ministered at that shrine. Men would stand before her and ask a question and the priestess would fall into an ecstasy, and while in that ecstasy her answers were called oracles. Heathen oracles are all dumb, but these God-inspired oracles are living.

They are not only called living oracles, but they are called the oracles of God, as we see from Romans 3:2 :

“What advantage hath the Jew? Much every way, for first of all they were entrusted with the oracles of God.” The advantage is that these Old Testament books were entrusted to them, not as man’s books, but as containing the speeches of God, as well as the works of God.

Now, I will briefly set forth the inspiration of both the Old and the New Testament. 2 Timothy 3:15-16, covers all the Old Testament. Paul says to Timothy: “From a babe thou hast known the sacred writings.” Any other writing is what is called profane writing, not in our modern sense of profanity, but means not divine, but rather human or secular. “Thou hast known the sacred writings, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation. Every scripture is inspired of God,” etc. He first speaks of the books of the Old Testament in groups, to hiera grammata, the sacred writings. Then he speaks of them distributively, pasa graphe. Every one of these sacred writings is God-inspired.

We may stand on that one declaration to affirm the inspiration of every one of the Old Testament books.

Another passage bearing on Old Testament inspiration is 2 Peter 1:20 : “No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.”

Here again is the idea of inspiration. An inspired man, when he speaks, does not speak his will; when he writes, he does not write his will, but he speaks and writes for God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.

Now let us take up the New Testament. In John 14:26 we find that a promise was made, before inspiration was given, that they should be inspired: “But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things,and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.”

Again in John 16:12-13 : “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come he shall guide you into all the truth; for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak; and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come.” That is, Christ in His lifetime did not complete the revealed truth. They were not prepared to receive it all. But He made provision for the revealing of the truth by promising the Holy Spirit who would teach them all that it was necessary for them to know. What Christ said in His lifetime, which they had forgotten, the Holy Spirit enabled them to remember and guided them into the completion of the truth. So, after His resurrection Christ breathed on them and said unto them, “Receive ye the Holy Spirit” (John 20:22). This is inspiration and fulfills His promise to them. This same thought is emphasized in 1 John 2:27 : “The anointing which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you; but as his anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true, and is no lie, even as it taught you, ye

abide in him."

One other passage, a very important one, is 1 Corinthians 2:6-13 : "We speak wisdom, however, among them that are full grown; yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, who are coming to naught: but we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory: which none of the rulers of the world hath known: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory: but as it is written,

Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, And which entered not into the heart of man, Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words."

Here is the promise again clearly stated; that what is to be communicated through this inspiration is something that eye could not see, ear could not hear, nor the heart of man conceive. It is a revelation, and it comes through the Spirit that knoweth the things of God. As your spirit alone can know you (your neighbour does not know you as well as you know yourself), so the Holy Spirit alone knows the will of God, and that Spirit has communicated it to inspired men in man's words. Mark this verbal inspiration: "combining spiritual things with spiritual words."

It has always been a matter of profound surprise to me that anybody should ever question the verbal inspiration of the Bible.

The whole thing had to be written in words. Words are signs of ideas, and if the words are not inspired, then there is no way of getting at anything in connection with inspiration. If I am free to pick up the Bible and read something and say, "That is inspired," then read something else and say, "That is not inspired," and someone else does not agree with me as to which is and which is not inspired, it leaves the whole thing unsettled as to whether any of it is inspired.

What is the object of inspiration? It is to put accurately, in human words, ideas from God. If the words are not inspired, how am I to know how much to reject, and how to find out whether anything is from God? When you hear the silly talk that the Bible "contains" the word of God and is not the word of God, you hear a fool's talk. I don't care if he is a Doctor of Divinity, a President of a University covered with medals from universities of Europe and the United States, it is fool-talk. There can be no inspiration of the book without the inspiration of the words of the book.

Very briefly I have summed up proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament and of the inspiration of the New Testament, and now I will give you some scriptures on both Testaments together. Hebrews 1:1-2 :

"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." In old times there were inspired men; but the culmination or completion is in the Son. That covers both. Hebrews 5:12 also

covers both: “When by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that someone teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God.”

Here the New Testament is called “oracles” as well as the Old Testament. Those were Christian people who had learned the first principles of the oracles of God and stopped. Another passage is 1 Peter 4:11 : “If any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God.” Peter is here talking about the Old and New Testaments. If a man gets up to speak, let him remember that there is a standard, and that that standard is fixed. He must speak according to the oracles of God. These Scriptures cover both.

Now let us consider some observations:

First, the books of the Bible are not by the will of man. Not one of the books of either the Old or the New Testaments would ever have come into being except by the inspiration of God. I want to give you a searching proof on that, found in 1 Peter 1:10-11 : “Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories which should follow them.”

Here are men moved by the Spirit of God to record certain things about the future, and they themselves did not understand it. They studied their own prophecies just as we study them. They knew that God had inspired them to say these things, but they did not understand, e. g., God instructed a prophet to say that the Messiah should come forth out of Bethlehem of Judaea. God inspired each and every item concerning the Messiah. To show that these things did not come from the will of man, the man himself could not explain them. It was a matter of study and investigation to find out what these signified. They found out that their prophecies were meant for the future, that is, for us. The second observation is that the propelling power in the speaking or writing was an impulse from the Holy Spirit. They, the inspired men, became instruments by which the Holy Spirit spoke or wrote. Take, for instance, that declaration in 2 Samuel 23:2, where David said: “The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and his word was upon my tongue.” In Acts 1:16 we find that the utterances of David were being studied. We have a declaration that the Holy Spirit spake by the mouth of David concerning Judas; and in Acts 3:1-26 we have another declaration of the same kind. Always the speaker or writer was an instrument of the Holy Spirit. The third observation is that this influence of the Holy Spirit guided the men in the selection of material, even where that material came from some other book, even an uninspired book, the Spirit guiding in selecting and omitting material. From such declarations as John 20:30-31 and John 21:25, we learn that Christ did many things, that if all were written it would make a book as big as the world; that what has been written was written for a certain purpose. The Holy Spirit inspired Matthew, Mark, Luke and John to select from the deeds and words of Jesus that which God wanted written; not to take everything He said, but only that which was necessary to accomplish the purpose. The fourth observation is that inspiration is absolutely necessary in order to awaken the power of remembrance. John 2:22 says that after His resurrection they remembered what He had said, that is, the Spirit called it to remembrance. To illustrate, take the speeches of Christ, viz.: that address delivered at Capernaum on the Bread of Life, the Sermon on the Mount and, particularly, John 14:1-31, John 15:1-27 and John 16:1-33.

There were no shorthand reporters in those days, and there is not a man on earth who could, after a lapse of fifty years, recall verbatim et literatim what Christ said, and yet John, without a shadow of hesitancy, goes on and gives page after page of what Christ said just after the institution of the Lord's Supper. Inspiration in that case was exercised in awakening the memory so that John could reproduce these great orations of Christ. Of the orations of Paul, take that speech recorded in Acts 13:1-52, an exceedingly remarkable speech, or the one recorded in Acts 26:1-32, or the one on Mars' Hill, in Acts 17:1-34, one of the most finished productions that the world has ever seen.

Inspiration enabled Luke to report exactly what Paul said. Luke never could have done that unassisted. Luke, as a man, might have given the substance, but that is not the substance, it is an elaborate report, the sense depending upon the words used. The fifth observation is that inspiration was to make additions to the Scriptures until they were completed, in order that the standard may be a perfect treasure, incapable of being added to, unsusceptible of diminution; we want what is there, all that is there, and no more than is there; therefore, when we come to the last book of the Bible, this is said which, in a sense, applies to the whole Bible:

"I testify that every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book." - Revelation 22:18-19.

It was the design of inspiration to give us a perfect system of revealed truth, whose words are inspired. As an example of verbal inspiration, take Paul's argument, based on the "seed" in the singular number. Everything in the interpretation depends upon the number of that noun. Apart from verbal inspiration, how on earth would Paul hinge an argument on whether a word is singular or plural? The next observation is that inspiration was to give different views of the same person or thing by different writers, each perfect according to its viewpoint, but incomplete so far as the whole is concerned, all views being necessary in order to complete the view. There is a Gospel by Mark, written for the Romans, beginning with the public ministry of Christ. Then there are the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, and a Gospel by Paul. Each of them is perfect according to the plan which the Spirit put in the mind of the writer. They are perfect so far as the viewpoint of each is concerned, but incomplete so far as the whole thing is concerned. We have to put them side by side in order to get a complete view of the life of our Lord. That is what we mean by harmonical study. Each is infallibly correct, but it takes the blended view of all to make the whole thing.

Apart from inspiration, no man on earth can account for Genesis. Just see in what small space there is given the history of the world up to chapter 11 how much is left out. We see the same plan all through the book. It first takes up the wicked descendants, gives their genealogy a little way, then sidetracks them and takes up the true line. Then of their descendants it follows the wicked first a short way and eliminates them and goes back and takes up the true line and elaborates that. That principle goes all through the Bible. For instance, the first missionary period of Paul's life covered a greater period of time than any other, and there is no record of it, just a single reference to it in Acts. So with his fifth missionary journey. There are only a few references to it in Timothy and Titus. But the intervening three journeys are elaborately given.

Now we come to an important point. When these inspired declarations were written, they were absolutely infallible. Take these Scriptures: John 10:35, “The scripture cannot be broken;” Matthew 5:18, “Till heaven and earth shall pass away, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished;” Acts 1:16, “It was needful that the scripture should be fulfilled.”

That is one of the most important points in connection with inspiration, viz.: that the inspired word is irrefragable, infallible; that all the powers of the world cannot break one “thus saith the Lord.”

Another observation is the power that comes upon the inspired word.

Hebrews 4:12 : “For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.”

Yet another observation is the object of the word. There are two objects. John sets forth the first one when he says that they are written that we might believe, and, believing, have life, or, as Paul says to Timothy, “which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.” They are both expressed in Psalms 19:1-14 :

“The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.” The last observation is on the sufficiency of the word: that the inspired record is complete; that it is all-sufficient. That is presented in two Scriptures, Luke 16:29 : Abraham said to the rich man in hell who wanted a special messenger sent to his brothers: “They have Moses and the prophets, and if they cannot be moved by Moses and the prophets, neither could they be moved even though one from the dead went to them.” The other is 2 Timothy 3:17 : “That the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.”

Let me say further that only the original text of the books of the Bible is inspired, not the copy or the translation.

Second, the inspiration of the Bible does not mean that God said and did all that is said and done in the Bible; some of it the devil did and said. Much of it wicked men did and said. The inspiration means that the record of what is said and done is correct. It does not mean that everything that God did and said is recorded. It does not mean that everything recorded is of equal importance, but every part of it is necessary to the purpose of the record, and no part is unimportant. One part is no more inspired than any other part.

It is perfectly foolish to talk about degrees of inspiration. What Jesus said in the flesh, as we find it in the four Gospels, is no more His word than what the inspired prophet or apostle said. That is the folly of the Jefferson Bible. He proposes to take out of the four Gospels everything that Jesus said and put it together as a Bible.

What Jesus said after He ascended to heaven, through Paul or any other apostle, is just as much Jesus’ word as anything He said in the flesh.

Here are some objections:

First, “only the originals are inspired, and we have only copies.” The answer to that is that God would not inspire a book and take no care of the book. His providence has preserved the Bible in a way that no other book has been preserved. The second objection is, “We are dependent upon scholars to determine what is the real text of the Bible.” The answer is that only an infinitesimal part of it is dependent upon scholars for the ascertainment of the true text, and if every bit of that were blotted out it would not destroy the Holy Scriptures.

# 04.02. Question of Inspiration Re-opened

2. THE QUESTION OF INSPIRATION RE-OPENED BY HIGHER CRITICS

Within the memory of old men now living, the question of the inspiration of the Scriptures, which had been settled eighteen hundred years, has been re-opened and the agitation on the subject has surpassed anything in the history of religion. Its expressions are found in newspaper and magazine articles and tracts, and for the first time in the history of the subject of the inspiration of the Bible, it has reached the common people.

There is not a church in the United States but has members in whose minds the question of inspiration of the Scriptures has been raised. For the first time in the history of the discussion the attack comes from the inside. Heretofore the heathen in their lands and the infidel in Christian countries have been the ones to assail the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures. This time it comes from the pulpit, the religious commentary and the professors in Christian schools. The result has been that distrust upon the subject of the inspiration of the Bible is more widespread just now than it ever has been in the history of the world.

It becomes us to inquire the origin and cause of this reopening of this question in modem times. It has been a radical mistake to attribute this re-opening and agitation to the progress of modem science. I know that this is what they say-that it is caused by the amazing developments of modern science. Not a word of it is true.

It would be impossible for the question of inspiration to come before science, since science has nothing in the world to do with such a question, and cannot have in the nature of the case. Hence science can have nothing to say about the ultimate origin and destiny of things and beings. It cannot sit as a judge or as a jury upon questions of the supernatural. It can only discuss the natural, not the supernatural. There need never be any apprehension that any matter that touches the supernatural shall ever be challenged to stand before the bar of science and be subject to its verdicts.

While science has not re-opened this question, the disturber is speculative philosophy, which is quite a different thing from science, and there is nothing in speculative philosophy to qualify it to pass judgment in such a matter.

We might ask what has speculative philosophy ever achieved in the realm of the supernatural, where are all questions of Deity and ultimate origin and destiny and inspiration and miracles, in order to justify its assumption to be arbiter of this question? Can any man show that speculative philosophy has ever devised a standard acceptable to any two of its advocates by which matters in the realm of the supernatural might assuredly be known, weighed or measured? Has it ever or can it ever, in the nature of the case, go into an unverified and unverifiable hypothesis with reference to supernatural matters? Does not the history of human philosophy show that even in accounting for natural things its most assured conclusions at any one period of the world are like shifting sand-dunes in a desert, changing their form and locality with every contrary wind? What it is today

it was not yesterday, nor will it be tomorrow. And if it be so unstable and valueless in the realm of natural things, how can it call for us to lift up our hats to it in the alien realm of the supernatural? How can the finite assume by natural reason to comprehend the infinite? The case is fairly stated thus, by the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 1:19 :

“It is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning will I bring to naught. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God’s good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.” In other words, human philosophy, in the nature of the case, can never by searching find out God or things that relate to God and the supernatural.

I declare with all emphasis that if all of the literature of human philosophy on supernatural matters from the time of Jannes and Jambres in Egypt, and the time of Epicurus and Zeno in Athens, down to President Eliot of Harvard and Mrs. Eddy, were put together the whole of it would not be worth the twenty-eighth chapter of Job or, as Dr. Gambrell well says, Burns’ little poem, The Cotter’s Saturday Night. And I may add that it is not worth one sermon on religion by the Negro preacher, John Jasper, of Richmond. There is less in it than in anything else that ever befogged the human mind.

There are three facts that bear upon the matter of the reopening of this question of inspiration. The first fact is that before the time of Paul the Grecian philosophers, the Epicureans on the one hand, and the Stoics on the other hand, had attempted to account for the universe and everything in it by a theory of evolution or by fate. That it, on the face of it, left out God and the supernatural, but Paul buried both under his magnificent oration as you will find recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts.

We now come to the second fact. Within the last sixty years Charles Darwin wrote his book, Descent of Man, claiming that man is derived from the lower forms of life, and through his coadjutors, Huxley, Tyndall, Haeckel, Wallace and hundreds of others, this theory of evolution was popularized.

It never was popular before, but they so discussed the subject that it reached the people, and it had this merit: it very modestly and quite consistently claimed the position of agnosticism. In other words, so far as that theory goes, it is impossible to know anything of God, if there be a God. Huxley stated the position when he used the term “agnostic.” My position is that this theory has nothing to do with the supernatural. It commenced below that realm, and so toward all supernatural matters it simply says, “We don’t know.” Now, that agrees exactly with what Paul says in 1 Corinthians 2:10 :

“God has revealed these things to us through the Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God…But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words. Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged.” So we see that on this point Paul and Huxley stand on the same platform.

We come now to consider the third fact: Certain school men, coming from Christian schools, began to apply the principles of the atheistic theory of evolution both to human history and to Biblical history with the aim to eliminate all the supernatural. They fell over themselves in the scramble to do that.

These so-called Christian expositors of the Darwinian theory of evolution are hard to describe. They are neither fish nor fowl, neither pig nor puppy. They are like Mr. Lincoln's ox on the fence, unable to go forward or backward, unable to gore the hounds in front or to kick the ones biting him behind, and so they do nothing but bellow.

I say that these so-called Christian exponents of the heathen theory of evolution have driven millions of Protestants back to Romanism, and tens of thousands of others back to atheism.

They have done more to discount the value of Christian schools than all the other agencies in the world put together. It is a matter of simple fact that a pious country boy is safer on supernatural questions on his religion in the Texas State University than he would be in the great majority of the so-called Christian universities. He is more apt to come back home a sane Christian in his thinking.

These school people who are discussing this subject take themselves too seriously. They are mere doctrinaires, but this much they do accomplish-they create the spirit of irreverence for holy things. A cattleman would understand my characterization of them when I say that they are dry cattle, barren, and unfruitful, and if by chance any of them should give a little milk, it is either blue or too thin to raise cream on, or else it is made bitter by the poisonous weeds that they have eaten, and so unpalatable.

I repeat that the danger from this application of the heathen theory of evolution to the Bible and to Biblical criticism, brings about a new generation of practical men who say, "If there is no such thing as inspiration of the Bible, then we will disregard it.: If there be no such thing as God, if the supernatural is eliminated!, then we will live as we please." This is not the schoolman; it is the literary descendants the schoolmen rear. They say, "We will kill, we will apply the torch of conflagration."

Whenever you sow a nation down with the heathen theory as applied to the Bible, you may look for a crop of anarchy - of armed men striking at everything, repeating just what was done in France in the days of the French Revolution. When this trouble comes; when the practical men put into application what the schoolmen teach, the schoolmen will stand off and say, "We did not mean that; we didn't mean to be devilish like that."

They did not. They were simply trying to exploit themselves, but this crop came from the evolution-seed they sowed. In Æsop's fable about the trumpeter, you remember the trumpeter was captured, and he asked to be spared; he said he had not fought and killed men.

"No," said the other, "but you blew the trumpet and called the men who were armed and who did kill."

I say that a breath of this modern theory is as cold as the last gasp of a dying man, and that what they teach is more fatal to the human race than any fire that fanaticism ever kindled, or any superstition that ever darkened the land.

I will say further, which you will find as you read, that they are in their own esteem wiser than seven men that can render a reason. They believe that wisdom will die with them. They are the most conceited and most gullible and possess the least judicial mind of any set of egotists that ever kicked up a row in this world.

Now, that is what has re-opened this question of inspiration. That is where it came from, and wherever one of them enters a school as a teacher, I don't care who he may be nor what his qualities in other directions, as sure as rain will bring up Johnson grass, he will raise a crop of religious doubters in the school where he teaches.

Now we will take up the question of inspiration, since it has been raised in that way, and in order to get the matter before the reader I will cite the passage upon which I will comment. I will say some things which I have said before, but as this is to be a complete discussion I want every point brought out clearly. The passage is 2 Timothy 3:14-16 : "But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

I take up first the term, "scriptures." Scriptures may mean any writing, but when we say Holy Scriptures that qualifies the word, discriminating between the sacred Scriptures and all other kinds of scriptures, and when we say, "inspired," that indicates the means by which these Scriptures became holy writings. The inspired writings of God necessarily are holy.

I take up next the word, "Bible." The word, "Bible," is derived from the Greek neuter plural, to Biblia, which means the books-a collection of books. And so when we say, "Holy Bible," we mean the Holy Library.

Now, what books belong to this collection? Everybody knows that they are the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament and the twenty-seven books of the New Testament sixty-six in all and in the Philadelphia Confession of Faith every one of these books is mentioned by name, and in the New Hampshire Confession of Faith is this expression, given in the first chapter of this volume and which I here quote again:

"We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions shall be tried." No man can obtain a position on the teaching force of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary that does not write his name under that article. All the Baptist churches, or nearly all of them in the South, adopt that New Hampshire Confession; our Associations and the Baptist General Convention of Texas do this. That is where we stand on the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures. And I state as a fact that you cannot find in Texas any reputable presbytery that would lay the hands of ordination on any candidate for the ministry that holds loose views on the subject of the inspiration of the Bible.

Now notice again the words of that Scripture that I cite: The Greek, ta hiera grammata, “The Holy Scriptures,” spoken of collectively; then it is spoken of distributively, Pasa graphe. Every one of these Scriptures is God-inspired. It is impossible for language to be plainer.

Now notice the object of having inspired Scriptures: That there may be a perfect standard, not an imperfect one-a perfect standard of what man is to be, of what he is to do, of what he is to think, of how he is to live in religious matters; not only a perfect standard which prescribes being, thinking, doing and living, but a standard so perfect that it will convict a man of any departure from that standard, when he has heard it; not only the standard so perfect as to convict, but the standard so perfect as to correct any departure in being, thinking, doing or living. In the religious realm there are three respects in which the object of inspiration is to furnish the standard.

Now let us notice the next point. It is to make, not only a perfect standard, but a perfect man; that the man of God may be perfect. Not perfect in the sense of sinlessness, but in conduct-well-rounded, symmetrical conduct. John L.

Sullivan, I might say, was a perfect man physically, or Voltaire a perfect man mentally, or that George Washington and Robert E. Lee were perfect men all round - physically, intellectually, spiritually, and complete, sound, symmetrical. The third thing that it is to produce is, not only a perfect standard and a complete man, but a complete equipment for the service of that perfect man. This Scripture says that the man of God should be perfect, completely equipped, as a performer of every good deed. Now, this is why the book is inspired; this is the object of it. Who is there living that will say Shakespeare is inspired as the Bible is inspired? Could you, from reading Shakespeare, obtain a perfect standard of what a man should think and be and do a standard that would convict a man of every departure from right being, thinking, doing and living a standard that would correct every departure from right being, thinking or doing a standard that would train every one in right being, right doing, and right thinking in a religious sense?

We hear it upon the lips of some people, “Yes, I believe in inspiration; I believe that every writer is inspired.”

Well, that is not the kind of inspiration we are talking about.

Thus brings up the next word. We have discussed “Scriptures,” and “Holy Scriptures,” and every one of these, Pasa graphe. Now I am going to take up the word, “inspiration.” Our English words “inspire” and “inspiration” are derived from the compound Latin words, inspirare and inspiratio. Literally, those words mean “to breathe on or into” and “a breathing on or into.” This is the literal meaning of these words.

Now, what is the Scriptural meaning of these words? We get the Scriptural meaning of the word where God the Father or the Son does the breathing on or into. That is Scriptural inspiration. I have already given a definition of inspiration; now I give a more extended definition:

Inspiration is that communication of supernatural power from God which invariably and adequately and even perfectly accomplishes the end designed by it, whatever that end may be, and which (and this is an important part of the definition) no inherent force that is resident in nature, and no development of, or combination of inherent forces would in any length of time or under any environment bring about.

I want you to get that definition written in letters of fire upon the tablet of your memory: that inspiration, in its Scriptural meaning, is that communication from God of a supernatural power invariably and adequately and perfectly accomplishing the end desired, whatever that end may be. It may be this or it may be that; it is such a supernatural power that no inherent force resident in nature, no development of an inherent force, no combination of inherent forces could, through any length of time bring it about. I will stand or fall on that definition.

I repeat that whatever the need may be and that means that the needs of inspiration may be various, as I will prove to you before the discussion is concluded that whatever the need is, inspiration accomplishes that need every time, everywhere, without any instance of failure.

Now we have come to the cream of the matter. We will get at this word by a method that no other man that I know of has ever done. I am going to give some matters that you will not find in any book.

I once delivered twelve lectures on this subject, and I ordered every book I could find on the inspiration of the Scriptures. I have two shelves full of these books at my house, and about six of them are some account; the rest of them are straw. I will take up the examples of inspiration in the next chapter.

# 04.03. Examples of Inspiration Explained

3. EXAMPLES OF INSPIRATION EXPLAINED

We will now take up the examples of inspiration. The best way to test anything is by the usage of the word. The first case of inspiration is in Genesis 2:7 : “And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into [that is our word inspire] his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.”

What is inspiration? The breathing on or into. What is inspiration in the Scriptural sense? God breathing on or into.

Now let us see what was the object of this inspiration. Here the inspiration of the Almighty not only imparts mere life to the inert body, but communicates an immortal soul, making the man dual in nature, body and soul, and thereby differentiating him from the animals that perish by a chasm infinite and impassable. The speculative philosophy which I discussed in the previous chapter attributes man to an evolution from lower forms of life, not mere monkeys, but even back to jelly-fish. It attributes man to an evolution from the lower forms of life. It is an unverified hypothesis, even according to its own advocates. There isn’t a case in the world where history could say. “Here is a monkey that has changed to a man.” Now, it does look like, as old as this world is, that somebody would have seen a case. Hence it is a theory, an hypothesis, and in the nature of the case it is an unverifiable hypothesis.

Now, to call such a case science is intellectual dishonesty. Science is something you know something that is demonstrated. It is science to put up a great building; it is science that makes the enormous bridges that span the mightiest rivers; it is science that makes iron ships that float, the airships that fly; this is science. We see this demonstration, but to call such a philosophy as this, science, is simply to tell a bald lie.

Now, what is the only evolution that is proven, demonstrated, that can become science? I will quote it for you; it is just what this Book says; everybody will admit that kind of evolution. Genesis 1:11-12 : “And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so.”

Notice also . Genesis 1:24 : “And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creatures after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so.”

Now, what can you develop, what can you evolve? You can only evolve what is previously involved. Take the acorn, and you have the true story of evolution. It is what is brought out of that acorn. I plant it, and it pushes up through the ground, a little leaf, then a bush, then a tree, and then the tree bears acorns. That is evolution. From the germ of that acorn has been evolved the acorn-bearing tree. But I venture that if you plant a persimmon seed you cannot from it evolve an orange. Hence the Bible says, “Do men gather figs from thistles?” Each thing after its kind; that is the true doctrine of evolution. It is the only doctrine that is provable. We may put monkeys on a

lonely island for ten thousand years, and they will never evolve a man; no lapse of time and no environment will bring it about.

I said that the inspiration of the Almighty, the breathing of God into the nostrils of the body imparted an immortal spirit, making man dual: hence we find in Ecclesiastes 12:6-7 : “Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern.

Then the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit, hall return to God who gave it.”

Now. that is the first example of inspiration, where God breathed into the nostrils of Adam’s body the breath of life and he became a living soul. To inspire means to breathe on or into. The first case of inspiration in the Bible, then, as we have just learned, was not merely giving life to a dead body, but the imparting of an immortal soul.

Now we take up the second case, which is in Exodus 31:1 : “And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, See, I have called by name Bezalel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah: and I have filled him. with the Spirit of God. in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship.”

Here is a case of inspiration, not as in the first case, in order to impart an immortal soul, but a workman is inspired, filled with the wisdom of inspiration so that in constructing the tabernacle, whether it was a piece of wood that was to be finished, or a brace secured, or a precious jewel to be cut and set-whatever it was, the artificer, through the inspiration of God. was enabled to do the work exactly right. Not approximately right, but precisely right.

Now bear this in mind while I quote the third case, as recorded in 1 Chronicles 28:19. David is here talking about the plan of the Temple. “All this,” said David, “have I been made to understand in writing from the hand of Jehovah, even all the works of this pattern.”

Now notice that the inspiration in the case of Bezalel was to enable the artificer to exactly fashion each constituent element that went into the tabernacle. In this particular case David received a plan for the Temple in writing from Jehovah.

Every building of any size and beauty is designed by some architect, as Sir Christopher Wren designed Westminster Abbey; as the architect designed the Seminary building; but in this case God’s inspiration brought about a document that showed the exact plan of the building that the architect was to erect.

Another Scripture shows the result that this inspiration brought about, viz.: 1 Kings 6:7 : “And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready at the quarry; and there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building.”

Such a thing never occurred before in the history of the world. To be sure, the sound of the hammer and the saw were heard while the building of our Seminary was going on.

Now let us go back to our definition of inspiration: It is a communication of supernatural power by the Holy Spirit so that the end may be accomplished (whatever that end may be), completely and perfectly accomplished, and so accomplished that no force resident in nature or combination of

forces in any lapse of time or under any environment could have brought about that result, and so that no human gift of mere genius could have brought it about. There never was an earthly architect that devised so perfect a plan or so executed it that it could be put together without the sound of a hammer or saw: and so perfectly finished a building. As in the case of the plan given, the result intended by the inspiration was perfectly secured-secured in a supernatural manner.

Now we come to the fourth case, and I cite only two verses - Ezekiel 37:9-10. The case is this: God leads the prophet to look out into a valley full of dry bones, very many and very dry, and God asked the prophet, “Can these dry bones live?” And the prophet said, “Thou knowest, not any way that I know, but thou knowest.” And God said to the prophet, in the language that I here cite: “Then be said to me, Prophesy unto the wind: prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord God; come from the four winds. O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live.”

Then follows a description, that as the Spirit breathed on the bones, sinews came on them, and then flesh and cuticle, and then life, and they stood up, a great army. Then God interpreted that vision. The prophet tells what it means.

It means that this valley of the dry bones represents the dispersed Jews, and spiritually they are dry bones, and this breathing on them represents their conversion. So this case is unlike any one that we have yet considered, and yet it is a plain case of inspiration that by the Spirit of the Almighty breathing on the spiritually dead soul it is regenerated.

Now consider a moment. No human power could bring about such a result. All the forces of nature resident and potential under any environment or combination can never regenerate a sinner, but the Spirit of the Almighty breathing on a sinner can regenerate him.. That was the puzzle in the mind of Nicodemus, as presented in John 3:1-36. He could not understand. Then Jesus explained that you hear the sound of the wind; you do not see it, and you cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, and so it is of every one that is born of the Spirit. Now, nobody has ever seen such a thing as that, because it refers to the conversion of the Jews, in one day, as described by Isaiah and discussed by Paul, and that will take place when the fulness of the Gentiles has come. You will see the accumulated force of this argument as we go on with this discussion. The kind of inspiration we are talking about is the inspiration of the Scriptures; that whatever may be the various ends He has in view by inspiration (and they are various), in every case the inspiration is supernatural, superhuman power, and the result of it is perfect and absolutely certain, whether it is giving a soul to Adam or skill to Bezalel, or the written plan of the Temple to David, to the building of the Temple or to the brooding of the Omniscient Spirit over the dispersed world in one day, bringing all Israel to the knowledge of God.

We now take up the fifth case. When God communicated a soul to Adam, that was the first case of inspiration. That soul was upright, in the image of God, perfect, according to Paul in Colossians and Ephesians, in righteousness, knowledge and true holiness. That is the way it started. As a proof of that, he, without being taught by any one, named the animals that passed before him. In Ephesians 4:13-24, we have the new man of righteousness and true holiness. Christ’s image is formed in him, the hope of glory.

So, then, this case of inspiration is the counterpart of the old man of the first case of inspiration. It is the imparting of a soul imbued with righteousness and true holiness.

Now, approaching nearer to our subject, we come to the sixth case of inspiration. I quote this case from John 20:21 :

“Jesus said unto them [this is after His resurrection and spoken to His apostles], Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, be breathed on them [there is our word, inspiration; He inspired them], and said, Receive ye the Holy Spirit.”

Now, as a result of that, “Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” This is an inspiration that brings joy. You shall do just as I did when the Father sent me; you shall authorize, declare the terms of the remission of sin. There will be no doubt about it.” When the inspired apostle told a man what was necessary for the remission of sins, it was the same as if God had told him.

Now, this is a case of New Testament inspiration. God so inspired them that they became mouthpieces for Him, so that He spoke through them, and this kind of inspiration was the inspiration of all the prophets of the Old Testament, as I now want to prove to you from Exodus 4:12. This is illustrating bow the inspiration that Christ gave to His apostles, God is giving to inspire Moses: “Now therefore, go, and I will be with thy mouth and teach thee what thou shalt say.”

Later we will have something more to say about verbal inspiration. God certainly gave Moses verbal inspiration: “I will be with thy mouth [that is the speaking part of Moses], and I will teach thee what thou shalt speak.” To illustrate by some other Old Testament examples, I will take 2 Samuel 23:1, all under this same head. We come to the inspiration of David:

“These are the last words of David.

David the son of Jesse saith, And the man who was raised up on high saith, The anointed of the God of Jacob, And the sweet singer of Israel:

‘The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, And His word was upon my tongue.’”

Notice the bearing of that on verbal inspiration. In Mark 12:1-44, our Lord, referring to this case of David, says, “The Holy Spirit spake by the mouth of David, saying,” etc.

Before leaving this point, and by way of illustration, take another Scripture as touching the general subject of inspiration. Commence at the first of the letter to the Hebrews:

“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 by his Son.”

Or, as Peter expresses it:

“Men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” The case we are speaking of is Christ’s breathing on His apostles, which breathing is the inspiration, and that is similar in kind to the inspiration of every Old Testament prophet, or other Old Testament writer. Whether he wrote history, or poetry, or allegory, or proverbs, or foretold future events, the record is the result of the inspiration of the speakers or writers.

You will find in some of these cases of Old Testament inspiration where the devil speaks. A man once said to me, “Do you think the devil’s speech is inspired?”

“No, but the prophet’s words are inspired.”

“Do you think that the sayings of wicked people, which they spoke to God’s people, were inspired?”

“No, but the record that God says that they said those things is inspired.”

Now we come to the main passage that most nearly touches our case. The most relevant of all these is that passage, 2 Timothy 3:15-17, which I discussed in the dosing of the last chapter, leading up to my definition of inspiration. Let us see what we have found in it and see bow it illustrates my definition. This makes the seventh case of inspiration. I selected seven, in order to give all the different kinds of inspiration, where the ends are different. One might be inspired to speak and not inspired to write.

Now, this is an unanswerable passage, and I never knew a man that could stand before it. I give you my translation or paraphrase: “From a babe thou hast known the sacred writings.” We have shown that writings or scriptures mean any kind of writings, but sacred or Holy Scriptures means writings that are superhuman: that the whole selection is spoken of as to hiera grammata, the Holy Bible; that to grammata is collectively speaking, and pasa graphe is distributively speaking. All these words in these writings are God-inspired, God-breathed on. This is a clean-cut definition that covers every book in the Old Testament, and they had the Old Testament just exactly as we have it now. No man denies that the canon of the Old Testament was as we have it now. The whole collection is holy, and every book of the collection is God-inspired, whether it be Job or Ruth or Chronicles or the Songs of Solomon or Exodus every one of them is God-inspired.

I also called attention to the object of this inspiration. The design of it is set forth here. I will paraphrase and state that design: “Every one of them is God-inspired and is also profitable for teaching what a man should be and believe and do and think, righteously.”

It is to be a perfect standard of instruction. Then it says. “for conviction,” that is, it is to be a perfect standard by which any aberration in the matter of right being, right thinking or right doing religiously may be made manifest to the one committing the error.

Then he says that it is profitable for correction that when a defection has been pointed out through this standard, when the light is held by the side of the standard, and the word or thought or deed or the defect has been demonstrated, then this standard is inspired so as to correct that defection.

Then it goes on further to show that the standard is for instruction which is in righteousness, or training which is in righteousness, from being such as I am, thinking such as I do, saying what I say, and doing what I do to a perfect or mature man in Christ. And I want to know if there is any sure, absolute, correct standard that shall teach me what is right being right, doing right, talking right, living righteously. These Scriptures are theopneustos (inspired of God), that such a standard may be a perfect standard-that the man of God may be perfect. The object of applying the standard of perfection to the man is to make him perfect that he may be perfectly equipped, with a perfect standard as a perfect man-equipment to do any good work.

Now, let us go back to the definition of inspiration. When God does the in-breathing it communicates supernatural spiritual power that -in every case secures, with absolute certainty and infallibility, the result aimed at, without any error and in such a way that no mere genius like

Shakespeare, Poe, Shelley, Ovid, Homer or Virgil could have attained.

# 04.04. Luke's Case and Other Important

4. LUKE'S CASE, AND OTHER IMPORTANT RELATIVE MATTERS In this chapter I call your attention to a case where the word "inspiration," you may say, does not occur, but I take that particular case because it is raised as an objection. A distinguished lawyer once heard me preach on inspiration, and he came to me with this case:

"I want to know how this squares with what I heard you preach," he said. Luke 1:1-4 says, 'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed.'

Now," he went on, "evidently. from the face of that Luke gathered his information just like any other historian-no evident inspiration about it: that he traced out everything from the first."

"Didn't those other writers that Luke tells about try to do the same thing? I answered.

"Then why was it necessary for Luke to write an account? Those other writers didn't make things certain: Luke makes them certain. He says, 'I am going to write you an account that you may know the things- are certain.' If he were writing to give a mere history to the world, it would not make things certain. What has become of all the memoirs or histories of Christ? Luke says that a number wrote them. Why have these accounts survived-Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul?"

"Well," replied my interrogator, "I think you are putting too much emphasis on that."

I handed him a Greek concordance (I knew he was a Greek scholar) and a Greek Testament.

"What is the Greek word for 'from the first?"' I asked him.

"' Anothen, '" he answered.

"Now," I said, "look through the Greek concordance and tell me what that word means."

"Well," he replied, "in many cases in the Bible it means 'from above.' 'A man must be born,' says Christ ' anothen' - born from above."

"Very good," I added. "Now let me read the Greek to you and translate it in this passage of Luke: 'Having been instructed in all things accurately - anothen - from above.' Why not translate anothen that way here, since you do translate it that way in other cases in the New Testament? A good many scholars deny that anothen should be translated 'from above,"' I went on. "I have studied what they say, and it seems to me they make out a poor case of it." My friend replied that he did not know that that word was there. Now note the object was that Luke was to write to produce absolute certainty. He had heard a good many things on this problem. Luke says, "Having been instructed in all things from above, I will write you so you may know the certainty of the things that

are believed among us." This staggered my lawyer.

"Anyway, whether you accept that position or not," I said, "you see the need; that when one goes to write a history of Christ he must write about Christ's boyhood; that, Luke knew nothing about. He learned this from God. who told Mosses many things and who told Paul about the Lord's Supper. Paul says,

'Jesus told me Himself.' There is no record of Mary telling Luke, as some believe. How did Luke find out just exactly what Elisabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, said when 'Mary visited her? How did he find out just exactly what

'Mary said when she sang the Magnificat? 'Now,' says Luke, 'if you would know the certainty of these things you must know them from above.'"

"I will give you an uninspired account of Christ's boyhood," I continued. "the work that was palmed off on the world by the Roman Catholics, and I will ask you if it gives you strength. Now, will you please read that and see what a silly and indecent thing it is? Notice the way it deals with delicate subjects. Notice the bald immodesty in this uninspired account. Notice the silliness, and then go down on your knees and ask God to help you never to doubt that the Scriptures are inspired. John said that he didn't write everything that Jesus said and did; that he just wrote enough to superinduce faith, that you might believe.

Now. I was taught that the best way to reach a safe conclusion is to get a large induction of facts and then let a man try them. Therefore, I have selected several kinds of inspiration where the end was different, and no matter what the end was, the end was certainly accomplished."

Then I asked this lawyer to turn to the account in the book of Numbers which tells of Balaam, who didn't want to say what he said, but he had to speak what the Lord put in his mouth. He didn't want to bless Israel, but God made him say what he didn't want to say.

"I will take a more remarkable case than that," I continued. "Turn to that passage in the New Testament where it is said that the prophets received a communication from the Holy Spirit that they themselves did not understand and that they earnestly inquired the meaning of it, but they wrote it down just like God gave it to them, and they studied their own prophecies just like you study them. That was not human comprehension. Oftentimes the prophets did not know the meaning of what they wrote down. Do you suppose that Isaiah comprehended everything that he wrote about the salvation of the Gentiles?

They prophesied about the coming of Christ, and they were very anxious about the time when Christ should come and wanted to get a time definitely fixed."

Now, the next most important question is, what is not inspired? Well, first of all, a version is not inspired. A version is a translation. We have the American Standard Version or translation, the King James Version and the Septuagint Version in Greek. We have the Old Testament in Latin, called the Vulgate, and hundreds of other versions. Into practically every tongue that has been spoken on earth this Book has been translated.

Versions, or translations, are not inspired; if they were, all of them would be just alike; but the original manuscript was inspired.

What else is not inspired? Why, the division into chapters and verses. The Pentateuch comes in just one book. There are different divisions in it, but it was just one book. That is why “and,” “and” goes on through it, connecting the books as we now have them. We know just exactly when it was divided into chapters, and who did it. That is not inspired.

I will even go beyond that, and say that the copies of the manuscripts were not inspired, and will go further than that, and say that we have no original manuscript. We take the three oldest manuscripts the Vatican, the Sinaitic and the Alexandrian. These are the three nearest to the original copy. There are hundreds and hundreds of manuscripts.

Well, suppose a man bad written on parchment, and after a while some other man comes along, and be wants some paper and he hasn’t any, and he writes on the vellum that is, one thing on top of another; now you have to put a microscope on it to see the first writing.

It would be interesting here to give the story of the manuscripts; also a story of the text and canon, but I must confine my discussion to the subject of inspiration.

I come, now, to ask a question. Some have gone the Sunset Route from San Antonio to El Paso, and will remember the Pecos Viaduct, where they crossed on that steel bridge and it made them dizzy to look down into that canyon, far, far, below. A young man was the architect of that bridge quite a young fellow. If he had made a mistake as to the kind of steel, or in one-eighth of an inch of a certain piece of material, or the wires had been at fault; if he had not exercised infinite precaution in the knowledge of material and the greatest knowledge in putting things together, then the great trainload of people would have been precipitated into that river.

What, then, do you think is necessary to make the bridge that will span the chasm between earth and heaven? Is there any mere human wisdom that could do it? We don’t want a probable standard nor one of such uncertainty, but we want something that is absolutely infallible and irrevocable, and the Bible is called holy because it is that infallible, theopneustos, product of the Holy Spirit. The Bible is the Word of God.

All the Bible is the Word of God. A great many people say, “I think the Word of God is in the Bible, but I don’t believe that all of the Bible is the Word of God; it contains the Word of God, but it is not the Word of God.” My objection to this is that it would require inspiration to tell the spots in it that were inspired. It would call for an inspiration more difficult than the kind that I talk about, in order to turn the pages of the Bible and find out which part is the Word of God.”

“Oh,” says one man, “I can pick them out.” But can you satisfy Mr. B.? He can pick them out, too, but he doesn’t agree with you. So, whatever you do when you preach, don’t preach a spotted inspiration, or you will have to find an inspired man to find the spots. In other words, with reference to the Scriptures, inspiration is plenary, which means full and complete, hence my question is, “Do you believe in the plenary inspiration of the Bible? “If the inspiration is complete, it must be plenary. My next question is this: “Do you believe in plenary verbal inspiration?”

I do, for the simple reason that the words are mere signs of ideas, and I don’t know how to get at the idea except through the words. If the words don’t tell me, how shall I know? Sometimes the word is a very small one, maybe only one letter or a mere element. The word with one letter-the smallest letter-shows the inspiration of the Old Testament. The man that put that there was

inspired.

Take the words of Jesus. He says, “Not one jot or tittle of that law shall ever fail.” The “jot” is the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet and the “tittle” is a small turn or projection of a Hebrew letter. He says the heavens may fall, but not one jot or tittle of that law shall fail. Then He says that the Scriptures cannot be broken.

What is it that cannot be broken? Whatever is written cannot be broken if it is theopneustos. But the word is not inspired if it is not theopneustos, which means God-breathed, or God-inspired.

Let us take that case that Paul spoke of in the letter to the Galatians, where it is the number of the word, whether singular or plural, that determines the argument. Paul speaks confidently and says:

“Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.” - Galatians 3:16.

If the words are not inspired, what business had Paul making an argument on one of the words as singular and the other plural?

Take this fact: Commence at the first verse in Genesis, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” The second verse drops from the universe matter to this earth. Just in one sentence it drops to one particular part of the universe; then it goes right on dropping from the general to the particular until it gets to Christ. It drops every one of the nations down to one nation-Israel-and from the ten tribes that were dispersed to one tribe-that of Judah-and from all the families of Judah to that family that had David as its ancestor, then on to Christ. That is characteristic of the Old Testament. It goes the other way when we get to Christ, from the particular to the general. Where do you find that in any other book? Suppose a man finds some bones while having an excavation made for the foundation of a house, and another party finds other bones, and so on until one hundred have been found, and you put these bones together, and they make a perfect skeleton of joint and bone of a perfect animal; they make a correct skeleton of an animal, but the bones must all be there. What does this prove by the fitting of every bone and joint, of each part to the other? This perfect articulation of the parts proves that these bones were all the bones of one animal. Did that happen of itself? There must have been somebody back of all these bones who had the design in the making of that animal. That would necessarily mean the fitting or corresponding of all these parts. The Bible is just like that.

There never was a skeleton so well fitted as the books of the Bible.

There was once a little Irish boy who said to me, “Mister, I have something to show you,” and he showed me nine speckled puppies and said, “Mister, would you believe it? I can’t spare a one.” That is the way I am about the Bible. I could not spare one of these books of the Bible. If you take out one of the collection, the Bible isn’t complete. Each part fits into the other part and is a demonstration of the design and the structure of the whole sacred library.

Now, take Sir Walter Scott. I read twenty-seven of his books in twenty-five days. He is a wizard writer - a writer most marvellous - but his books do not fit into each other that way. Take James Fenimore Cooper’s novels. His sea tales don’t fit his “Leather-Stocking” tales, nor do his land stories fit his “Leather-Stocking” stories. What is the matter? It is just like a train. A lot of coaches put together must have a head, and so there is the great engine, and when that engine moves that

coupling-pin holds these coaches together and the train acts as a unit. The Bible is as much a unit as that train.

Now I am going to give you the most hyperbolical illustration that you ever read. Spread out a map of America and take the great Mississippi River System. Taking our position at its head and looking toward its mouth, we see the rivers that come in on the left, viz.: the Chippewa, the Wisconsin, the Illinois and the Ohio, with all their branches; then on the right, the Minnesota, the Des Moines, the Missouri, the Arkansas and the Red, with all their branches. Now imagine all these tributaries coming into this great river, from the right and from the left, and that water going down until all these tributaries flow into the Gulf of Mexico. That exactly illustrates the Bible.

Take the case of Charles Haddon Spurgeon. He believed in that Book from cover to cover. He believed that every part of that Book was profitable, and he preached four thousand sermons covering every book in the Bible. You can take one set of those sermons and put them together, and you have a complete commentary on the Bible. He believed it all. He preached sometimes from Job, sometimes from Esther. From anywhere in that Word of God, he would take a text and preach from it, and what was the result?

Never since the days of Paul were so many people converted. What else followed? Homes for old widows, orphanages, colportage, missions went out from that one man's preaching, and all over the wide world those sermons went. A boy had one of the sermons in his hand when they found him, dead. A man was found frozen in the Alps with one of his sermons in his hand. A poor convict had his hand resting upon some precious treasure, and he was shot, and a bullet pierced his hand, and the treasure was one of Spurgeon's sermons. Who ever heard of any one carrying anything of the higher critics around, anything that they have said on inspiration? I tell you the difference: Their criticisms are like jelly-fish-they have no weight, they have no backbone-no legs to stand on-just jelly-fish.

Then imagine one of Spurgeon's sermons drifting out on the sea and a man picking it up, and when he reads it his soul is convicted. A Hindu was going, on his hands and knees, to the Ganges, to be purified of his sins, and the poor fellow never got there. They found him dead, and his face was illumined, and in his hand was a passage translated from John's Gospel.

What wind brought that leaf to him with that saving message which delivered his soul from bondage and, while gasping in death, caused him to find that Jesus Christ is the light of the world, the hope of the world, and the Saviour from sin?

Now, if we have not a standard, why say A is right and B wrong? If A is right and B wrong, there must be some law that prescribes the right and proscribes the wrong. If you don't believe anything, don't preach anything. God's man would say, "Because I believe, I have spoken."

Recently, with three hundred people turned away because they could not get into the house, I spoke on the salvation of men. All the Christians of the city had come together, and sinners crowded in. I outlined the sermon, and as I presented it in the words of God, if I ever saw rapt faces it was that crowd that night. The mayor of the city called on me on the following morning. "Thank God that you came here," he said. "I never heard such a sermon. These people will never get away from it, but if you had come here with criticisms, the people would have scorned you."

# 04.05. Qualifying Facts...

5. QUALIFYING FACTS ENABLING US TO LIMIT INSPIRATION AND STATE ITS MEANING AN orderly discussion of the subject of inspiration would be to follow this method: First, the text of the Scriptures; second, the canon of the Scriptures; third, the historical setting; fourth, inspiration. This method has been adopted in my class in Baylor University and the Seminary, but in the present discussion I am treating inspiration only, and take for granted everything back of inspiration. In the preceding chapters we have discussed the inspiration of the New Testament and Old Testament Scriptures, the inspiration of the authors of the various books of the Bible, certain promises in the New Testament, then the fulfilment of those promises, but did not have space to discuss another important item, viz.: certain modifying facts and circumstances which help us to define and to limit inspiration.

There are certain terms in the Bible to which we need at this juncture to make reference.

One is regeneration, that work of the Holy Spirit which makes a sinner a Christian.

Another is sanctification, that work of the Holy Spirit which perfects holiness in the Christian.

Still another is revelation, which has for its author Jesus Christ only. He does the revealing, and it is an unveiling or disclosure of any matter which God wishes to make known to man. And illumination is that influence of the Holy Spirit such as you and I may have obtained by prayer, so as to help us understand the revelation.

Now, inspiration is a different thing. Christ reveals, but the Holy Spirit inspires, so inspiration is that influence of the Spirit (here I carry forward the definition given before) which qualifies its subject to receive a revelation, or to speak or write what God wills, so as to secure the infallible accuracy of the inspired declaration or record. This is a condensed definition of the one which I gave in former chapters.

Now, as bearing upon the definition of the terms “Regeneration,”

“Sanctification,” “Revelation,” and “Inspiration,” I wish to bring out some modifying facts in connection with the inspiration of the New Testament writers. The first Scripture I cite is John 11:50-52 : “Nor do ye consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not (and this spake he not of himself, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for the nation only, but that also he should gather together into one the children of God that were scattered abroad),” declaring in effect: “If we let him thus alone, the Romans will come and take away our nation.”

Now, here is a case of inspiration that will help to distinguish between the terms to which attention has been called.

Caiaphas was a bad man. He was not regenerated, he was not sanctified, but there was an influence of the Spirit resting upon him that caused him to say just what he said, and yet he did not

mean it that way at all.

He had an entirely different meaning in his mind. He meant that, as a matter of political expediency, it was better, whether Christ was righteous or unrighteous, guilty or not guilty-it was better for that man to be put to death than that the Romans should come and take away their nation. That was all it was to him. He was the unconscious subject of the inspiration of God; so if anybody objects to Peter's exhibiting faults after he was inspired, it may be replied that the object of inspiration was not to regenerate or sanctify. Here was a man (Caiaphas) who had never possessed that at all.

I take a second case illustrating the same thing. It was customary, when men were crucified, to write the indictment or accusation over the head of the man who was publicly put to death, and so Pilate wrote in three languages

Greek, Latin and Hebrew the accusation, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," or, as abbreviated by one of the writers, "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews," or, as abbreviated by another, "This is the King of the Jews," or, as still more abbreviated by a fourth, "The King of the Jews."

Now, he wrote that in three languages, and the Jews came to him and said:

"Write not that He is King, but that He said He was King." Pilate said, "What I have written, I have written."

Now, the circumstances show that, without Pilate's meaning to, without his having a consciousness at all that there was an influence of the Spirit of God guiding him to write that sentence-writing it in the three languages of the world-it went abroad to the whole human race.

Many a man, without knowing it, has been moved to do things by the Spirit of God. Judas was an inspired man, and is in hell today. Saul, the King of Israel, was inspired at one time in his life. So we must not confound inspiration with either regeneration, or sanctification, or revelation.

Now we come to the second point. Turn to the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. I want you to see the particular working of the Holy Spirit that I am going to introduce now. Not only inspiration, but many other powers of the Spirit came upon the disciples. We have this account:

"And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language. And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galilaeans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?"

Now compare that with 1 Corinthians 14:27-28, and you have a phenomenon: "If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church: and let him speak to himself and to God."

Now here was an inspiration that came upon those men that enabled them to speak the words of God in a language that they did not know themselves.

Some, it seems, had the gift of interpretation.

I want you to see the bearing of this upon verbal inspiration. If a man himself thoroughly understood the tongue that he was going to speak in if he knew what the words meant one might claim for him the inspiration of ideas, but not of words. But these men did not know, certainly not in the case of 1 Corinthians 14:27-28.

Let us now suppose a case. It is the day of Pentecost, and one of the inspired people is standing up to speak to the people of other nations, and to speak it in their language, although he does not know the language himself. In answer to the question from some Greek in the audience:

“How must I pray?” he answers in Greek, ho Theos, hilastheti moi to hamartolo (God be merciful to me, the sinner). But, as a proof that it was verbal inspiration, he did not know what it meant.

Or, suppose it was a Roman, and he replies to that question in Latin, Deus, propitius esto mihi peccatori (God be merciful to me, the sinner).

Or, suppose a question in the first instance was in Greek, “What must I do to be saved?” and he answers in Greek, Pisteuson epi ton Kurion Iesoun Christon kai sotheese su (Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved), or to the Roman in the Latin, Crede in Dominum Iesum Christum et salvus esis to (Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved).

I am elucidating this to show the bearing of a certain fact of this kind upon the inspiration of the words. Here it was bound to be an inspiration that furnished the word as well as the idea, because the man is speaking in a tongue that he doesn’t know.

Take another case: In the promise of the inspiration which is found in John 14:26, one effect was that it would bring all things to remembrance, and yet we find Paul, in 1 Corinthians 1:16, saying: “And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides I know not whether I baptized any other.”

Now, here is a lapse of memory in Paul, but the question is: Is it a lapse of memory on the point upon which he was inspired? The promise was to bring to remembrance all things whatsoever Christ had said or commanded. Inspiration on one thing doesn’t guarantee a perfect memory in other things; it did not bring back to memory the number of people he had baptized.

Let us take another case. It is very important indeed, and I shall have to find myself differing from a great many people in the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12:12-13 :

“Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God: that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual words.” In this we have both revelation and inspiration conjoined. Here is revelation, illumination and inspiration all together. There are three significant Greek words here, pneumatikoio, pneumatika and sugkrinontes, “ joining spiritual things to spiritual words.”

Look again at the passage before us: “We have received spiritual things, and we have received them not in the wisdom that man teaches, but in the words that the Spirit teaches, joining spiritual things to spiritual words.” That is a good translation of this passage, and is considered so by some good scholars. I cite an authority on that translation, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, who is as fine a scholar as can be found. He says that this inspiration which Paul received enabled him to set spiritual things, not in words that man’s wisdom taught, but in words that the Spirit taught to him which we call joining spiritual things to spiritual words.

It is claimed that logos there might mean “discussion.” Now, this has a direct bearing upon the subject of verbal inspiration, and yet we do not find that verbal inspiration stereotypes the style, even in the case of a single man. It is nothing mechanical like that, nor does it in the least destroy the individuality of the inspired man. When Paul writes, he writes in Paul’s style; when Peter writes, he writes in Peter’s style. The Holy Spirit inspires the penman and not the pen, and we must not be disturbed when we find Paul’s style, when he is writing spiritual things in spiritual words, or Peter’s style in his writings. We should accept that fact as we go along. In other words, by the wisdom of God, through inspiration, we have a Bible of infinite variety. We have history, law, poetry, parable, allegory, proverb, symbol, simile, argument, persuasion-every form of composition or speech, by all classes of men, and yet each man was moved to speak as he spoke or wrote.

Now let us take 2 Corinthians 12:1-21, where the Apostle Paul is describing how he received a revelation. He had to be inspired to receive it. The inspiration itself qualified him to receive a revelation. John was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day when he received the Revelation. Paul is recording a fact that occurred fourteen years before. Fourteen years before he wrote, he was inspired to receive a revelation, and now he is inspired to record it. He says:

“I knew a man in Christ just about fourteen years ago, whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, but I knew such an one caught up to the third heaven into the paradise of God.” So we see that the inspiration doesn’t make knowledge perfect on the method, and that is why I don’t include in my definition of inspiration, the method of inspiration. Though Paul states there the process, he cannot say that he knew so as to state whether it was in the body or out of the body. That is where his knowledge was imperfect. And then notice that the Bible, both in the New and Old Testaments, tells us a good many things that wicked people said and did, and the question has been asked, “How can that prove the Bible to be the Word of God?” Those wicked people were not inspired of God to say the wicked things they said and do the wicked things they did, but the Book recording them is inspired. Now bear that in mind as bearing upon inspiration. In the next place, please notice the distinction in the workings of inspiration when the subject of it is writing history, or bearing testimony on the one hand, and on the other hand, making an argument or an appeal. The most astounding thing in the whole Bible to me is the proof of inspiration on this point. When it comes to writing history, it is arbitrarily given. There are no explanations given. The writer does not stop to go into explanations of the stupendous things he records. Unlike human historians, not one of them makes a solitary explanation. They go on and state the facts arbitrarily, and this is characteristic of both Old Testament and New Testament history. The next peculiarity is the brevity of its statement. It puts in a phrase what a human historian would put in a volume. It packs into a few sentences the most momentous incidents of time.

Commence with the case of the apostles, and you behold Peter. Peter steps on the stage. Then Paul steps on the stage and he has his say, but they don't stop to explain what the great majority of the disciples said or did or wrote. The history makes no explanation at all.

Then each writer, under his own inspiration, addresses himself to the work before him without the slightest effort to harmonize what he is going to say with any of the other New Testament writers.

Take Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Matthew commences with Abraham and closes with the resurrection; Mark commences with John the Baptist and closes with the resurrection; Luke commences with Adam and closes with Paul a prisoner at Rome; John begins with Jesus in eternity and closes with his Revelation on Patmos. Paul commences where John does and closes where Jesus Christ turns the kingdom over to the Father. Mark never once stops to consider where the others begin.

These historians go right ahead teaching things in the domain of science, geography, astronomy, history, and going down into all the spheres of technical knowledge. They go right on confronting everything in the wide world, and never expecting to make a mistake in anything, and the man is not living that can show where they ever did make a mistake.

Whether they teach history, science, geography or philosophy, or refer to the weather, the times, the customs, or the seasons, they use the right words or phrases in everything they say.

Take the officer in the Philippian gaol, that Roman gaoler, where there is not a man to witness. It is the most remarkable history that the world has ever seen.

They go on and tell us, and it just makes one shiver as he reads.

These New Testament writers voice a statement, for instance, that Christ has raised a young man or a girl from the dead. The young man is given back to his mother, the girl to her parents, and we look to see what the writer says in explanation. He doesn't say a word!

Now contrast that with the feelings and emotions of the personality of the writers when they are not testifying, but writing letters. Take up Paul's case. We can hear the very throbbings of his heart. We can look down into the very depths of his soul. We can hear him say that he could wish himself accursed for his brethren's sake. We can see the heaviness of his heart and the tears when he is writing of his unfaithful brethren, just as you can see John writing when no man or angel is found who is able to open the book of future events. Then you see all the feelings of Jeremiah brought out: "Oh, that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!"

Now that is marvellous. When you go to history, they are the only people that fail to explain it. They are the only people that fail to give evidence. Why, you put that before a lawyer, and he understands it in a moment. They speak, so that they are the only witnesses that are wanted on the witness stand.

Now, leaving out things in these histories that you wonder at, you find that in writing under inspiration Paul says to Timothy, "Bring my cloak and books at Troas." I never understood Paul's captivity at Rome until I read that sentence. In prison !

“I have one old weather-beaten cloak,” he writes, “that I carried with me on many voyages and travels, and the winter’s coming, and I am not able to buy a new cloak. When you come, bring me that cloak. I am shut up here in this prison, and I want to read, so bring me the books, and especially the parchments.”

Hereafter let no one talk about that sentence not being put in there by inspiration.

I now apply some of these facts. Understanding these things on inspiration, let us go back and apply some of this to the Old Testament.

I will take up some of the most difficult cases, even worse than that great sea-monster swallowing Jonah. Take 2 Peter 2:15-16 : “Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Besor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness, but was rebuked for his iniquity; the dumb ass speaking with man’s voice forbad the madness of the prophet.”

Now examine what Jude says, Jude 1:11 : “Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah.”

Now take what Jesus says, Revelation 2:14 : “But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication.”

Now turn to the Old Testament. Notice that it bears distinct testimony to that record in the twenty-second, twenty-third and twenty-fourth chapters of Numbers. There was this man Balak who had sent for Balaam to come and prophesy against the children of Israel. Balaam was rebuked by the dumb ass.

Under the influence of the Spirit this dumb ass speaks. The only trouble about the case now is that the uninspired asses sometimes speak. But, speaking seriously, here is a case of the inspiration of an animal. The most wonderful thing in this world is the influence of the Spirit of God; for He could brood over inorganic matter and give it life; create darkness and light; influence children in the womb; cause a dumb brute to speak in the language of man. The most alluring quest in the world is the study of the work of the Holy Spirit.

Take this case of Balaam, if you want to study the method of inspiration as it relates to the character of the inspired one. Suppose we look a little, first, at Numbers 22:38 : “And Balaam said unto Balak, Lo, I am come unto thee: have I now any power to say anything? the word that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak.”

Notice again the next chapter, Numbers 23:5 : “And the Lord put a word in Balaam’s mouth and said, Return unto Balak, and thus thou shalt speak.” And then we have the words that He put in his mouth:

“And how shall I curse whom God hath not cursed? How shall I defy whom God hath not defied?…Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!…God is not a man that he should lie.”

Notice the last verse, where he expresses the vision of the future. Balaam, the man who heard the words of God, prophesied: “I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh: there

shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." That is a marvellous prophecy of this wicked man, not a regenerated man, not a sanctified man, but an inspired man, unable to speak for God any word except that which God put in his mouth. God takes this man and inspires him to receive a revelation, inspires him to tell that revelation with infallible accuracy, inspires him to point with an insistent finger into a future so dim and distant that no uninspired eye could see it. A Star! A Star!! And yet wise men shall see that Star at a later day, and find it shining on a Babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laying in a manger.

Now let us take two or three epistles. In Romans 15:4, the Apostle Paul makes a statement. We have proven him to be an inspired man. Now he is going to make a statement about the whole Old Testament: "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."

If he is referring only to the faith of Abraham, what about the book of Ruth, that sweet little pastoral gem? Let me tell you. I read that book over again the other day to see if I could get an inspiration; it came over me like a vision, and I felt the Spirit of God. Here is the genealogy of David. Here is the sidelight on the dark period of the judges. Here is the proof that while many were going astray and were doing wickedly, a family unknown to history, like one of the seven thousand that had not bowed the knee to Baal and, unknown to Elijah, were keeping the commands of God.

"Well now," I said, "I will read Esther." What is there good in the book of Esther? As I looked over the newspapers and saw the Jews in Russia under the iron hand of persecution driven away from their homes to an awful exile yet they are not annihilated. Now, here is a little book in the Old Testament that gives us a picture of a people in exile, and persecuted; that compares this people to a burning bush that burns but is never consumed. "And whatsoever things were written before time were written for our admonition."

Now I turn to 1 Corinthians 10:6-11. Here the apostle is talking about that long journey through the wilderness, and of it he says: "Now these things happened unto them by way of ensample; and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come."

We should look back to the start of that marvellous pilgrimage and be admonished of our course.

Now take Romans 3:9. The apostle propounds two terse questions: "What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin."

He bases the biggest argument that was ever made by mortal man upon two words of that fourteenth Psalm from which he quotes "all" and "none." All have gone astray, none are righteous, and on that "all" and "none" he makes the predicate of his treatise. Every word has its significance with him, each one a marvellous word. Romans 10:12 : "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." How do you know? Well, I base it on one word of the Old Testament - "whosoever." "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Paul, in another instance, as I have already shown, bases an argument on the singular instead of the plural of a noun (Galatians 3:16), and Christ based His argument on the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet, and on the stroke of a letter (Matthew 5:18).

# 04.06. Difficulties Met And Objections Answered

6. DIFFICULTIES MET AND OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

Some questions have been raised which I wish to answer. One of these is relative to the scholarly support of my position on the first part of Luke, in which I set forth in a former chapter a possible translation justifiable a translation that would make Luke claim inspiration for everything he wrote.

Those who are familiar with the Greek will understand the explanation better than those who are not. It depends upon the translation of a single word. Luke says that he had perfect understanding of all things, and now comes in the modifying word, “anothen. ” That word primarily means, “from above.” It is so translated in the third chapter of John: “Except a man be born anothen; ” it is so translated in the letter of James: “The wisdom that cometh anothen, ” and in an overwhelming majority of cases in the New Testament it has that translation. So that if you translate that word, “Having had perfect understanding of all things from above,” it makes his claim to inspiration refer to his entire record.

Now the question is as to whether that translation had any real scholarly support. I stated that John Gill favored that translation, and he was a great scholar of the early English Baptists. But the question now is, “What other scholarship supports it?”

I answer: Matthew Henry, in his Commentary; Erasmus, the prince of the Greek scholars; Gomar, another distinguished Greek scholar; Lightfoot, another distinguished exegete all these men adopt that rendering, together with Galson, the great French scholar, who not only adopts it but makes an elaborate argument in support of it. These are all very distinguished men.

Now the objection made to that translation is, that the verb which accompanies it indicates mental activity in tracing out an examination, and the question arises as to whether that verb is so used. Does the verb require that we should not translate this word “from above”? I will give two uses of the word that are unexceptional, and that bear directly upon the question. What would a Greek say if he were going to use the word anothen as it is used here by Luke? What word would he use with it?

Demosthenes’ On the Crown has a sentence in which we have the same word as used here by Luke. We have the same verb of Luke, and here he wishes to express the precise idea “from the first,” and he uses there, not anothen, but ap’ arches, just as it is in the preceding verse, as he wishes to express the idea of “from the beginning.” If any one wishes to look this up he can find it in Demosthenes, fifty-fifth line of the First Section.

Another use of the word (the most significant use of the word I know of) is that of Josephus where he institutes a comparison between following sacred revelation on the one hand, and securing information from the people on the other hand, and when he wishes to convey the idea of getting information from sacred revelation he uses this very word, and puts it over against another word that illustrates the idea of getting information from other people. That is a very remarkable thing.

I will give you another use of the word bearing in the same direction. There was a very noted Greek speaker and writer, and in one of the books he used that same verb which Josephus used. Now it is a little singular that we should have this much of Greek testimony bearing upon this point.

Another objection to that translation was that it was not necessary for God to give Luke from above a revelation of those things that could have been obtained from earthly sources. I answer that Paul could have obtained from Peter or John (who were still living) all he did not know, yet he did not get a jot from them. God revealed it to him direct.

Then take another point: Balaam prophesied in the camp of Balak. There was not a Jew there to hear it. Moses was not there, but he got a remarkable series of prophecies of Balaam in the camp of Balak. The record of what he prophesied, in the very words, was given by Moses. How did Moses get it?

There was evidently a revelation made to Moses of just what Balaam said.

Now still another point: The word in this passage in Luke expresses the highest possible degree of certainty: “That thou mayest know with absolute certainty, the things which thou hast been taught,” and that certainty cannot be obtained from the many histories that have been written without inspiration, for he says that many have undertaken for themselves to write these things of what the Lord did and said, “but,” he states, “I, having obtained information of all things from above, write unto thee in order that thou mayest know with certainty the things which thou hast believed.” Certainly, no one needs to be ashamed to stand with such scholars as I have mentioned. It may not be the right translation, but certainly a strong crowd stands there.

I now take up the second question submitted to me. “Please make a little distinction between ‘inspired men’ and ‘inspired books.’” I answer that an inspired man can only reach his hearers; an inspired book can reach every generation of the world. In the next place, inspiration did not necessarily accompany an inspired man all the time. It came according to the sovereign disposition of the Spirit.

Balaam did not have inspiration resting upon him all the time. The word of God came to him; God put words in his mouth. When that inspired hour passed, he spoke like other men. But a book is inspired all the time. The Word of God-the written Word of God-liveth and abideth forever.

Yet again, it would amount to very little to you and to me that certain men nineteen hundred years ago or three thousand years ago were inspired. When they spoke, you did not hear them, and I did not hear them. The need of the inspiration of the Book is to transmit to all mankind exactly what the inspired men said. Therefore, the principle of the inspiration with which we are concerned has to do, not with the inspiration of men, but to make certain the writing God inspired, and so far as you and I are concerned it does not make any difference whether the number of inspired men back yonder was many or few. The inspiration that interests us and comes home to us is the inspiration of the record that we have.

Now let us see whether the New Testament discusses inspiration that way. Let the reader turn to Romans 16:26. We read it in the English, but it would be better to read it in the Greek.

I want to show that it is not so much the prophets that Paul is speaking about as the recorded prophecy. He is saying that it is not made manifest by the sayings of the prophets, but by the

prophetic writings. The Greek expression is graphon prophetikon, i. e., " the prophetic writings" or "the writings of the prophets." To show again that when Peter used that remarkable language in 2 Peter 1:20-21, about men speaking who were moved by the Holy Spirit, he is not discussing the speech of these prophets, but he uses this language: "We have also a more sure word of prophecy," the prophecy of the record the prophecy of the writing. What Peter is saying is, "Here you have a writing, a Book, and that Book tells you about the mysteries of God."

He says this is the prophecy, or the writing, that was moved by the Holy Spirit that took possession of the men. It is the Book that we are concerned about.

Let me bring the matter still more closely to your attention. Romans 1:2 : "Which he had promised before by his prophets in the holy scriptures." He did not refer to any words of the prophets, except their recorded words. How are these men to get in touch with what Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah and Malachi penned? Paul says, "Which he had promised before by his prophets in the holy scriptures." So you can see what kind of inspiration we are after. We are after the inspiration of a Book and not that of a man. Let us illustrate. I want to give you an idea of prophecy. One of the commonest meanings of the word is what the man writes from God, no matter whether it is a prediction or not. It is a writing from God, and is what the man wrote because God put it into his heart to write it. In Exodus 4, where God wants Moses to represent Him, to go and speak for Him, and Moses objects upon the score that he is not eloquent, God says:

"There is your brother, Aaron. Take him and let him be your prophet, and you be God to him. I will be God to you, and you shall be my mouth, and Aaron shall be your mouth."

Now, what is a prophet? A prophet is one who speaks for God; that is why we are getting at His utterance. But how do I know that Moses said those things when he went before Pharaoh? How did it get to me? We learn that God commanded Moses to do some writing, and that writing was deposited in the Ark of the Covenant, and that writing gives an account of all these things.

Now, what are the references in the New Testament to that case?

Deuteronomy, the book the Lord commanded Moses to write, our Lord Jesus, in the hour of His temptation, quotes from three times, "It is written."

God told Moses to write that, and Moses was God's mouth whenever he spoke. But he was God's penman when he wrote, and that which the Saviour said was what the man wrote. So when Paul wanted to make a reference to Genesis, one of these books written by Moses, he did not stop to say that Moses said a certain thing about Abraham, but he says in his letter to the Galatians, "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen by faith, said to Abraham."

Now those were the words of God, but those words were recorded, and what Paul is going to use now is in the record. He says that the Scriptures foresaw that God was going to justify the heathen by faith: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." And now he is talking about those very things about which Moses was commanded to write.

Take the case of Pharaoh. Paul says, "Therefore, the scripture said to Pharaoh, For this purpose have I raised thee up." The thing that with him is inspired is that record which he has in his hand. He is too far removed from that period in time, and too far in distance to know anything about the voice or to hear that voice, but he has that record, and he quotes it in that way: "The scripture says

to Pharaoh."

Again: in one of His discussions where He wants to bring out the inspiration of David's word, God quotes the one hundred and tenth Psalm: "Jehovah saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Jesus says to these Pharisees, "How is it that David in the Spirit used that language?" referring to the record.

Then let us see how Peter used it. He takes another one of the Psalms, and he does not discuss the inspiration of David as a man, but he is discussing the inspiration of the record, and he says, "This scripture must needs be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David" (Acts 1:16).

It is quite probable that David himself did not understand the signification of what he wrote in that record, but now, when Peter used it, he did not employ a proof of what it said, but he simply referred to a record that he had in his hand, and said, "This scripture must needs be fulfilled," and it is true with reference to David and Moses.

I have cited only two cases by way of example, but this is equally true with reference to Isaiah, and with every other one of the prophets. I want to show that it is just as true when it refers to some prediction they were making as when it refers to some historical fact.

I introduce Paul on that. Paul says, "Do you not remember how the scriptures tell us of Elijah's intercession? "The prophet Elijah, in history, is recorded as having dealt with God. He is not now recording prophecy, but facts, and Paul states, as an infallible guide on the subject, the Scripture records of that historical transaction, and his intercession about the prophets of Baal, and so on every other point.

Hebrews 11:1-40 takes up the events all along, "according to the scripture." The author commences with Abel, enumerating quite a number whose exploits are recorded in the book of judges, and goes on clear down through the list to Samuel and the prophets, and it is the record that he cites to prove his point. At this point I consider the next question presented to me: "Please make a little plainer the distinction between illumination and inspiration."

Well, to illustrate the difference: Inspiration is that influence of the Spirit which enables its subject, or constrains its subject, to write what God wants to be written. Illumination is that influence of the Spirit that enables its subject to understand what is written. One may have only inspiration and no illumination. The reader will recall that I cited the case of Caiaphas, who, being high priest that year, prophesied, "It is expedient that one man die, etc." The record says,

"This he spake not of himself." He did not say that of himself. There was an Influence upon him that put those words in his mouth, and he was totally unconscious of it. He did not know anything about what it meant. Illumination comes from God to enable a student of that inspired statement to understand it.

Take that other passage where Peter refers to the prophets who, under the influence of inspiration, having written certain things, were very much exercised as to the meaning of those things, and they prayed God to enable them to understand them. They prayed God for illumination. God declined to give it to them. To inspire these men to write was to constrain them to use the words that God wanted them to use. Illumination is to be enabled by the Spirit to understand the words

which God has constrained the writer to use. This is so exceedingly important in this discussion that I am going to elaborate it a little more. Illumination is an ordinary grace of the Spirit possessed by every Christian. Inspiration is an extraordinary or miraculous gift of the Spirit.

Illumination continues with a Christian; inspiration may be intermittent, even with the inspired man. God may inspire him on one occasion by the miraculous influence of His Spirit, and then divest him of it forever afterward.

There are many instances of that in both Testaments, and Paul distinctly says,

“Whether there be tongues they shall cease, whether there be prophecies they shall fail,” and as Daniel foretold, “the vision shall cease.”

Inspiration, having the definite object to make a complete and accurate record of the words of God, is no longer needed. Just as soon as the canon of the Old Testament Scripture was completed, prophecy ceased for four hundred years; and just as soon as the New Testament record was completed, it ceased again, and no man living can, under the Scriptural interpretation, claim inspiration now for anything that he may write. The object of faith is not a state of mind of the writer. It is not presented as an object of my faith that Caiaphas was a regenerated man, for he was not; that he was a sanctified man, for he was not; that he understood, for he did not. But the object of my faith is his words that the Spirit of God constrained him to speak. My faith has nothing to do with the understanding or the knowledge of the subject of the inspiration. My faith has nothing to do with the character of the man or the spiritual nature of the one who speaks the inspired word, for it may be Balaam’s ass which testifies with the inspired words which God may have wanted spoken.

Yea, it may be a hand attached to no body, that mysteriously comes out on the wall and writes the word of God. What concerns me are the words that are written on the wall; that is the object of faith. It is evident that we get at these words by the record of these words. Therefore, said the Apostle Paul, these records are sacred books, or, as he says in the letter to the Romans, they are Holy Scriptures; or, as he says again in the letter to the Romans, they are the oracles of God; or, as Stephen says in his speech, they are the living oracles; or, as Peter says, they are the prophecies of Scripture; or, as Paul says, they are the prophetic writings.

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Believeth what? The object of man’s belief is the Word of God, and hence this entire Book is called the Word of God, or the oracles of God. Now, that is inspiration-the inspiration of a Book.

We see, then, that in nature, and in object, and in duration, and in method, there is a radical difference between illumination and inspiration. A man’s illumination may go up and down. There may be a big measure of it or a little measure of it, a big degree or a little degree. But inspiration is a fixed measure, without any degree whatever. There are no degrees in inspiration. The prophecies of Balaam were no more inspired than that sentence of 1 Chronicles 1:1 : “Adam, Seth, Enoch.” That book is as much inspired as any other. And if Luke is inspired he is as much inspired as Paul. If Mark’s book is an inspired book, it is equal in its power to any other book. If the Song of Solomon is inspired, the inspiration is as high in degree as Psalms 45:1-17, or Psalms 23:1-6 ” The Lord is my shepherd.”

I repeat that there are no degrees in inspiration. And we see how it is that there cannot be any inspiration of a book apart from the words of the book. That is exactly what inspiration is to write the words of God. And that record extends, not only to the words, but necessarily to the letters which make each word; yea, it extends to the vowel points, for what would a book of consonants be? And this idea of inspiration is the old idea of inspiration.

It is the New Testament idea of inspiration.

It is the idea of Josephus and the early fathers, and only in modern times has infidelity, bald and blatant, seeking the destruction of religion, like a cuckoo, laid its egg in the nest of people who claim to be Christians, and they have raised that up for a real chicken; hatched it out and raised it for one of God's chickens.

There is not a thought even in all of the modernistic books on inspiration of which I cannot trace the fatherhood to an open and avowed infidel who has made open assaults upon the Christian religion, and it doesn't make a bit of difference to me whether they are college presidents or any other great men of modern times claiming to be preachers, or even bishops. When they pat that little fellow on the head and call him "son," we may be sure it is an adopted child.

I now answer another question that has been propounded to me and runs as follows:

"Is not the Bible merely a human expression of a superhuman revelation? That is, there are certain things in the Bible that are inspired, and certain things with which inspiration is mixed, and certain things in which it is not inspired. Now, does not the human element necessarily bring in imperfection?" My answer is that I don't care whether the element is human or mule; if it speaks the words that God puts in the mouth there will be no imperfection in the word, and there is no inspiration without it.

I give a crucial test of that: Whoever takes the position that the Bible is merely a human expression of a superhuman revelation necessarily brings out one of two things, and one or the other of these two things comes like a conqueror: That he either sinks the Divine element below the human or he draws up the human element above the Divine.

I give three examples, the first of which is this: There are a vast number of Protestants who hold just exactly that view-prominent men in England, Germany and the United States, Th.D.'s, LL.D.'s, and others having a whole alphabet attached to their names. Mark my point: That position of "part-inspired," "part-mixed," and "part-uninspired" inspired in spots-necessarily destroys the standard of authority and leaves no standard at all.

Now we will say that a part of the Bible is inspired. I prove it is mixed here, at least the degree of inspiration is mixed did not need much and a part is not inspired at all. Who is to determine what is inspired and what is mixed, and what is uninspired?

"I can tell," says one. "I can read the Bible and I can see that some parts of it are not inspired."

Well, then, you are the judge; you are the one to fix what is inspired and what is not inspired. You pass it to B, who says:

"I see the same things, but I don't agree with A."

Then you pass it to C, who says: “I endorse A and B, but I don’t agree with them as to the limit or degree of inspiration.”

Result: No standard. Where is there an authoritative God’s Word under that system? There is none, and there are thousands of young men today that are reading the Bible just that way. They have no standard.

I saw one of them not many months ago. He was reading Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, and as he was reading along he was separating in his mind what was inspired and what was not inspired. He said: “Here Paul says he is writing as a man, so that he was not inspired when he said this.” Thus he was sifting as he went along. Would that man have any certainties? How long is he going to hold on to inspiration?

I am going to make a test still stronger, and that will bring out more sharply than it has yet been done, the distinction between illumination and inspiration. The Jews said the Scriptures were inspired, but they had an illumination that put a meaning upon a passage different from the accepted meaning of its words. I quote some of their sayings:

Rabbi Isaac: “Oh, students, pay more attention to the words of the scribes than to the words of the law.”

Rabbi Eleazar (and he was on his deathbed when he said that): “Turn away your children from the study of the Bible and place them at the feet of the wise men, whose illumination can interpret them.”

Rabbi Jacob: “The words of the scribes are more agreeable to common sense than the words of the prophets.”

Let us illustrate by a comment. Jesus said, “But ye do make void the commandments of God with your traditions,” a free rendering of which is this:

“The commandments of God-that is the standard but you take away that standard; you make it void and set up a false and shifting standard.” The Roman Catholic says: “Yes, the Bible is inspired, but the Pope and the Council have equal or greater infallibility.” Tradition is thus made equal with their Bible, which is a version, a translation, and an exceedingly faulty one at that; that is their inspiration.

Again, they say that the Holy Scriptures do not contain all that is necessary for salvation, and by themselves are not sufficient. I quote their words:

“It does not belong to the people to read the Holy Scriptures. We must receive with the obedience of faith many things not contained in Scripture. It is in the power of the Pope to establish articles of faith.” Our missionary to the Jews writes home a report.

“Here is the trouble,” he says. “When I present their own Scriptures to them they have no standard of authority for the Scriptures. They say (quoting a rabbi), ‘Scripture is water; the Talmud is wine; the tradition is spiced wine,’ and that obtrudes between them and the voice of their own prophets.”

Suppose I was contemplating a debate with one of them; it would be impossible.

It has been said that a war between England and Russia would be like a fight between an elephant and a whale. The whale would say to the elephant, “You come out here, and I will drown you.” The elephant would reply, “You come upon the land, and I will crush you.” One being a land power and the other a naval power, they have no common ground on which to fight.

I cannot have a debate with a Romanist, because we have no common ground on which to stand. I might try to prove my case by the Scriptures, but he would say, “Yes, but the Vulgate says so and so;” or I might quote a Scripture, and he would say, “Yes, but the Pope interprets that thus, and it is the interpretation of the Pope that is infallible, and not the literal Scripture.”

Now, how are we going to make an issue? We have nothing by which to decide. But when we take the Word of God as inspired, whether God causes a dumb ass to speak a part of it; whether God moved a hand that had no arm to write a part of it; whether God influenced Caiaphas, a wicked, vile scoundrel, to speak a part of it; whether God influenced prophets to write a part which they could not understand, the words are inspired, and that constitutes the standard.

Every one of the Scriptures is God-inspired. That is the true doctrine of the inspiration. It is the doctrine set forth in the New Testament.

# 04.07. DANIEL: AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF INSPIRATION

7. THE BOOK OF DANIEL: AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF INSPIRATION FOR this chapter we have the selection of a book from the Old Testament, and a discussion of the inspiration of that book. The book selected is Daniel, the one about which, in recent years, there has been the most controversy.

First, I call attention to the fact that the book of Daniel, from the time it was first written until the time of Christ, impressed the imagination of the people more than any other book of the Old Testament, just as the book of Revelation has impressed the public mind and the imagination since it was written, more than any other book of the New Testament. The circumstances connected with Daniel were very much like the circumstances of Joseph and Moses. The reader will recall that Joseph was taken as a prisoner into a foreign land, and there, on account of his purity and piety, and the favor of God, he was exalted to the chief position in the government of that nation, precisely similar to the case of Daniel, who was taken to Babylon and attained the highest position in the court there.

Many hundreds of years after Joseph came Moses, and Moses also was exalted to the highest position in the foreign government where his people were in bondage, and he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and the favor of God was upon him. The circumstances of Daniel were very much like the circumstances which surrounded Moses. The book of Daniel is written in two languages. From the fourth verse of the second chapter to the end of the seventh chapter is written in Aramaic. The first chapter and three verses of the second chapter, and from the eighth on, it is written in Hebrew. The transition from Hebrew to Aramaic is very remarkable, and the transition back to Hebrew is equally remarkable. The circumstances under which the transition takes place sufficiently explains the transition to any thoughtful mind. I shall not discuss that phase of the subject here. I simply call attention to the fact. The Hebrew part of it is about like the Hebrew of the contemporaries of Daniel, and the Aramaic is about like the Aramaic of the contemporaries of Daniel.

Such is the testimony of the best scholarship upon this point.

Now, the reason I have chosen Daniel to illustrate the inspiration of a Book is that its inspiration has been attacked upon the following grounds: First, they say that it had no place in the Jewish canon of Scripture; that it was a novel written by a gifted Jew, say about one hundred and fifty years before Christ, in the time of the Maccabees.

Then they allege that the book cannot be inspired, because of false historical statements made in it. They deny the statement in the beginning of the book that there was any deportation of the Jewish people in the third year of the reign of Jehoiachim to Babylon. They say that is a false statement. They deny, as a matter of fact, that there was any Belshazzar, king of Babylon. They deny that Babylon was taken as represented in the book of Daniel. These are some among the matters of fact which they deny, and therefore they question its inspiration.

They then question its inspiration on account of the “incredible” miracles which it relates, and the “incredible” predictions which it makes. They admit that a large part of the predictive portions of the book exactly correspond to the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, but they claim the book was written after these events.

Now they claim that these are the grounds upon which the book of Daniel has been denied a place among the books of God. It is these objections that I wish to answer, and the first point that I make, or the first question I ask, is this: Was the canon of the Old Testament completed before the Maccabean period? Were all the books of the Old Testament written, as we now have them, before the time of Judas Maccabaeus? His history is set forth in the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, a very fine book, though not inspired, and a book well worth reading. It is conceded that this book was written two hundred years before Christ. The grandson of the man who wrote it translated it into Greek one hundred and thirty years before Christ, and issued a preface, and now I quote from that preface. This book can be found in any of the large Bibles which contain also the Apocryphal books. He says:

“My grandfather, seeing that he had much given himself to the reading of the law, of the prophets, and of the other books of the fathers, and had gotten therein sufficient learning, was drawn himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom.” That is only a part of the preface, but the reader will note that the preface states the three divisions of the Old Testament the law, the prophets and the other books, or writings and three times he makes that statement in the preface-that the author of Ecclesiasticus, who wrote the book two hundred years before Christ, had, before he wrote his book, given much attention to the reading of this threefold division of the Old Testament the law, the prophets, and the other writings.

Nobody has ever been able to question the accuracy of the statement by this historian. We do not accept him as an inspired writer, but we do accept him as a competent historian who states a fact. This can be found now in any Jewish Bible just as he quotes it; so it appears in the Jewish Old Testament today, which, with the exception of the Apocrypha, is exactly like our Old Testament. The order of the books is not the same, but all the books are there, and they are just the same as our Old Testament. The next historical fact that I cite is the prevalent Jewish tradition which nobody questions, that the Old Testament canon was completed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, and that the last book added was the book of Malachi. That tradition can be found in writing in a number of places, and I could quote a great many passages in the Old Testament that make it extremely probable that this is correct, but I merely wish to cite historical facts. It is therefore a settled Jewish tradition that the canon of the Old Testament was closed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, who were contemporaries of Daniel. The third historical fact is the testimony of Josephus, who himself cites this Jewish tradition, and who goes on to state that no book could possibly have been added after the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, because no Jew would accept, in his canon of Scripture, a book that had not been given by a prophet or approved by a prophet.

He says that after that time prophecy ceased in Israel, and that while they had a great many books written after that time, they were not accepted as inspired books. So here are three historical testimonies. My next question is, Was the book of Daniel in that list? If the book of Daniel was in the list of the Jewish sacred books as part of the law or the prophets, or other writings, that settles its inspiration and thoroughly answers at least two of the objections made against the book.

Without citing a vast multitude of authorities, I give a single statement by Eidersheim, one of the greatest of the Hebrew scholars. In the second volume of his Life of Christ, and in the fifth appendix, he pays a great deal of attention to the formation of the Jewish canon and the books that enter into that canon, and says: “No Jew of the ancient synagogue ever questioned the right of Daniel’s place in the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures,” and he challenges the world to show a single instance. In Smith’s Bible Dictionary is an article on the book of Daniel by Westcott, one of our greatest Hebraists, and he states about the same thing that Eidersheim does with reference to it.

Let us now examine the testimony of Josephus upon Daniel. He not only places Daniel among the sacred books, but he refers to some of his remarkable predictions which have been fulfilled and, in closing, he says, “Now, as for myself, I have so described these matters as I have found them and read them; but if any one is inclined to another opinion about them, let him enjoy his different sentiments without any blame from me.”

He also says that the prophetic character of the book of Daniel was by the Jews placed higher than any other book of the Old Testament, except the Law of Moses. In the next place, nobody denies that the book of Daniel is in the Septuagint translation, the Greek version of the Old Testament. These are historical evidences to show about the canon and about the books being in the canon. The next question is, “Does any Old Testament book refer to Daniel to show that he was a real person, and that he lived at the time specified in his book, and that his character corresponds to the character set forth in the book?” The only place that one could find this would be in some book written by a contemporary, and I will cite such a book: Ezekiel was a captive in Babylon at the time Daniel was. He was brought there some time later, but the two were there together. Ezekiel was a prophet to the people of Israel in Babylonian bondage. Daniel was an officer of the court. Now here is Ezekiel’s testimony.

Ezekiel 14:13-14 : “Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously, then will I stretch out mine hand upon it, and will break the staff of the bread thereof, and will send famine upon it, and will cut off man and beast from it. Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God.”

Ezekiel 14:20 of the same chapter reads:“Though Noah, Daniel and job were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall deliver but their own souls by their righteousness.”

Another passage from the same book - Ezekiel 28:3 - reads: “Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel: there is no secret that they can hide from thee.”

These are the references. In the first and second, a reference is made to the righteousness of Daniel, and in them he is associated with Noah and Job; Noah interceding for the whole world, but able to save none of them, except himself and his family, by his righteousness; Job interceding for his three friends, and Daniel interceding for his people in captivity. The last reference shows the extraordinary wisdom of Daniel.

Now we must either assume that there were two Daniels, one who had lived in the time of Ezekiel, whose piety and intercessory power in prayer and whose wisdom were so remarkable as to make him a colossal figure in the mind of Ezekiel, and that some man far subsequent to this time wrote

the book and put it off as a forgery under the name of this Daniel, or that Daniel wrote the book that is attributed to him. But Ezekiel's facts came from the book of Daniel. It is in the book of Daniel that we find out about his piety, his intercession and his righteousness. In the next place, they say this book was written by a forger in the days of the Maccabees. Now against that I submit two quotations from the book of Maccabees. The first page of the first book of Maccabees, fifty-fourth verse, quotes the following passages from the book of Daniel:

"And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand, two hundred and ninety days." When the book of Maccabees was written there was the Daniel literature in the hands of the writer of the book, and he quotes from it; but in 1Ma 2:59-60, he quotes from the book of Daniel about the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, and how that God preserved their lives, and then he quotes that Daniel himself, though innocent, was cast into the den of lions, and was saved by the power of his God.

I cite another fact: The impress of the book upon the inter-Biblical period appears by the number of myths and legends that attach themselves to this book. In the Catholic Bible we find in that chapter that tells about the three Hebrew children in the furnace right in the midst of that account-a number of verses purporting to give the song of the three Hebrew children the song they sang while in that fiery furnace. This Apocryphal writer of the inter-Biblical period had the history Daniel wrote about the preservation of these Hebrew children.

Then we find at the end of the book two appendices which the Roman Catholics receive. One is the account of Susanna, and the other, the Dragon.

Here are three Apocryphal traditions, or legends, which have fastened themselves upon the book of Daniel, and such is the character attributed to him for wisdom, and his veracity in writing the account of the three Hebrew children that these traditions continue to survive. But Dr. Farrar objects to the book of Daniel because it made no impress upon the inter-Biblical period. That is his objection to the book. But here is the history, and here are three legends that, during this period, grew up and attached themselves to the book. They are not in the Hebrew canon, of course, but we find them appended to the book in the Septuagint translation. The next question is, "What has the New Testament to say about the book of Daniel?" I cite first Matthew 24:14-15 :

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (let him that readeth understand)."

Jesus is answering three questions here: When shall the Temple be destroyed? When shall Jerusalem be destroyed? What shall be the sign of His coming and the end of the world? His answer is:

"When therefore ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, flee unto the mountains."

Now, this is the testimony of our Lord Jesus Christ. He quotes from Daniel the prophet. He cites that remarkable prediction of the desolation set forth in Daniel 12:1-13. Now let us look into the

next chapter, Matthew 26:64. Here Jesus Christ is again speaking: “Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.” Where from the Old Testament could such a conception as that be found? We find it in the seventh chapter of Daniel, where the Son of man comes to the Ancient of Days, and where there is given unto Him a kingdom, and power, and great glory, and that expression, “Son of Man.” There is no other book of the Bible from which it could be taken, except the book of Daniel.

Here, also, we find “the Kingdom of Heaven,” the institution of the Kingdom represented by the Stone that was seen cut out without hands, and that struck the image that represented the kingdoms of the world and that broke them up in pieces and scattered them. Our Saviour refers to that when telling how His Kingdom shall be preached throughout all the world, and says:

“Whosoever falls upon this stone, he shall be broken, and upon whomsoever this stone shall fall, he shall be ground to powder.”

Suppose we look at the miracles recorded in Daniel. In Hebrews 11:33 we find that miracle of preservation from fire quoted by the author of the letter to the Hebrews.

Let us also look at the doctrine of the angels, as set forth in the book of Daniel. In Luke 1:19-26, we see the angel Gabriel appearing to Zacharias and to Mary.

Now let us look at the analogues that Daniel furnishes. We see them reproduced in the book of Revelation, so that the book of Revelation and the book of Daniel stand or fall together. The thirteenth chapter of Revelation and the seventh, eighth and eleventh chapters of Daniel must fall together, or stand together forever.

We now look at Paul’s “man of sin” that speaks the great swelling words of blasphemy and thinks himself above God. Unquestionably he gets it from Daniel 7:26, and it is again referred to in Revelation 13:5. It is thus evident that the New Testament certifies to the prophecies of Daniel, the miracles of Daniel, the history of Daniel, and the inspiration of Daniel.

Here, then, we have the Old Testament in Ezekiel, the inter-Biblical period in the book of Maccabees, and the New Testament in Christ and Paul and John, all pointing to this book as a proof of God’s revelation and inspiration.

Let us now look at the objections, which are: first, that this book is a forgery; second, that certain statements made in it are falsehoods unsupported by any historical evidence; third, that the miracles in it are incredible; and fourth, that the predictions in it are incredible.

Let us look at the matter of fact. I have examined with great care the statements made in the first chapter of Daniel. He says that Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem in the third year of the Jewish King (Nebuchadnezzar at that time was not King, but Prince Royal) and that he took back with him certain Jewish prisoners of the princes: Daniel and those three young men, specifically mentioned in the book of Daniel, are all identified in the beginning of the book as having been taken by Nebuchadnezzar.

Now what the objectors claim is, that Nebuchadnezzar never made that expedition. The statements made in Jeremiah and in Herodotus, the Greek historian, and in Josephus with reference to this matter, are simply inexplicable unless this fact occurred just as Daniel says it did.

Take the next objection stated. They claim that Daniel's statement about Nebuchadnezzar's madness-that he lost his mind for a number of years and ate grass like an ox is unsupported, but it is that very fact that the Babylonian historians confirm, and a number of other historians who testify to that very derangement of mind of Nebuchadnezzar. The next fact is that about Belshazzar. Now, upon what ground do they dispute the capture of Babylon and the death of Belshazzar? They dispute it upon one solitary ground, the recent discovery of a tablet set up by Cyrus to commemorate his conquest of Babylon. Let us assume, in the first place, that this tablet says what they claim it says. But, on the other hand, what is it?

There is first the testimony of Xenophon in his history, who lived there in his time, and whose account of the conquest of Babylon harmonizes with Daniel.

Then we put over against it the testimony of Herodotus, the father of history, who lived near that time, and his accounts and the account of Daniel are in harmony.

Here, now, are three historians Daniel, Xenophon and Herodotus and the critics propose to offset the testimony of these three historians by a little tablet scarcely discernible. The inscriptions on it-the most important part of them-are defaced or rubbed out, so that one cannot make out what it says. And yet it is a fact that the tablet confirms the Daniel account, according to the best translations of that tablet. It is needless to go over all of this. I simply say that a close examination of the tablet clears up the only point of doubt in it, viz.: as to whether Darius the Mede entered into Babylon. Somebody died that night. The inscriptions read, "the King's son," and the King's son was Belshazzar. Daniel testifies that Belshazzar was to die the very night of the capture of Babylon. That tablet declares that on that very night a certain important personage died, which filled the whole land with mourning.

Now, the question is, How are we going to read it? They say we should read it,

"the King's wife." We say that we should read it, "the King's son." While there can be no certainty attached to it, it ought to be the King's son that died, and, giving it this reading, the tablet and the record in Daniel are in harmony; and no matter what the tablet may have said, it is not sufficient to displace the testimony of three competent historians-one, Daniel, living at the time, and one Xenophon, living so near the time and writing upon matters of which he is fully informed, and Herodotus, the father of history. So the historians and the Greek stand together, and the tablet may be harmonized with them.

Now with reference to the miracles: They say that the miracles are incredible, yet any miracle is incredible from a human standpoint. The question is, was there an occasion for special miracles at this juncture? It certainly was a transition period. The Jewish polity had just been destroyed. The people had been led into captivity. They were now passing through one of the most vital transitions in all of their history, and it is always at those periods that miracles are introduced.

Miracles became necessary in the time of Moses to attest him, to accredit him in the movement that led the people out of their captivity and to establish them as a nation in their own country, and the character of the miracle corresponded with the necessity of the case. Here are the people in captivity again. Here is a great man like Joseph and Moses, the man of highest power among his people, and if ever miracles were needed to give credentials to a man through whose mighty influence Israel was to be restored, it was needed now. So, there is nothing incongruous in the

miracles of that period.

Suppose we take a passage from the Scriptures on this. I cite Micah 6:5 : “O my people, remember…that ye may know the righteous acts of Jehovah.” The reference is to the effect that, as in the days of Moses, God intervened with mighty wonders, so He will again intervene under similar conditions. That is the substance of the statement. The point I am seeking to impress is that miracles in the New Testament time were never introduced unless they were necessary. There must be an occasion to justify them. The conditions justified the kind of miracles that were brought to pass in Daniel’s time; and if we object to this book on the basis of miracles, we can object to any other book in the Bible just as well.

Now let us look at the predictions. What is the matter with the predictions? The critics say that the references to the four successive kingdoms, culminating as they did with full explanations about the Greek and Persian kingdoms, were so very exact that they must be history instead of predictions. They make exactly the same objections to Isaiah 53:1-12. They say that Isaiah’s picture of the sufferings of our Saviour is so exact-that it is so precisely fulfilled in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ-that it must have been written after the coming of Christ. But let us take another prediction in the book. This prediction, if it had any fulfilment at all, had to be fulfilled after the writing of the book. Here it is:

“Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy. Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Anointed One, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks:” (that is, sixty-nine weeks,) “and it shall be built again, with street and moat, even in troublous times. And after the threescore and two weeks shall the Anointed One be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined.”

Here is a prediction that, first of all, points to the destruction of Jerusalem. The city is to be destroyed; next, the vision and the oblation are to cease, so there are to be no more offerings upon the Jewish altar; next, to make reconciliation for sin; next,’ the coming of Messiah, the Prince; then the cutting off of the Messiah to be followed by the destruction of the city and the sanctuary. That is the prediction, and the time is given, and that is one of their objections to it-the specific time given.

Now I submit one simple test, set forth over and over in the prophecies. Sixty-nine weeks must pass before Messiah comes. The Jewish method of computation at that time was to count thirty days to the month, and just exactly to a day from the issuing of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem, as we find in the second chapter of Nehemiah just to a day from the issuing of that decree, sixty-nine weeks of years, Jesus of Nazareth came into Jerusalem, and the multitudes spread their garments before Him and quoted the words of the prophet Zechariah about the coming of the Kingdom and the Messiah of the Kingdom, who was Jesus of Nazareth. In other words, the crucifixion of Christ under the statement that I have just made, fits the prophecy of Daniel, not to a year, not to a month, but to a day; and if the Messiah-Prince has not come, when is He to come? He was to come before Jerusalem was destroyed.

We know that it is the doctrine of our belief as much as we believe anything about the Bible, that when He died He made reconciliation for sin, and that it was then that He brought in everlasting righteousness; and we do know that after the destruction of Jerusalem the oblation ceased; and we do know that the vision has closed, that prophecy has ceased. Now, that is the prediction. I know of nothing in all the prophecies of the Bible so remarkable as that ninth chapter of Daniel. Now they claim that the book was written as late as one hundred and fifty years before Christ! This is one of its predictions. Let us now take another-the prediction that those kingdoms of this world are to be given over to the saints of the Most High God-and compare this with the prophecy of Jesus in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, also the prophecy of Jesus in the book of Revelation, and if one can deny the inspiration of Daniel he must deny the inspiration of Christ. If he can take away the authority of that book he may take away the authority of any book in the Bible.

I don't know any better exemplification of the folly of the higher critics than the issue that they have made upon the book of Daniel. I don't know of one single point that they can sustain as a matter of fact in history. Suppose, for example, to illustrate their questionings of the integrity of this book, this argument: "There are certain Greek words in the book that demand a later day for its writing than the date assigned to it." The first time that I saw that argument I thought it must be something very formidable. What are those Greek words? They are just two-the names of two instruments of music. Two Greek instruments of music are referred to under their Greek names, and that, they say, demands a later date for the book than the time assigned to it.

Let us go back to the time assigned to it, and that is about the time of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Was there any contact with the Greek world up to that time? Had there been any touch with the people of Greece that would at least account for the names of two musical instruments in the book? No other fact of history is established more clearly than that. The only mystery to me is that there are not more such words, and how puerile that sounds to make such a tremendous assertion upon such a trivial basis as that! The subject for the next chapter is this: Why have inspired books, and especially inspired in their words, unless we have the precise text of the books?

Second: Why have inspiration of words when the masses of the people have to depend upon translations and versions, as we do?

Now, as the words, as originally given, are lost, and we depend upon copies only, and as we admit that the copies vary, and that we have to depend upon the translations of those copies, then why insist upon inspiration?

These are two of the objections that will be answered in the next chapter, with some others of like nature.

# 04.08. Some Questions Answered...

8. SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED AND A RESUME OF THE WHOLE DISCUSSION OF INSPIRATION This closing chapter will be devoted to a very brief review of the general subject, so as to fix in the mind what we have discussed. Before doing that, however, I answer some questions propounded oftentimes, to this effect: The theory of verbal inspiration is objected to on the ground that it means merely the inspiration of the autographs-the original manuscripts-and that none of the original manuscripts survive. In fact, there is no autograph copy of any ancient book of the Bible, “and the copies that we have,” says this objector, “are so varied as to the text that it is practically impossible to assume verbal inspiration.”

They further state that the great variety of the texts of the New Testament books alone show at least fifteen hundred variations in the text. This was discovered after the first Bible was printed, when they began to print the Bible, so that all the copies were necessarily exactly alike. The impress from the types would be exactly the same, and it was no longer possible for variations of the text to occur, so that the variation of texts lies a thousand years back of 1456, the time of the printing of the first Bible. Within this period of a thousand years we were dependent upon copies of the New Testament, and there were multitudes of these copies, and the variations amount to, say, fifteen hundred. My reply to that is, in the first place, that if every variation claimed was granted, it in no way interferes with any doctrine or promise or duty commanded in the Bible. In the next place, when you take out the variations they amount to nothing; that is to say, they are the mere transposition of words, or some constructions of grammar that in no way materially affect the sense. When you take out those variations only about one one-thousandth part of the New Testament is affected by the variations one part out of a thousand-and out of that thousandth part the only variations that might change anything can be counted on the fingers. So that when it is carefully scrutinized this whole question of the variations of the text is a very weak argument. The first reason is that no other books in the world in their copies show so little variation. Other books since printing was introduced show more variations than the variations of the New Testament.

We have more copies and more harmonious copies of the New Testament than of any other book in the world. The copies of the New Testament books were carefully prepared. In the next place, it has not been deemed essential to go back to the original of any other book with anything like the degree of zeal and energy that has been manifested in getting back to the original of the Bible. The work of scholars, the journeys taken, the expense incurred, the years of toil which they have devoted to the subject, and a great multitude of them of all enlightened nations, show that there is an importance in getting at just what the Holy Spirit says in the matter of the New Testament books that does not apply to any other book in the world.

We hear of nothing like that on the Koran or the Book of Mormon.

Now if we can count on our fingers all the important variations in the text of the New Testament, that fact, instead of being against verbal inspiration, is in favor of verbal inspiration. The second question propounded was this: “Is there any need of verbal inspiration, since the masses of the

people have to rely upon a translation anyhow? Not many people read the Hebrew and the Greek texts, but most of them have to read in their native tongue. Inasmuch as the people have to depend upon translations, why make such a to-do about the inspiration of the original?" The first time I ever did any carpentering I wanted to put up a small fence, and I thought I could do the work myself. I thought it was useless to hire a carpenter to put up a little picket fence. There were some pieces of timber that had to be sawed in equal lengths and then nailed up, and I thought I could do that as well as anybody, and so I measured off my first paling the height I wanted it, and measured my second one by that. Then I laid aside the first one and measured the third paling by the second, the fourth by the third, the fifth by the fourth, and so on, and by the time I got to the twelfth paling there was at least an inch difference in the length of the first and the twelfth palings. Why? Simply because I was following each time a faulty standard, and I increased the difference every time between that and the preceding standard.

Now I want to apply that to this matter. Say there was no standard of text at all that only the idea of the Bible was inspired, and then we had to have translations, and the translations would be made from translations, and so on as additional copies were needed by the time we got our tenth translation we would be a thousand miles from the original translation. But in our present translations we don't go back, say, to the King James Version and revise that and put that in more modern English, but each time we make a translation we get just as close back to the original standard as possible, and in this way the translations become a great means for determining the true text.

Suppose we take the Greek translation of the, Old Testament. There are several of them-three or four and we take the Syriac, or Peshito, then the Old Latin translation, the Vulgate, and then the Septuagint translation, and so on throughout the various nations of the world. Every one becomes valuable to us, for each one makes an effort to go back to the true text. We do not try to make a new standard, but try to get back to the original text as nearly as possible, and in that way instead of the deviations increasing as the years roll by, the variations are diminishing. There are less now than there used to be, and if we were to make another translation, say forty years hence, that translation would be nearer the original than the American Standard translation, which we are now using, and of course very much nearer than the King James translation.

Now, that is the reason for having a standard, and it is bound to be a standard of words. The integrity of the text of any book is maintained whenever it is preserved incorrupt, or whenever there are means of restoring anything that is wrong, or making it right again. While we don't maintain that the original text, just as Paul wrote it, or as Peter wrote it, or as Matthew wrote it, or claim that the autograph copy can be shown, yet we do maintain that by the old manuscripts, by the old translations, by the old quotations and by the internal evidence we virtually restore the books of the Bible so that it is just as it was when it was written by the men inspired of God.

Now, one other remark: God's leaving this kind of labor to be performed by man has had a tremendous effect in bringing about a study of the Bible that would never have been undertaken if to every nation there had been handed down, in God's own handwriting, a text of the Bible in their language.. If it had been handed down as a solid book from the skies it would not have brought about that reverence for the Bible, that attention to its study that has been accorded it. It would not have called forth that wholesome effect, with sacrifices of toil and money. It would not have

engaged the study of so many devout scholars.

These things would not have been, if a Bible had been handed down from heaven in English. So there is nothing in that to interfere with the argument which has been made upon inspiration.

Now I call attention to a general outline of the whole subject that has been presented. It has been stated that to discuss simply the subject of inspiration, it is necessary to assume acquaintance with the text, the canon, and the credibility.

All of those, in logical order, go before the subject of inspiration. Taking for granted an acquaintance with the text of the Bible, the canon of the Bible, and the historical credibility of the Bible, I have given no time to the discussion of those subjects, but have assumed that we are taking the Bible as a historical verity with the best of other histories, and that we have the books as they were originally given, and have then discussed the subject of inspiration in the following order:

First: the inspiration of the Scriptures as believed by Baptists from time immemorial.

Second: the question of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures re-opened.

Third: examples of inspiration and their explanation.

Fourth: Luke’s case, and other important matters.

Fifth: certain qualifying facts and the circumstances which modified our ideas of inspiration, enabling us properly to define and limit it.

Sixth: we discussed the difficulties of inspiration and answered certain objections.

Seventh: we took up the book of Daniel as an outstanding example of attack by radical critics. In these foregoing discussions we have established the inspiration of Jesus Christ, and the inspiration of the New Testament writers.

We then applied the testimony of Christ and His apostles to the Old Testament Scriptures, and when their testimony was applied we learned that they taught the following things:

First: the Old Testament is a single document the Word of God, the Scriptures; that the Old Testament has been called collectively, as to its books, Sacred books, Holy writings, oracles of God, prophetic writings, the prophecies of Scripture, and titles of that kind.

Then from these general statements Scriptures by Christ were introduced showing that the divisions of the Old Testament are, in general, the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms. Then of every book of the Old Testament clear declarations by these witnesses that every one of the Old Testament writings was inspired of God; and then that the end of this inspiration, or the object in view, was that they might become profitable, and profitable for a definite purpose. All that was presented in the foregoing chapters which I regard as fundamental upon this subject.

Having considered, then, the basis of inspiration, the circumstances were analyzed both in the Old Testament and the New Testament. For instance, a distinction was made between inspiration and other words, such as revelation, which is getting the knowledge of God, while inspiration is accurately stating or recording the knowledge of God; illumination, for the purpose of

understanding the statements and records of the knowledge of God, and regeneration and sanctification, for the purpose of harmonizing man with the Word of God. In this way we brought out the discriminating idea between these terms. Then examples were shown where men were inspired who had no revelation made to them, therefore inspiration and revelation are not identical. Instances also were given where men were inspired who had no illumination, therefore inspiration and illumination are distinct. The case of the prophets was cited, when they wrote out the words of God and did not know what they meant, and prayed for light on them, and even the angels stooped over from the heavens and tried to look into those things.

We found in the case of Caiaphas that he was not even conscious that he was inspired, supposing that he was speaking his own words, with a wicked intent in his mind, and yet what he said was in a higher sense from God, and bad a meaning attached to it different from the meaning in his own mind.

Then examples were shown where men were inspired who were not good men, and examples were shown of inspired men who were good men, but not sanctified men, not perfectly good men, and therefore there was no chance, when the matter was properly analyzed, to confound inspiration with revelation, regeneration, sanctification, or illumination.

Finally, as the discussion proceeded, only that part of the inspiration was considered that pertained to the records; that while men were inspired to state what God said as God wished it to be said, we were not present, did not hear those statements, and therefore would not be benefitted unless there was a phase of inspiration that went beyond the mere utterance of the Word of God.

So, in the latter part of the discussions, stress was laid upon the inspiration of the writing that the Scriptures were God-inspired. The records are inspired, and that is the part of the subject that most nearly concerns us, and that inspiration was an inspiration of the records, which made those records inerrable, not only in idea, but in word. In that case they were written just as God willed them to be written; but while the record was inspired, it did not follow that what the wicked said in that record was inspired of God, or that what the devil said in that word was inspired of God, but the record of what they said was inspired of God.

I hope the distinction is clear, because one brother was very much confounded the other day when we were discussing inspiration. He wanted to know if that dumb brute was inspired to speak, if the devil was also inspired to speak in job and in Matthew. My reply was that, in both cases, the record was inspired, and the one that prepared the record of the words of the dumb brute was inspired, the one that prepared the record of job was inspired and the one that prepared the record of the temptation of Christ was inspired, and it seems to me that any intelligent mind could see that.

David committed a grievous sin. The record that tells us about that is an inspired record, but it doesn’t tell us that God inspired David to commit the sin.

Now, if this record, the discussion went on to show, is God-inspired, and inerrable, then there must be no contradiction between the parts. If God inspired the one hundred and tenth Psalm, and God inspired the letter to the Hebrews, then the two must be in accord. They do not fight against each other; and if God inspired Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul to give us a record of the life and work and office of Jesus Christ, then Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul must be in accord. There can be no contradictions between them, and the position that we take on the matter is that

there are no contradictions in the Bible. We take that stand openly, not incidentally; advisedly, not ill-advisedly, but after years of patient study of the subject the stand has been boldly taken that the books of the Bible are in harmony with each other, and not merely in harmony with each other, but more than that, the harmony is so vital that it is not a harmony of mere juxtaposition, which is a mechanical connection, but there is a connection far more than that-it is a living connection. For instance, there is no contradiction between the finger and the ear. They are different, and yet there is a living connection between them. It is not like a wooden ear and a wooden finger. There is a living connection the same as between the eye and the heart, between the hand and the foot; and as the whole body has a vital connection, so all the parts of the Bible constitute that living, that quick and powerful Word of God that abideth forever.

Then the author proceeded to state that inspiration was closed-that not only was the canon of the Old Testament completed, but the canon of the New Testament was completed, and if completed, then what follows? There must be no superfluity, no redundancy. There is not more there than is necessary. There is everything there that is necessary.

There is no superfluity in the Word of God. We cannot trim it down. It does not admit of subtraction, and if it be a complete revelation of God, there are no deficiencies in it nothing that needs to be filled out. Therefore it is incapable of addition.

We can no more add to it than we can take from it, and if it be a complete revelation, an inspired Bible, then there must be sufficiency in it. By the sufficiency of the Scriptures is meant that they meet all the demands of the case.

There is no possible condition of human nature that can be conceived of by the mind where the Scriptures would fail of sufficient light for the guidance of the man in that condition.

They are all-sufficient. Not only did this follow, as the discussion showed, but there is efficiency-not merely sufficiency, but efficiency. It is powerful,, able to make one wise unto salvation through the Holy Spirit, who inspires the Word of God; is competent for all the purposes contemplated, so that in order to convict a man of sin we need not as a preacher go outside the Word of God to get the means of conviction to regenerate a man; we don’t need any testimony beyond the Word of God. They are convicted by the Word of God, or through the Word of God by the Holy Spirit, and therefore when a man goes out to preach, the subject-matter of his preaching is provided for. When he goes out to sow seed, the seed is provided. He is not to mix that with other seed. The sower goes out to sow, and he sows the seed that God provided-the incorruptible seed of the Word-and when he preaches, he preaches the Word; so the teachings of the Bible are efficient. The man that goes out to represent God as a preacher must preach the things that God says, must preach the Word of God, and no other word.

Now, that doesn’t mean that a preacher must not sometimes deliver a Fourth-of-July oration. He may sometimes write a poem, if he wishes, on the stars, on the mists and rainbows of a cascade. That is all right, but he must not expect to convert the world with them. The efficiency is in God’s Word, as well as the sufficiency. There is enough of it there. All of it that is there is needed, and it is very full, too, for it is a live wire.

There is no dead wire in it. It is the living Word of God, and is like a two-edged sword, and with the Spirit guiding that sword it can press to the very thoughts and intents of the human heart. Now, all

of that is dependent upon its inspiration. This is as far as the discussion has gone.

I will now take up what some people have regarded as an insuperable obstacle in the way of accepting the inspiration of the Scriptures. They say that if the Bible is inspired, and all of its records are accurate, and that there is no errancy in it, then it puts a man of science in the position that he must choose between science and the Bible, their teachings being diverse. To this man I would say that he is mistaken, and I would challenge him or any other man to show one solitary contradiction between science and the Bible. But he must confine himself to science.

Science is something known, something proven. He must not bring up his speculative theories, his mental vagaries, and call them science. I challenge him to bring up a single contradiction between the teachings of Scripture and real science.

I have seen that tested on Genesis 1:1-31. That gives an account of the creation of the universe, the formation of the earth, and the creation of man, and to this very day science-not science as represented by some men who try to set the teachings of science over against the Bible by butting their heads against the accounts in Genesis, job, certain of the Psalms, and Paul's declarations at Athens-but true science is and has ever been in harmony with the Scriptures. The Word of God stands today grasping the hand of all real science just like the coat-of-arms of the State of Kentucky "United we stand, divided we fall."

Now I will give you some science: When I was a young fellow, just before the Civil War, a great political emergency arose the question of slavery and men not only discussed it from political standpoints, but they began to discuss it from Bible standpoints, and then scientific standpoints, and there was published in the city of New York a daily paper, and because of its peculiar views on the subject of slavery it attained a circulation of many thousands. Just before the war a series of articles was published in that paper to prove that the Negro and the Caucasian, by scientific demonstration, did not have a common origin that it was impossible in the light of science that all men came from one man.

If that is true, that puts the Bible in default, for if anything in the world is taught in the Bible, it is the unity of the race.

It certainly does teach that the human race descended from Adam, and that the plan of salvation is based upon that fact, and all human redemption is based upon the fact that all these lost descendants of the first Adam are redeemed and saved in the Second Adam.

About this time two doctors, in Mobile, Alabama, who saw the question from a Southern standpoint, published a very large book, and they contradicted the articles which were published in the New York daily. They saw a conflict between science and the Bible. Well, all that was necessary in that case was not to move the Bible into the scientific camp, but let the Bible stand, and see all the scientists trooping back to get under the Bible-tent; so, I have even lived to see the time come when facts not only prove to the world that scientists are ready to demonstrate the unity of the human race, but that they, like the Indian, stood so straight up that they leaned over, and they went so far as to state that all beings had a common origin not only man, but monkeys and man; not only monkeys and man, but elephants and man; not only elephants and man, but jellyfish and man; not only jellyfish and man, but cabbage heads and man. Now, all that is necessary is not to move the Bible, but just let it stand.

I have lived to see the theory of Charles Darwin die again as Paul saw it die in its original habitation where it was proclaimed by its advocates in Athens, Corinth and Rome, and today the best advocates of science are just as ready to denounce Darwin as I am.

They say it is not science; and so the Bible goes along like Bunyan's great path, and all along we see roads leading off from it, but they come back again. Some of them cross it at right angles, but then they wind around and come back again. The road goes right on, and about every thirty years we are in harmony with science, because it comes back to us. It plays all around us, first on one side and then on the other, but we need not follow it. We are wasting our time if we try to move the solid foundations of the Bible, so as to accommodate it to the shifting vagaries of science, falsely so-called.

Here comes a marvel. Take any of the accounts of the creation of the world, viz.: the Babylonian, the Egyptian, or that which the Chinese, the Japanese, or the people of Hindustan regard as the origin of the world, and when has there ever been harmony with any scientific fact on that point? It has all the time been confusion.

Now, how was it that a Hebrew away back yonder in the land of Egypt, when all the rest of the world was at sea, if he was not inspired, could write an account of creation that stands and smiles serenely, impervious to every assault of so-called scientific thinking today, as it was then? It is the inspired Word of God.

I have had scientists to bring up that instance of Joshua commanding the sun to stand still. Some preachers skip that chapter, and I am sorry for them. They had better read it just as it is. They had better take it just as it reads.

Only a few weeks ago I saw in a book of great power, an absolute demonstration of what would have been projected as a result if the sun and the moon had stopped, and I have certainly seen it demonstrated that it would not have occurred. But suppose they put God into the account; if they would just put God in there, that would be a guarantee. He would know how to manage it. I suppose we all believe in an all-powerful God; He could take care of the situation, unless we have a God who finds some things too much for Him. I suppose He could manage that little affair just as He could raise a dead man to life that had gone into corruption. The great battleground, if we are going to make one of contradictions, is the battleground of the resurrection. Take the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul. Now, can any one, from those records, prove either errancy or contradiction in those accounts? I have been over it a great many times, and I freely confess that I see no contradiction in the statements of the witnesses.

I select now a single item which seems to be a positive contradiction in the whole thing. Mark says that Christ was crucified at a certain hour of the day, and John says that He was crucified about six hours later than that. Now, there are the statements with six hours difference. The commentator comes to it, throws down his pen and he says, "There must be some mistake here in the copy. As it stands it is a palpable contradiction."

I have long since found out that a man ought to go slow about affirming a mistake in the copy. I admit that is a possibility, but I don't believe that is the best way to meet this. Can it be reconciled in any other way?

Yes, and there is this explanation of it: Mark wrote as a Jew, and followed the Jewish method of computation, which was from sunrise to sunset and from sunset to sunrise. John followed the Roman method of computation, just exactly as we do. We count from midnight to noon and from noon to midnight. One minute after twelve o'clock, midnight, is A. M.

"Well," says one, "if this is true, that will harmonize it exactly, but what is your evidence that John employed the Roman method?" My evidence is fully set forth in his Gospel. He used the Roman hour, and some of the cases absolutely demand it. All we have to do is to take the Gospel of John, go through it and see where he refers to hours.

That, of course, is met by the statement that the Romans did not use that method, and we simply meet that by proving that they did use it, and at least five of the best Roman historians state that they did. But the question comes up: Why should John employ that method and not the others? The answer is that the others wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem, before the Jewish nation had been blotted out by that fearful catastrophe. John wrote many years after Jerusalem was destroyed, when the Jewish method of computation no longer governed anywhere. The time that he wrote in Ephesus was about the year 90, or later, which would be at least twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and it was the most natural thing in the world that all through his Gospel he should have employed the Roman method; and I can cite some passages in John where you are compelled to have it.

I have seen these contradictions melt away until I have lost all confidence in them. Now, a boy is usually a great deal smarter than his father, and than he is when he gets to be a father. When I was a boy I thought I had found a thousand contradictions in the Bible. In the old Bible of my young manhood I marked them.

Well, I had then nearly a thousand more contradictions than I have now. I do not see them now; they are not there. There are perhaps a half dozen in the Bible that I cannot explain satisfactorily to myself. I don't say that my explanation of all the others would satisfy everybody. There are some that I cannot explain satisfactorily to myself; but since I have seen nine hundred and ninety-four out of the thousand coalesce and harmonize like two streams mingling, I am disposed to think that if I had more sense I could harmonize those other six; and even if I forever fail to harmonize them, God knows better than I know, and that when I know perfectly just as I now know only in part, and only a very small part, I will be able to understand that; and so when I come to things of that kind and cannot master them, I put them in a parenthesis and say, "I will come back; God won't leave you penned forever; He will send somebody that can take away the difficulty and make it clear to me." I assume that it can be done. The President of the State University once remarked about a noted infidel in Waco, that his infidelity arose from this: He had read a book against the Bible which he could not answer, and he concluded that as it was a book he could not answer, it was unanswerable, and it is the-best explanation I ever heard of that man. He is just the kind of man that would assume that anything he could not solve was unsolvable.

We will not take that position. We need to get away from such conceit.

Believing that we have an infallible standard, we will go on like the old-time Baptists, who put it in their articles of faith, and we can do nothing better than to close this last chapter with the same quotation from our Confession of Faith with which the first chapter was introduced:

“We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions shall be tried.”

# 04.09. FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

Ft1 With the desire to secure the opinion of Dr. A. T. Robertson. of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and perhaps the greatest Greek scholar in America. I submitted to him some pages from this chapter in which the author discusses at some length the critical meaning of the word anothen and asked Dr. Robertson to give me his view on Dr. Carroll's interpretation of this Greek word. Replying to my query, he said: "The literal meaning of anothen is 'from above,' and the contest in Luke's Gospel will make good sense with Dr. Carroll's translation of it. THE EDITOR.

Chapter 31

# 05.01. B.H. Carroll’s Interpretation of the English Bible Topics

B.H. Carroll’s Interpretation of the English Bible Topics.

Chapter 32

# 05.02. Introduction To An Interpretation Of The English Bible

I INTRODUCTION TO AN INTERPRETATION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE

My theme is a thrilling one – THE ENGLISH BIBLE. The most natural construction of this topic calls for a history of the Bible in English from the earliest crude version in this tongue to the latest version, and for a summing up of the value of these versions in their traceable effect on our language and literature, on individual character, on the family, the unit of society, on business and commerce, on national policy, legislation and life, and on world evangelization, civilization and unity.

A less natural construction allows the more timely discussion of the value of a thorough study of the whole Bible in English by English-speaking people.

In expressing a preference for this less natural construction of the demands of the topic, I do not seek to disparage the interesting character and importance of the discussion as delimited by the first construction. No event in any nation's history can be more momentous and far-reaching than the giving to them of the Word of God in their mother tongue and allowing it to be an open book at every fireside, with no page or promise or precept darkened by the proscriptive shadow of priest or state. The book is for the people themselves. It is God's message to man and is addressed in all its sublime simplicity to the individual heart and conscience, obligating the personal responsibility of private judgment.

You recall the notable fact at Babel, showing that division of the race into nations arose from a prior confusion of tongues and not different languages from a prior division into nations. A common speech is the greatest factor of unity.

And you will observe also in that other Bible story that Pentecost, by its gift of many tongues to one set of men, reversed the disintegration of Babel, prepared the way for breaking down the middle walls of partition which separated peoples, and rejoiced the hearts of the representatives of every nation under heaven, who thereby were enabled to hear the Word of God each in the tongue wherein he was born. And you also recall the apostolic declaration that whoever speaks in an unknown tongue to another even though he speak the words of life is unto his hearer as a barbarian. Even a thing without life, a bugle, a harp, or flute, if it give no distinction in its sounds conveys no message to the hearer. And when I consider what the English version of the Bible has wrought, I could not overestimate the greatness of the topic under this construction. (See 1 Corinthians 14:7 f.)

On the contrary, I desire to commend as one of the most charming and instructive classics of our language, "The History of the English Bible," by Doctor Pattison, of the Rochester Theological Seminary. Every preacher, every Sunday school teacher, every English-speaking Christian, yea, every student of our language, would do good to himself by adding to his library this valuable contribution to our literature. Yet, very weighty are the reasons which constrain me to adopt the line of discussion suggested by the less natural construction of the topic.

The Bible in English is valueless unless we study it. Mighty as has been the influence of this version, that influence has been measured by the study of the Book. If all the English speaking people had made this version a vade mecum, a lamp to their feet and the oracle of their counsel, the millennium would be here now. We have the Book, but do we study it? Do we study it all? Who of use ver devoted himself to a four years' consecutive course of earnest and prayerful study of the English Bible, covering all its parts from Genesis to Revelation, allowing the Book to mean what it wants to mean, and to be, by comparison of all its parts, its own interpreter? THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA The idea of the work in this form originated in this way: First, a statement in a great introductory oration by Dr. Boyce at Greenville, South Carolina, that the Baptist ministry consists of two kinds – an educated ministry, and a ministry of educated men – meaning by "an educated ministry" people in the ministry who had received a college or university education; and meaning by "a ministry of educated men," men trained for the ministerial work, whether holding college or university degrees, being thoroughly disciplined in the truth of the Bible. The history of the denomination shows that the greatest achievements of the past in Baptist history have been by men who were educated in the Bible) but not college men. To further explain this idea, I quote from Dr. Broadus' History of Preaching: "Let us bear in mind that the early progress of Christianity, that great and wonderful progress to which we still appeal as one of the proofs of its divine origin, was due mainly to the labours of obscure men, who have left no sermons, and not even a name to history, but whose work remains plain before the all-seeing eye, and whose reward is sure. Hail, ye unknown, forgotten brethren] we celebrate the names of your leaders, but will not forget that you fought the battles, and gained the victories. The Christian world feels your impress, though it has lost your names. And we likewise, if we cannot live in men's memories, will rejoice at the thought that if we work for God our work shall live, and we too shall live in our work.

"And not only are these early labourers now unknown, but most of them were in their own day little cared for by the great and the learned. Most of them were uneducated. Throughout the first two or three centuries it continued to be true that not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, were called to be Christian ministers or Christians at all. It was mainly the foolish things, weak things, base things, that God chose. And what power they had through the story of the cross, illuminated by earnest Christian living! . . . And such preachers have abounded from that day to this, in every period, country and persuasion in which Christianity was making any real and rapid progress."

The thought is strongly reinforced in that great book, now much neglected by our people, Wayland's Principles and Practices of the Baptists. What a pity we cannot get our people to carefully read over again what he has to say upon this very subject!

The sentiments thus set forth by these three great men of our history I unhesitatingly accept. These are followed by an additional thought, to wit: That there ought to be some place higher in character and extent of its work than Bible institutes and Sunday schools, for preachers and laymen to meet together to study the Word of God thoroughly. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE, AND THE TIME REQUIRED

The course requires that four consecutive years shall be devoted to the study of the Bible itself, and not of things about the Bible, and must be arranged to cover in the best method possible within the time limits the whole Bible – every chapter and verse of every book from Genesis to

Revelation. One hour each of four days in every school week must be devoted to teaching and recitation, and twice as many to study.

While it is in every way desirable that each student shall complete the entire course, yet our method of study will possess this advantage – that a failure to complete the course does not destroy the value of a partial course. Every lesson even, apart from all others, will be profitable; and this profit will be greatly enhanced if you prepare the lessons covering only one book.

LITERARY QUALIFICATIONS OF THE STUDENTS

The higher one's scholastic attainments, the wider the range of his general information, the more perfect the discipline of his mind, the more systematic his habits of application, the better is he prepared to take this course, and the more profit will he likely derive from it. But if these high qualifications were made conditions of entrance into this course, the main object in view would be frustrated. The one prerequisite, therefore, is ability to read and write in English, accompanied with a little common sense.

The course itself will quicken and develop his capacities and enlarge his acquirements. A course thus restricted, and with this minimum of antecedent qualifications necessarily assumes or takes for granted many things to which a modern theological seminary devotes much special and critical inquiry. These, for the time being, are left to subsequent opportunity, which indeed in some cases may never come.

The study of the things thus deferred, even if by necessity deferred forever, is not disparaged. But it is claimed that the study of the Bible itself – what it says and what it means to the common mind – is a primal, elemental, vital, and fundamental requirement, binding on every Christian conscience, and intensely obligatory upon the mind and heart of every preacher.

TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER HELPS The only textbook absolutely requisite is the English Bible. The Common, or King James Version, can be made to serve, but the Canterbury Revision, or the American Standard Version, is much preferred. On the first book of the Bible Conant's translation of Genesis, with its critical notes, is very helpful.

Editions of both Testaments can be had with the King James Version and Canterbury Revision in parallel columns. The Jewish translation of the Old Testament, by Isaac Leeser will be helpful; and the improved edition of the American Bible Union Version of the New Testament.

In the study of the Gospels, Broadus' Harmony will be the textbook. After that, Clarke's Harmony of the Acts will be the textbook, compared with Goodwin's Harmony of the Life of Paul. The student will need a concordance, Cruden's or Young's, and access to Smith's Bible Dictionary, either abridged or unabridged, and to the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, and to some analysis of the Bible, West's or Hitchcock's. This last to aid in comparing scripture with scripture. We are now ready for a statement of the principle.

THINGS ASSUMED

That very critical study of the things deferred calls for a wider range of learning and a higher grade of scholarship than the commonalty of men, or even the average preacher, now has or ever will have. By necessity, therefore, this needed but special work must fall upon a comparatively small

class, and this class itself in turn be measurably dependent upon the greater scholarship and information of a very few highly qualified experts.

It is assumed that the teacher himself has necessary general information, and either possesses adequate scholarship or is sufficiently acquainted with its best results to safely guide his class; and while avoiding technical phraseology and nomenclature, can point out and expound what the Bible itself says in the principal passages which have been made the occasion of minute, far-reaching, and destructive criticism.

For example: (a) the alleged discrepancies in matter and style between Genesis 1:1-31 and Genesis 2:1-25; (b) between Exodus 6:3, and certain passages in Genesis; (c) between Jeremiah 7:22, and similar passages from other prophets on the one hand, and the historical statement of Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy on the other hand. It is assumed that the providence of God, overruling all human agencies and earthly circumstances, has preserved for the race all that is needed of the revelations his goodness bestowed at sundry times and through divers instrumentalities, and has assured reliability in the records embodying them, and their correlated matter. And that this Providence has also overruled in the combination of the several books necessary to a complete canon.

That this library of many books embodied now in one book and called by us the Holy Bible, not only contains, but is the Word of God and is both so necessary and complete in every part that it may not be subject to addition or subtraction, and that, being inspired of God throughout, it must remain to the end of the world as the sufficient, supreme, and infallible standard by which all human creed and conduct should be regulated in time, and by which they shall be judged at the last day.

That our present Hebrew and Greek texts being in essential substance transcripts of the original manuscripts in these tongues, are sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes; no doctrine, or precept, or promise, or hope being lost or affected by transcription.

That our English versions do with substantial fidelity and accuracy translate the Hebrew and Greek texts, and where difficulties arise, helps, brief but sufficient for the purposes of this course, are accessible to the English student.

That this book, as we now have it, both as a whole and in all its parts, is profitable for teaching what we ought to know and believe, and for conviction and correction of all wrongdoing, and for instruction in all right doing, in order that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped unto every good work.

It is assumed that in our Baptist literary schools, or in other accessible schools or theological seminaries, abundant provision is made in behalf of those needing it or desiring it, for both the needed scholarships and its employment in pursuing the studies about the Bible only briefly considered in this course, whether relating to textual or historical criticism, or to any other department of study prescribed in modern universities or theological seminaries.

It is assumed that this course in the English Bible will not only not be in opposition to, or a substitute for, higher scholarship and more critical studies, but will promote them by tending powerfully and continually to increase the number of recruits seeking to add to knowledge strictly

biblical all other helpful knowledge relative to it, and that too from a class who, without the awakening and inspiration of this course, would certainly never seek higher attainments, and more certainly never pursue special and critical studies. All observation and experience justify the expectation that when the mental horizon has been widened, aspiration kindled and the love of God’s word by study of the Bible in the mother tongue, it will be difficult for the student to stop at the terminus of an elemental and fundamental course.

But the hope may be reasonably cherished that one grounded in this elemental course will be safeguarded in many directions while pursuing other courses, and will at least have attained to familiarity with all the Book itself. And, sad to say, this safeguarding and attainment many never possess who actually become or affect to become experts in the things about the Bible.

GENERAL RULES

The Bible is its own interpreter. That is, we arrive at the meaning of any passage by a comparison of scripture with scripture. Revelation is a unit, or system of truth. The parts must be interpreted to agree with each other, and with the trend of the whole system. A difficult or doubtful passage, here or there, must not be set aside but must conform to what is clearly taught in many unambiguous scriptures. As the Bible was given us for practical purposes, bearing upon character, conduct and destiny, our study of it, to be profitable, must be in a line with these purposes. The very heart of every lesson, therefore, will be its doctrine on these points, and this doctrine must be so received by faith and assimilated by obedience as to become experimental knowledge. "Whosoever willeth to do the will of God shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

Continual confirmation and increased assurance that we are rightly interpreting the Divine Word can come to only those who can say: "Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord," in the same experimental way which brings its own blessings with every forward step. "But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing." As this book is the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, reverent and prayerful appeal to him for its right understanding and application is continually necessary.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA

The idea of a course of study in the English Bible which would comprehend the entire book is not of recent origin. Even before my conversion, when the book was considered merely from the standpoint of literature, it seemed to me the best and richest of the classics, and utterly apart from any thought of its alleged inspiration, to deserve a place in the curriculum of a liberal education far beyond that assigned Greek and Roman classics, or to the other acknowledged masterpieces of our own tongue. That at least our textbooks should include selections from its history, moral code, jurisprudence, worship, poetry, orations, essays, and parables, sufficiently full in extent to convey a fair understanding of the scope and variety of this matchless library of literature: selections something like in extent and variety those given in Professor Wilkinson’s Foreign Classics in English.

From any literary viewpoint I could see no good reason far excluding from our schools a study of this book, while giving so much attention to the myths, fables, legends, idolatries, philosophies, and skeptical speculations selected from ancient heathen and more modern foreign classics. In

moral purity and sublimity of thought, grandeur of matter and loftiness of design, they all fall below the excluded Hebrew literature.

But soon after my conversion, and in the light of it, my reflections began to take, and continued to take with cumulative power, a wider and intenser form. In this Book alone I found the origin and destiny of all created things and beings – here alone the nature of man, and his relations to God, the universe and fellow man, out of which arise all of his obligations and aspirations, and in conformity to which lie his usefulness and happiness. This Book alone discloses man's chief good and chief end.

I saw it as the only living oracle, replying instantly and freely in simple, unambiguous language to every interrogatory propounded by life's problems and perplexities. In its presence the double-tongued oracles of the heathen became dumb, their dubious utterances died into echoless silence and their idolatries and superstitions were relegated to the moles and bats.

From this reflection there was an unconscious transition to the natural inquiry: Are the people ignorant of the matter of this Book? And if informed somewhat, how extensive and systematic is their knowledge? Investigation brought an appalling answer to this inquiry: Very few were found to be students of the Book. Fragmentarily, here and there, and from many sources, something of its matter had been picked up by most men. Much of this in corrupt form.

The inquiry passed from the pew to the pulpit, and here the disclosure was more startling. These men by office and profession were the teachers of the Book. Surely these preachers have studied earnestly, prayerfully, profoundly, and systematically all of the messages they are appointed to teach I And if they have not as yet, in some fashion, gone over the whole ground, surely they are habitually and diligently prosecuting such a study! If every one of the sacred writings is inspired of God, and is profitable for teaching what men ought to know and believe, and for conviction and correction of all wrongdoing, and instruction in all right doing to the end that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped unto every good work, surely a teacher of the Book will neglect no part of it, and will hasten to acquaint himself with it.

But the amazing truth must be acknowledged that few preachers, learned or unlearned, actually study the Bible itself, their supreme textbook, as a complete and well-ordered system of divine truth. It does not square with the facts in the case to limit this ignorance of the Bible to uneducated country preachers. Some of them study the Bible itself more, and are better acquainted with it, than many educated preachers. Too many of the latter class confine their studies to the framework and background of the divine painting, to the human outskirts and spurs of the mountain of revelation, to the temporary and perishing scaffolding of the temple of truth. The scholastic spirit drives out the Holy Spirit; the study of the myriad vagaries of subtle and ever-shifting philosophies, and of the protean shapes of speculative hypotheses and hairsplitting criticisms on text or history, becomes their theological task. And to this task, what are the labors of Hercules? Even searing with a hot iron does not stop the growth of new heads on this Hydra.

A teacher in the public schools must stand a critical examination on his textbook before receiving a certificate of efficiency. How many preachers could stand such an examination on the Bible? Let any preacher with sufficient honesty and courage to face the disclosure, make a candid examination of his own ministry in any given period of years on three points.

Say in five years, what amount of habitual, systematic study have I devoted to the Bible itself, and over how much of the whole ground of revelation have I passed in this time? Is not the most of my study merely to get a sermon for my next appointment?

Judging fairly from the aggregate of all the texts from which I have preached in five years, how much of the Bible itself have the people learned from me in that time?

Has my practice conformed to the example of the prophets and apostles and of our Lord, the Great Teacher?

While standing in amazement before this ignorance of the Bible, in both pew and pulpit, another question smote me like lightning leaping out of the bosom of a cloud: Is there in all the world a school where all this Word of God is taught in the mother tongue of the people?

To the most diligent investigation the answer came like the note of a funeral dirge: There is not one in the world! More than twenty-five years ago, before a great audience, I propounded this question: What would be the power of a man who with only Cruden's Concordance as a help, devotes three entire years to the reverent and prayerful study of the English Bible? Let this application be as rigid as a course in mathematics. Let him put aside for the time being all that he cannot understand from a comparison of scripture with scripture; then construct by his own analysis an orderly body of divinity.

Would not this man be a theologian? Would he not have an inexhaustible store of Bible sermons? Would he not, other things being equal, tower among the preachers like Saul, head and shoulders above his fellows?

Would he not be an original thinker? Would he not know how to handle the Bible? Would he not be approved unto God as a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, able to rightly divide the word of truth, giving to each hearer his portion in due season?

The world is waiting for that man, ready to receive and honor him when he arrives. We have in all history only one near approximation to this supposititious man, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, who, by common consent, is acknowledged to be the greatest preacher since apostolic times. I have seen 2,500 of his published sermons. They we as plump as a partridge, and as full of meat as an egg. Now from several complete sets of these sermons you may construct:

(a) A fairly good commentary on the whole Bible by arranging all of one set according to the books from which the texts are taken.

(b) Then by topical arrangement of another set you may obtain a complete body of systematic theology.

(c) From another set you may construct a system of practical theology, or of homiletics, or of some other department, until you virtually cover the whole ground of theological equipment in its practical phases, and as adapted to the exigencies of everyday life.

These sermons show that he reverently and prayerfully studied the whole Bible, honestly regarding it as inspired of God from Genesis to Revelation, and by simple childlike faith accepting all of it as the word of God. With what result? More fruit ripened on that tree than on any other that

has blossomed since the apostles died.

The world heard, and accepted, and honored the man; orphans were sheltered, clothed, fed, and educated; aged widows found asylums in the clouded sunset of life; thousands upon thousands in many lands were converted to God; colporteurs pushed out their wagons laden with wholesome books; schools and churches sprang up as by magic; preachers and teachers kindled their torches at his fire, and diffused in worldwide waves the light of the spiritual conflagration.

These reflections, substantially in the order stated, led me to seek light on a school model in the book itself. Here is what I found:

The school of the prophets established by Samuel, and further developed by Elijah and Elisha. These men were not priests. They had no part in the ritual of the Temple service. They were teachers of God’s Word. They constituted the only breakwater against the incoming floods of empty formalism and of multitudinous idolatries. They were the axes with which God hewed off the excrescences of national life, and his trumpets of judgment against social, religious and political corruption. They were the forerunners of a faithful ministry of a later day.

I found the school established by our Lord Jesus Christ. One day he looked out on multitudes of the people and was moved with compassion. He saw them scattered and helpless as sheep without a shepherd. He saw them wandering, groping, stumbling, and falling a prey to every ravenous beast. He turned to his disciples with an exhortation to prayer: "Pray ye to the Lord of the harvest that he send more labourers into the harvest." Then he called to him twelve men as his first class. They were neither from the ranks of the great, the learned, nor of the rich. They were poor men, ignorant Galilean fishermen. He kept them with him for instruction for three years. His Sermon on the Mount was his first great lesson. Then from a boat he taught them in matchless similitudes which later he expounded more privately. The lessons were followed by the question: "Have ye understood all these things?" and with the declaration: "Every scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven is a householder who brings out of his treasure things new and old."

He continued his instructions to the night of his betrayal, opening and expounding all the things concerning himself written in the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms, and yet later enduring them with the spiritual power to shake the world.

I found the example of the Holy Spirit in recruiting new students: "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not to bring to naught things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence."

I found that when he called a great and learned man, Saul of Tarsus, this man relied not on his earthly wisdom and learning, but himself said: "And I, brethren, when I came unto you, came not with excellency of speech or wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

From these Bible examples I turned to history and found four significant facts established by its univocal testimony:

The great majority of the preachers in every age had but little learning except what they gathered from the Bible.

That the great majority of the people in every age had to content themselves with the ministry of this unlearned class.

That schools were established at great expense to highly equip the comparatively small but much-needed class of preachers who became mighty in learning. I rejoice at this wise provision, while deploring the sometime perversion of it.

I found no provision for the great majority to be helped in Bible study.

From history I turned to Baptist polity and found, as I have already shown, that Baptist polity and history are in accord with these statements, viz.: that the ministry should not be restricted to the learned and socially great, but should include as many of every class as God himself shall call.

Then I narrowed the vision to Texas and saw:

About three thousand Baptist preachers.

That about fifty of these annually go abroad to theological seminaries in other states.

That provision is made in Texas schools to advance the literary education of several hundred more.

That neither in literary schools here, nor in theological seminaries abroad, is there provision for a course of study in the English Bible itself, anyway nearly approaching the course outlined in this chapter. No one who has ever taken what is called the English course in a theological seminary will claim any such thing. If he does, he will be contradicted by his classmates. I doubt that any theological seminary would admit such a course into its curriculum. It may be they are wise in this. I am not controverting but merely slating a fact. I am merely tracing the origin and development of the idea concerning the course here and now announced, and suggesting the reasons which led to its adoption in the present form.

I saw ever before me two multitudes: the multitude of unlearned preachers; and the far greater multitude who can never have any other ministry. I confess my heart goes out to them. My natural instincts incline me to an aristocracy. But Jesus Christ made me a democrat. I use the term in its etymological, not political sense. I have longed for years to see a school for the study of the English Bible.

I cannot shut out of my mind the three thousand preachers of Texas, while rejoicing that fifty can go abroad to attend theological seminaries.

It is respectfully submitted that help toward a literary education in a college, and help toward a theological education in a seminary, both of which are advocated and commended, do not exhaust the meaning of ministerial education. There is a need not yet supplied for a greater number than can profit by either of these provisions.

For the establishment of this course, we deem conclusive the following

REASONS:

There is no school of the kind on earth.

It follows the example set by our Lord himself, and accords with the Holy Spirit's choice of men to preach the gospel.

It accords with settled Baptist polity.

It is needed for both the learned and the unlearned.

Not being restricted to preachers, it will aid in the training of Sunday school teachers of both sexes.

It encourages the study of God's Word by the pew, which must, under divine law, judge the soundness in doctrine of the preacher himself.

Not more than one in a thousand will study the whole Bible, or any part of it systematically, apart from the requirements of a regular course.

Shall we not with joy and enthusiasm labor together to make this work a crowning glory to our seminary?

Upon the enterprise let us invoke the favor of men and the blessings of God.

QUESTIONS

1. What history of the English Bible is commended?

2. What is the proposed course in the English Bible, and the time required for completing it?

3. Why will it be valuable to take even a small part of this course?

4. What minimum literary qualifications required?

5. What textbooks required?

6. Helps suggested?

7. Considering the restricted scope of the course, and the minimum literary qualifications, what things are necessarily assumed? State briefly and substantially.

8. State briefly and substantially the general rules governing the course.

9. Why does the Bible, from a literary standpoint, deserve a larger place in a course of study looking to a liberal education?

10. Why from the standpoint of its inspiration?

11. Are the people generally well informed as to Bible teaching?

12. Do preachers generally study it systematically?

13. Is there a school in the world where the whole Bible is taught?

14. What may be constructed from several sets of Spurgeon’s published sermons and addresses?

15. What does this show as to his study of the Bible?

16. State briefly the result on human life and character of his Bible study and preaching.

17. What example of a Bible school have we in the Old Testament?

18. What good was accomplished by this school of the prophets?

19. What school in the New Testament?

20. From what classes generally does the Holy Spirit recruit his preachers?

21. What four significant facts does history declare?

22. What is Baptist polity with reference to educated and uneducated preachers?

23. How many Baptists in Texas?

24. What proportion of the Baptists of the world?

25. How many Baptist preachers in Texas?

26. About what number annually go abroad for theological education?

27. About how many annually seek literary advantages in Texas schools?

28. What proportion of these in Baylor University?

29. Is the course in the English Bible limited to preachers?

30. Why should Baptist laymen study the Bible?

31. What reasons led to the opening of this course?

# 05.03. Introductory Studies

II INTRODUCTORY STUDIES

There will be two chapters on the introduction to the Old Testament and to the book of Genesis. This is the first chapter. It is not designed at all, by these brief introductions, to take the place of the extensive work of biblical introduction, but only to give some general outlines of the relations of the book of Genesis.

I will commence with our English word "Bible." It has two derivations. The first derivation was from the Greek neuter plural Biblia, which means a library or collection of books. The word, "Holy," indicates the character of the books as distinguished from secular books, so that the words, "Holy Bible," mean sacred library. Later on, after all of the books were bound together into one volume, the word "Bible" was derived from the singular Greek word, Biblos, and is properly called “a” or "the book."

DIVISIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD AND THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BIBLE

In general terms, there are Romanists, Greeks, and Protestants. Only technically do Baptists belong to the Protestants; in a general way you may include them with the Protestants. The Romanists have an English Bible, the Douay Version, which, in the Old Testament, differs from our Bible by certain additions. I will state these differences: (1) Just after Nehemiah they insert two books, Tobit and Judith; (2) they add to the book of Esther six and a half chapters; (3) just after Song of Solomon they insert two books, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; (4) just after Lamentations they insert a book, Baruch; (5) between Daniel 3:23-24, they insert 67 verses; (6) at the close of this book they add two chapters, The History of Susanna and The Story of Bel and the Dragon; (7) after Malachi they put two additional books, I and 2 Maccabees. These books and parts of books which they add are not found in the Hebrew Bible at all. They were never accepted by the Jews as a part of their sacred oracles. They are sometimes inserted between the Old Testament and New Testament as parts of what is called the Apocrypha, that is, the questioned books of the Old Testament.

The Romanists have the same New Testament that we have, but there is another quite important distinction between their English Bible and ours. Theirs is not a translation from the original languages at all, but it is a translation of a translation. It is a translation into English of what is called The Vulgate, or the Jerome Latin Bible, and while the whole of it is a fine piece of work, in the main, it is in itself but a translation from the faulty Greek version called the Septuagint. And in that respect it is very inferior to our Bible. Their English Bible is, therefore, different from ours in the renderings or translations. I will give you two samples out of many: In Genesis 3:15, where the promise is that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head, they render: "she shall bruise the serpent’s head" – making a woman and not the Saviour the bruiser of the serpent’s bead. Again, where our Bible says "repent," theirs says "do penance."

We next come to the Jewish Bible in English. I have a copy of it before me. It is a very modern translation; after the King James, and even after the Canterbury Revision, which I advise you to purchase when able. It is by Isaac Leeser, printed in 1891 at Chicago. The difference between this English Bible and our Old Testament is that this version was made so late that all those passages which ancient Jews counted as messianic, this version strains to so render as to weaken, if not destroy, any application to our Lord Jesus Christ. The original of the Jewish Bible has exactly the same matter as our Old Testament, and the same books; it is only a difference of translation.

DIVISIONS OF THE BIBLE

In our English Bible there are two grand divisions, called the Old Testament and the New Testament. The word "testament" is a very unfortunate translation of the original Greek word, dialheke, because our Bible is not a last will and testament. In only two verses in the New Testament ought diatheke to be translated "testament": Hebrews 9:16-17. Here, plainly, the reference is to the last will and testament of a man who, as testator, must die before his heirs can inherit. In every other place in the New Testament the Greek word diatheke should be translated "covenant," which is quite a different thing from a last will and testament. So we really should call these two great divisions "The Old and New Covenants," and Paul does so call them in his letter to the Hebrews. Now, the idea of the translation, "testament," was suggested by two passages of Scripture: Matthew 26:28 – "This is my blood of the new testament"; and the other passage is Hebrews 9:15, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament [and it ought to have been rendered "covenant"], that by means of death) for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." While, therefore, there are points of analogy between a man’s will and God’s covenant, yet some hurtful interpretations have arisen by calling these two divisions of our Bible "Old and New Testaments." I refer particularly to a book of a certain sect looking upon the New Covenant as a testament or last will of Jesus Christ. He says that as under a will nobody can inherit until after the death of the testator, therefore no sins could be remitted, and there could be no children of God, until after Christ died, a failure to Dote the difference between the time of expiation and the time of remission. The true interpretation of this matter is set forth in the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, Art. VIII, Sec. 6, and in Art. XI, Sec. 6, which read:

Art. VIII, Sec. 6, Philadelphia Baptist Confession: Although the price of redemption was not actually paid by Christ till after His incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy, and benefit thereof was communicated to the elect in all ages successively from the beginning of the world, in and by those promises, types, and sacrifices wherein He was revealed and signified to be the seed of the woman which should bruise the serpent’s head, and the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, being the same yesterday, today, and forever.

Art. XI, Sec. 6: The justification of believers under the Old Testament was, in all these respects, one and the same with the justification of believers tinder the New Testament.

So you are to understand that the translation, "testament," is not inspired; it is a human, misleading rendering of the Greek word, diatheke.

SOME OTHER DIVISIONS

The Jews divided their Bible into the following classifications: "The Law, The Prophets, and The Holy Writings." They understood by the Law the five books of Moses, the Pentateuch, and they divided their prophets into two classes: those who record history, as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, which are called the Earlier Prophets, not because they were prophecies, but because they were books which prophets wrote. Their second subdivision of the second division is the Later Prophets, and these they have divided into Greater and Lesser: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and then the twelve minor prophets. To some it is a matter of surprise that their third main division contains Daniel – not that Daniel has no prophecy in it, but because Daniel's office was not prophetic. He was the prime minister of an earthly government, and, while there is much revelation in Daniel, yet there is very little prophecy directly uttered by him. He records marvelous revelations which God gives to him, and those revelations have much of the element of prophecy. For the same reason they include the psalms in their third division. David was not by office a prophet. By office he was a king, but incidentally he prophesied much in the psalms. Some people are greatly troubled at the thought that Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are classed among the prophets, and that Daniel's book is not classed among the prophets. You understand that there is no denial of the prophetic element in Daniel, but that his was not the prophetic office, and that there is no assertion that Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are prophecies, but that they were written by prophets.

BOOK DIVISIONS

Our Old Testament has thirty-nine books; twenty-seven in the New Testament – sixty-six books in all. The Romanist Old Testament has forty-six books, and their New Testament the same as ours. The Jewish translation in English has thirty-nine just like ours, but they have two different enumerations of these books. The first is twenty-four, obtained in this way: combining 1 and 2 Samuel as one book, 1 and 2 Kings as one, 1 and 2 Chronicles as one, Ezra and Nehemiah as one, and then the twelve minor prophets as one book, making twenty-four in all, answering to the letters of the Greek alphabet. Then again they are divided into twenty-two books, as found in Josephus. According to this combination Ruth and Judges make one book, and Jeremiah and Lamentations make one, answering to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. The New Testament recognizes the threefold division of the Old Testament – The Law, The Prophets, and The Psalms. Our Lord himself so recognizes it in Luke 24:44 : "All the things that are written concerning me in the law, the prophets and the psalms." THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS

The order is not inspired, nor chronological, nor at all times logical. The Jewish Bible collates the books for liturgical purposes, i.e.) for readings in the Temple, the synagogue, or the home, so as to provide special lessons for each year, each week and each day. Now, if we had to put the books of the Bible down in the order of their history, we have it about right as far as the second book of Kings. If we should arrange them according to the date of the writing, then, in my opinion, Job should come first, both logically and chronologically. In the New Testament they are arranged according to a mixed method, more historically than chronologically. Perhaps the first book of the New Testament was James' letter; then would come Paul's letter to the Thessalonians; next, his letters to the Corinthians, then Galatians and the Romans; and the letters of his first Roman imprisonment – Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, and Hebrews. And then would follow Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, and the letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus. John's Gospel and letters come very much later than the others, with Revelation last of all. It is important for you to

know that fact in order to know how much of the written New Testament each man had at the time he himself wrote.

DIVISION OF THE BIBLE INTO CHAPTERS AND VERSES

This is not inspired. The division into chapters took place about the middle of the thirteenth century, A.D., and the honor of making that division lies between Cardinal Hugo and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton. The object of the division was to make a concordance, and so about the middle of the thirteenth century the first concordance of the Bible was made. The division into verses took place in the sixteenth century A.D., by Robert Stephens, a printer in Paris, and that added very much to the facility in making concordances. While generally these chapter and verse divisions are fine, sometimes they break the connection and dislocate the thought most arbitrarily. For example: Genesis I should include the first three verses of the second chapter. THE BIBLE AS A STANDARD

You ask a Catholic what is the supreme standard by which all conduct and creed and destiny are determined, and he will say: "The Bible, with the additions that we put in it, and in the translations that we give, and in the interpretations we give, together with tradition." To illustrate: Suppose you and a Roman Catholic were debating, and he should cite a proof text from Tobit, or Judith, or Baruch, or 1 or 2 Maccabees, or Wisdom, or Ecclesiasticus – e this would be authority to him, it would not be for you, but only uninspired Jewish literature. Then, he would want to quote either from the Vulgate Latin Version made by Jerome, or the Douay Version, which is but a translation of the Latin Version into English, and then he would want to confine you to the interpretations put upon it by the Church of Rome, and ultimately the dictum of the Pope, while you would naturally object to hia text, his renderings, and his interpretations; so you could not join in an issue. Your standard and his standard are not the same. THE METHOD OF STUDY

Now, I want to say something about the method of studying the Bible in the Old Testament. The history of the Old Testament is really divided into two parts – just as distinct as it is possible for parts to be. The first part takes the history from Genesis to the close of 2 Kings, the destruction of the Jewish monarchy, with those prophets who prophesied in that period of time. Now, the other part of history commences with Chronicles, and instead of following the other order, it makes a new start from Adam. It commences with Adam and Eve, going back to the beginning. It does not recognize anything but the Davidic line. Now join with that Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, for history, and the post-Exile prophets, and the lines of thought are different. There is a pause where the Jewish monarchy dies. There is a new beginning after the return from the Exile. While we can and do use Chronicles in harmonic connection with Samuel and Kings, yet a part of I Chronicles does not synchronize with those books at all; but goes back to Adam. For this second part of the Old Testament history you need an entirely new viewpoint. You ought to commence the second part of the Old Testament with Chronicles, then Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel, and the post-Exile prophets: Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. They form a later and distinct part of the Old Testament history. I call attention to another division of Old Testament history, very clearly indicated in the original by an initial word, which is just one small letter, sometimes rendered "and." This little word of connection and relation marks out the several related groups of books, i.e., Genesis heads the first group, followed by Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers – every one of the last three commences with "and." Deuteronomy commences the second group, followed by Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel,

1 and 2 Kings – all of these connect with Deuteronomy by the same word "and," showing a continuity of history. I Chronicles commences the third group, followed by 2 Chronicles, Ezra. Nehemiah commences the fourth group and is followed by Esther. This quadruple division has been happily named thus:

1. The Books Before They Entered the Holy Land:

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers.

2. The Books in the Holy Land:

Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings.

Deuteronomy heads this list because they are about to enter the land under a renewed covenant, and relates to that entrance.

3. The Books out of the Holy Land:

1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra.

4. The Books in the Dispersion:

Nehemiah and Esther. A HELPFUL BOOK is the Syllabus for Old Testament Study, by Dr. Sampey, the professor of Hebrew and Old Testament English in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. This syllabus itself gives an extensive and up-to-date bibliography, a great part of which the reader does not now need, because we are in English, not Hebrew, and because many of you are beginners, unprepared for many critical discussions. As we progress, however, I will mention the helpful books an English student needs in studying the English Old Testament. An exceptionally important part of Dr. Sampey's book is the chronological chart. THE UNITY OF THE BIBLE

The next preliminary thing to note is the unity of the Bible, the whole of it. There are no other sixty-six books in the world that fit each other like these sixty-six books do. Genesis connects on to Exodus, and Exodus connects back with Genesis and on to Leviticus; Leviticus connects back with all these and forward to Joshua; and it is that way all through the Old Testament, and equally so with the New Testament. As Genesis commences with paradise lost, the New Testament closes with paradise regained.

Then, this book is a growth in a twofold way. I do not believe with the Negro who said that God Almighty handed down the Bible from heaven Just as we have it in the King James Version. It was a growth as to its books, book added to book, in a period of sixteen hundred years, with a gap of four hundred years between the Old Testament, and the New. That is, from 1500 B.C. to A.D. 100; 1,600. Then, it is certainly a growth in the unfolding of doctrine. Take Genesis 1:1 : "God created the heavens and the earth," and every other book in the Bible is evolved from that declaration. Take the promise: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," and everything touching Christ is evolved from that declaration. Likewise from the establishment of the throne of grace at the close of Genesis 3:1-24, clear on to the book of Revelation is a development of God's plan of salvation, from the first thought to its latest and highest expansion. It is a growth from "type" to "antitype," from symbol to the thing symbolized, from signs to things signified; and this is one of

the highest proofs of its inspiration: that an author back yonder 1,500 years before Christ leaves behind several books, to which other authors in the several centuries following have added their contributions, and these all articulate, fitting into each other like the bones of one skeleton. This vast library, whose volumes were written at different times, and under different conditions, fragmentarily and multifariously, becomes a single book in its unity. We now come to… THE CONTENTS OF THE BIBLE

These contents are very varied, and the styles of the different books vary. You have here poetry, prose, history, drama, law, prophecy, parables, proverbs, allegory, types – exceedingly varied. Now, the original languages in which this book was written: The Old Testament was written in Hebrew, except the following passages: Jeremiah 10:11; several chapters in Ezra, from Ezra 4:8-6:18, and Ezra 7:12-26; Daniel 2:4-7:28. All those exceptions were written in Chaldee or Aramaic. The New Testament was written i Greek. It may be that even the letter of James and the Gospel of Matthew were also written in Hebrew, but we know that the whole, of the New Testament was written in Greek.

Now, to get this Bible, originally written in these languages, into the mother tongue of each people is one of the most important things ever done. What was it that brought about the division into nations? It was first a division of the languages. God confused the speech. They were of one people and one tongue, and through the confusion of speech came the division of nations, not vice versa; not a division of nations and then different languages, but a division of nations resulting from a confusion of tongues. Now, the reverse of the confusion of the tongues at Babel is the gift of tongues at Pentecost. Why the gift of tongues? That these messengers of the cross might speak to every nation under heaven in the tongue in which they were born. Turning Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into English is called (rightly) a version – that is, a turning of one language into another; or it is called a "translation," from the old compound Latin word, transfero-ferre-tuli-latum, meaning "to translate, transfer." Suppose a colored liquid here in an opaque pitcher, and suppose another pitcher not quite so opaque, but translucent, you can see through it just a little. Then suppose another pitcher perfectly transparent. I pick up the opaque pitcher that has the colored liquid in it and I transfer it, translate it, turn it into the translucent pitcher. You can see it, but not clearly. That is a bad translation. But suppose I turn it into the transparent pitcher, that you may see its contents clearly. That is a good translation or version. So a version is a translation. The Septuagint Version is the translation of the Hebrew into Greek, the Vulgate is a translation of the Septuagint into Latin, the Douay is a translation of the Vulgate into English.

Now, in another respect, what is the Bible? It is not a history of all nations. It is a history of the kingdom of God. Genesis is a race history down to the eleventh chapter, then it sidetracks all of the families but one; when the Ishmaelites come it sidetracks them; when Esau comes he is sidetracked; when Lot’s children come (the Moabites and Ammonites) it sidetracks them; but it follows a certain family until it becomes a nation, to which are committed the oracles of God, and touches the history of other nations where they bear upon the development of the kingdom of God in that one people.

RULES OF INTERPRETATION FOR THE BIBLE

The usage of common life determines the meaning of a word or phrase; not that of philosophy.

The usage of the time and place of the writer determines the meaning; not that of any other time; not modern usage.

If a word or phrase has several meanings, the context determines the meaning it bears in a given passage. The more common meaning of the writer's day is to be preferred, provided it suits the passage, not that more common in our day.

If the author has occasion to employ a new word, or an old word in a new signification, his own definition or his own usage must determine the meaning, not any other author's usage.

The direct or literal sense of a sentence is the meaning of the author, when no other is indicated, not any figurative, allegorical, or mystical meaning.

Passages bearing a direct, literal or fully ascertained sense go to determine what passages have another sense than the literal, and what that other sense is; not our opinions.

The Bible treats of God in relation to man. It is obvious that this circumstance will afford occasion for new words and phrases, and new applications of the old ones. It brings into view such peculiar figures of speech as are called anthropomorphism and anthropopathism. It gives a new expansion to all the previous rules.

A word, a phrase, or sentence belonging primarily to the things of man must be understood, when applied to the things of God, in a sense consistent with his essential nature; not in a sense contradictory to any known attribute of that nature.

There is a growth in the Bible in two respects: (1) There ig a growth in the adding of document to document for at least 1600 years. Hence the simple or primary part of speech will appear in the earlier documents; the more expanded and recondite may come out only in the later. (2) There is a growth also in adding fact to fact, and truth to truth, whereby doctrines that at first come out only in the bud are in the end expanded into full bloom. At its commencement the Bible chooses and points the all-sufficient root from which all doctrines may germinate. The root is God. In him inhere all the virtues that can create and uphold a world, and therefore in the knowledge of him are involved the doctrines that can instruct and edify the intelligent creature. Hence the elementary form of a doctrine will be found in the older parts of Scripture; the more developed form in the later books. This gives rise to two similar rules of interpretation.

The meaning of a word or phrase in a later book of Scripture is not to be transferred to an earlier book, unless required by the context.

The form of a doctrine in a subsequent part of the Bible must not be taken to be as fully developed in a preceding part without the warrant of usage and the context.

The Old Testament was composed in Hebrew, the New Testament in Greek. Each must be interpreted according to the genius of the language in which it was originally written. The interpreter must, therefore, be familiar with the grammar of each in which the particulars which constitute its genius are gathered into a system. The writers of the New Testament were, moreover, Hebrews by birth and habit, with the possible exception of Luke. Their Greek, therefore, bears a Hebrew stamp and their words and phrases are employed to express Hebrew things, qualities, customs, and doctrines. Hence they Must receive much of their elucidation from the

Hebrew parts of speech of which they are the intended equivalents. Two rules of interpretation come under this head:

The sense of a sentence, and the relation of one sentence to another, must be determined according to the grammar of the language in which it is written.

The meaning of New Testament words and phrases must be determined in harmony with Old Testament usage; not by Greek against Hebrew usage.

The Bible is the word of God. All the other elements of our fundamental postulate are plain on the surface of things, and therefore unanimously admitted. This, however, some interpreters of the Bible do not accept, at least without reserve. But notwithstanding their rejection of this dogma such interpreters are bound to respect the claims of this book to be the word of God. This they can only do by applying to its interpretation such rules as are fairly deducible from such a characteristic. In doing so they put themselves to no disadvantage. They only give the claimants a fair stage, and put its high claim to a reasonable test. Now, God is a God of truth. Hence all Scripture must be consistent with truth and with itself. It contains no real contradiction. This gives rise to the following rules:

All Scripture is true historically and metaphysically; not mythical and fallible.

In verbally discordant passages that sense is to be adopted which will explain or obviate the discrepancy; not a sense that makes a contradiction. To explain it positively is to show the harmony of the passage; to obviate it negatively is to show that there is no contradiction.

Scripture explains Scripture. Hence the clear and plain passages elucidate the dark and abstruse; not anything foreign in Scripture to time, place or sentiment; not our philosophy. Of rules that cross one another, the higher sets aside or modifies the lower.

An inspired, illumined New Testament writer will give the true sense of an Old Testament passage.

QUESTIONS

1. What the derivation and present meaning of our English word “Bible," and the meaning of the word "Holy" in this connection?

2. In general terms, name the three grand divisions of the Christian world and state mainly the parts of the world occupied by them.

3. Do these agree on the books which constitute the collection known as the Bible?

4. State the Romanist additions to what we call the Old Testament, and show just where each addition is inserted.

5. On what grounds are these additions to be rejected?

6. Name another important distinction between their English Bible and ours.

7. What Jewish version commended, and what the difference between it and our Old Testament?

8. What two grand divisions in our Bible?

9. What is the meaning of "Testament"?

10. From what scriptures did men deduce the names, "Old Testament" and "New Testament"?

11. What name would have been better?

12. Cite a hurtful interpretation based upon the name, "Old and New Testaments."

13. Cite the true interpretation of this matter.

14. Cite the Jewish divisions of their Bible.

15. Cite, in order, the books of The Law.

16. The books of the division called The Prophets.

17. The books of the division called The Psalms.

18. What principle or reason governed in naming the second division "Prophets," and the third division "Holy Writings"?

19. Explain, according to this principle, why Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings appear on the "Prophet" list, and Daniel appears o n the "Holy Writings" list.

20. How many books in our Bible? In each grand division?

21. Show how the Jews made out their list of twenty-four books in the Old Testament, and why? Also their list of twenty-two books, and why?

22. Cite a New Testament recognition of the three divisions of the Old Testament.

23. Is the order in which the books of our present Bible are arranged inspired? What principle governed in their arrangement?

24. Is the present division into chapters and verses inspired?

25. Who divided the Bible into chapters? When and why?

26. When the first concordance?

27. Who divided the Bible into verses, and why?

28. What else besides the Bible is a standard of authority on revelation with Greeks and Romanists?

29. In what other way do Romanists widen the difference as to the standard between themselves and Protestants?

30. What suggestion made relative to the study of the Old Testament, and what quadruple division of Old Testament books in this connection?

31. What helpful book mentioned, and its peculiar merit?

32. Show the unity of the books of the Bible.

33. Show that the Bible is a growth in a twofold way.

34. What length of time from the writing of the first book to the last?

35. What are the contents of the Bible?

36. What are the original languages of the Bible?

37. What is a version of the Scripture? Name several.

38. What is the Bible as it relates to history?

39. What history of the English Bible commended? (Ans: Harwood Pattison's.)

40. Read carefully the rules of interpretation.

# 05.05. The Inter-Biblical Period Introduction

XIV THE INTER-BIBLICAL PERIOD INTRODUCTION

We commence this study with an introduction to the period. The Old Testament books written during the Babylonian exile are, part of Jeremiah, all of Ezekiel, all of Daniel, and possibly a few of the psalms. The Old Testament books written after the Jews' return from the Babylonian captivity are the following, in their order, as stated: Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Esther, Nehemiah, Malachi – Nehemiah and Malachi having been written about the same time. The Old Testament closes, then, about 433 B.C. with the books of Nehemiah and Malachi.

The extent of the period between the Old and New Testaments, in round numbers, is over 400 years, that is, from 433 B.C. to 4 B.C., the true date of Christ's birth, four years before the time it is usually given. We may learn the history of that 400 years: First, from the Jewish historian, Josephus, Jewish Antiquities and the first part of hisWars of the Jews.Josephus was a Jewish general in the war which led to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, living forty and more years after Christ died. Second, from a radical critic, Ewald, who has written, perhaps, the most remarkable history of the Jewish people. I do not very well see how we could do without it on account of its great scholarship and research, though many things in it cannot possibly be accepted on account of his radical criticisms. One volume of his history is devoted to this period. As that book may not be accessible, I mention Stanley'sJewish Church, the third volume. He is something of a radical critic himself, and follows Ewald just about as closely as Dr. Boyce, in his theology, follows Hodge. But better than all of them for brevity and clearness is a little book of the Temple Series of the Bible, entitled, "Connection Between Old and New Testaments." The author is Rev. George Milne Rea. This is the shortest, clearest, and most forcible history of the period that I know anything about. He is somewhat of a radial critic, but there is little poison in it.

Then, for a great part of the period, we find 1 and 2 Maccabees indispensable. They are apocryphal books of the Old Testament. The first book of the Maccabees is good, great, and spiritual. It is a fine history. It is not an inspired book, but many uninspired books are very valuable. I have been reading the first book of Maccabees ever since I was ten years old. The second book of Maccabees is also good, but not quite so reliable.

Daniel's prophecies concerning the Persian, Grecian, and Roman Empires, while prophecies are really a forecast of all the history there is on the subject.

I will sum up the histories of the period: (1) Daniel; (2) Josephus; (3) Ewald's History of the Jewish People; (4) Stanley's Jewish Church; (5) Milne Rea's Connection Between the Testaments; (6) I and 2 Maccabees. In giving these histories let me say that Josephus on that period sometimes gives the chronology wrong – in one instance at least a hundred years. The ancient Greek historians Herodotus, Xenophon, Polybius, Appianus, Arrianus, and others, touched on the period. The ancient Roman historians, Livy, Tacitus, Diodorus, and others, touch the period. The great modern histories of ancient times which cover the period are Rollin Rawlinson's Monarchies,

Grotes' History of Greece, and Mommsen's History of Rome.

We next notice the Jewish literature during this period, i.e., what the Jews wrote during this period. We get the literature of this period to find out how the people were thinking, to what their minds were being given. A large part of that literature appears in the Septuagint Old Testament, and is incorporated in the Roman Catholic Bible. In our Bible the Roman Catholics make their insertions of the Jewish literature as follows: Just after Nehemiah they put in two books, Tobit and Judith, neither one of them historically good, and a good deal of Tobit is exceedingly silly. To the book of Esther they add ten verses to the tenth chapter, and then add six more chapters. That these additions were written in this period, and after the inspiration closed, is evident from the reading of them. Just after the Song of Solomon, they put two Apocryphal books, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. These books, while not inspired, make very good reading, but they are written, as I said, in that interval between the two Testaments, and rather late in that interval. Just after the Lamentations of Jeremiah, they put the book of Baruch. Baruch himself was the scribe of Jeremiah and a good man. This book, some of it, is exceedingly silly, and evidently not written by Baruch.

To our book of Daniel they make the following additions: When Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were cast into the fiery furnace, they put a long song of about sixty-six verses into the mouths of these three men, and make them sing it in that furnace. At the end of the book of Daniel they put two stories: The story of Susanna, and the story of Bel and the Dragon – good stories to tell the children. Just after Malachi they put I and 2 Maccabees.

The Romanist Bible, Douay Version, has these additions and shows just where they come in. All these books were written during the period of which I speak, and in addition to them the following which do not appear in the Romanist Bible: the Prayer of Manasseh. He was the wicked son of the good king, Hezekiah, and the record states that when he was a captive in Babylon he repented and prayed to God to forgive him. It occurred to one of these inter-biblical Jews to write out that prayer for him. It is a splendid prayer and I do not see anything wrong in it.

A letter from Jeremiah to the Babylonian exiles. He had written one that we find in the book of Jeremiah, but this is . falsely attributed to Jeremiah. Then, during that period, they wrote certain psalms and attributed them to Solomon, calling them The Psalms of Solomon. Most of these are good reading.

But the greatest exploit of the Jewish mind during the period of which I speak was the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the Septuagint version. I will have a good deal to say about it later.

I did not include in that period two other books written by Jews, and sometimes classed in the period. One is the book of Enoch. That is an apocalypse, an imitation of Daniel, and a good deal like Revelation. Some of it is fine reading. It is barely possible that part of it was written before Christ was born, but it cannot be proved. The other books are 1 and 2 Esdras. They were certainly written after Christ, both of them, and it is not yet clear whether a Christian Jew wrote them or an unchristian Jew, but they are intolerable stuff, no matter who wrote them.

I will now restate the literature of that period. I called attention to the part of the literature incorporated in the Romanist Bible, the following books in their order: Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1and 2 Maccabees, then the additions to Esther and Daniel. Apart from what is

incorporated in the Romanist Bible I gave these: The Prayer of Mannasseh, the Psalms of Solomon, the letter of Jeremiah, the great work of translating the Old Testament into the Greek language – the Septuagint. That commenced about 250 years before Christ, and it was about 100 years before all of it was done.

The king of Persia at the time the Old Testament closed was Artaxerxes Longimanus, and the book that mostly influenced the Jewish thought and hope during that period of 400 years was unquestionably the book of Daniel. Revelation is the quickening book of the New Testament, as Daniel was the quickening book to the Jewish mind, both of them apocalypses.

There are ten great preceding events which influenced this period of 400 years, as follows:

1. The first event was 722 B.C. Sargon, king of Assyria, reign ing at Nineveh captured the capital of the Northern Kingdom, the kingdom of the ten tribes, deported the inhabitants into the Far East) and colonized their territory with heathen people from his own realm. As we go on, not only up to Christ, but beyond Christ, we will see the tremendous significance of that mixed population in Samaria – a heathen population settled there to take the place of the deported Jews, intermarrying with the remnant of Israelites left behind, and constituting what later was called the Samaritan people.

2. The second great event was in 587 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, captured and destroyed Jerusalem, the capital of the lower kingdom, the kingdom of Judah, and deported the best and most influential of the inhabitants to Babylon. All through the period comes the echo of that event.

3. The third great preceding event was in 538 B.C. Cyrus, king of the Medo-Persian Empire, captures Babylon, and in 536 B.C., two years later, he issued a decree allowing the Jewish captives in Babylon, so many as wished to do it, to go back to their own country, instructing them to rebuild their Temple, which Nebuchadnezzar had destroyed. This event, as we will find, was mighty in influencing the inter-biblical period in several respects. Heretofore the fortunes of the people of Israel had been influenced by the Hamitic and Semitic nations, who held them in subjection. Henceforward it is the Japhetic nations that affect them. The Medo-Persians were descendants of Japhet. The Babylonians and Assyrians were descendants of Shem, as were also the Ammonites, the Moabites, and the Esauites. The people of Egypt were the descendants of Ham, and so were the Canaanites, including the Philistines and Phoenicians. Now, with the coming of Cyrus to Babylon the nations to affect the Jews are the descendants of Japhet.

The second respect, and a very remarkable one, was that the policy of Assyria and Babylon had been to deport the inhabitants of the countries that they conquered and colonize them elsewhere. That had been the settled policy. The policy of Cyrus was exactly the opposite – to send all the exiles home, when conquering any people. Cyrus was not a Persian, but an Elamite, and hence not a monotheist, but a polytheist. He was a great man. A heathen, while he did not know God, God knew him, and God raised him up to do the work that he did as Isaiah prophesied, "God says, I will raise up and guide Cyrus, though he knows me not." He not only sent home those of the Jews that wanted to go, but any other captive nation.

The third respect was the policy of all the Hamitic and Semitic nations that when they conquered the people of Israel they destroyed their religion. Cyrus' policy was exactly the opposite; he did not

want to interfere with the religion of any conquered people. He even sent back all the captured idols in Babylon and sent the people back to their native land. He sent the Jews back and gave them all the Temple vessels, the sacred vessels of the sanctuary. No Persian king ever interfered with the religion of a conquered nation. At no time during the subjection of the Jews to the Persians, while they controlled the political end, did they interfere with their consciences. They let them worship God in their own way.

The fourth respect was that the Medo-Persian policy allowed a Jew, who was qualified, to be local governor, subject to the satrap who controlled a district, and was like a viceroy. The king appointed him and he had a great district under him. For instance, the district of Syria was ruled by a satrap, with headquarters at Damascus, but Judea was one province of this district whose local governor might be a Jew; and we know of two distinguished Jews who were local governors; Zerubbabel was one – he was the first one, who belonged to the line of David. He was not made king, but was the local governor over all the territory reoccupied by the Jews. The high priest, with a council of elders, attended to the religious matters. Nehemiah also was a local governor, but I do not know that any other Jew was local governor during that period. It is somewhat doubtful, from an expression in Nehemiah and one in Malachi, but those two were permitted to rule in civil matters.

4. The fourth great event that affected the inter-biblical period was in 535 B.C., when nearly 50,000 Jews returned to their own country with Zerubbabel as governor and Joshua as high priest, with orders to rebuild their own Temple and worship God according to their old forms. The question has often been asked why no more returned. There were forty-two thousand and some hundreds, besides some seven or eight thousand servants and some singing people, but less than fifty thousand Jews accepted the privilege conferred by Cyrus. One reason that the number was so small is that they would not allow anybody to go back – the Jews would not – who could not prove his genealogy – his pure descent by the genealogical tables. His pedigree had to be traceable all the way back to Abraham. That let out a good many of them. Now, as less than fifty thousand of them returned, that brings us to a new word diaspora, the "dispersion." The Jews who remained, from that time on till now, are called the dispersion. We find that language repeated in the New Testament. James and Peter both write letters to the dispersion.

5. The fifth great event was that these Samaritans, not being permitted to help rebuild the Temple, though claiming that they worshiped Jehovah, became bitter enemies to its rebuilding. Zerubbabel and Joshua were not counting numbers, but wanted a pure and homogeneous people. The Samaritans were a mixed race, and they refused to allow them to be associated in the work, whereupon they wrote letters back to Persia, making all sorts of accusations against the Jews, and finally securing an order for a discontinuance of the work of rebuilding the Temple, and held it suspended for fifteen years, until a new Persian dynasty received letters from the Jews asking him to search the records of the reign of Cyrus and see if he could not find that decree allowing the Jews to rebuild their Temple.

6. Darius did have the records searched, and did find it, and he used a pretty strong hand to help the Jews, and told them to go on with the building of their Temple. So, protected by him, the Temple was completed and dedicated m the year 516 B.C. The rebuilding of that Temple, the re-establishing of the old Jewish worship, can hardly be overestimated as an event bearing on the period we are discussing.

7. The seventh great preceding event was in 478 B.C. Esther, a Jewess of the dispersion, living in Babylon, became the wife of Xerxes the Great, he who is called Ahasuerus in the book of Esther. She became his wife and saved the Jews of the dispersion from being destroyed by Haman. That Ahasuerus, the husband of Esther, is the very Xerxes that invaded Greece with so great an army, but that was before he married Esther. I will tell all about it in a later chapter in showing the struggle between Greece and Persia. The war really commenced under Darius Hystaspis, and just about the time that Darius was having that Temple completed he sent the Persian soldiers to fight the battle of Marathon, just outside the city of Athens, in which they were ingloriously defeated. When Xerxes the Great came to the throne, he led an army of over two million people against the Greeks. At the pass of Thermopylae, Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans died fighting for Greece. Then in the great battle of Plataea his land forces were terribly defeated. When Attica was invaded, Themistocles caused the Athenians to take to their ships and let the city be burned, and on the sea he fought and won the great battle of Salamis.

8. The seventh great event was in 458 B.C., when Ezra leads another caravan of Jewish exiles to Jerusalem. This was in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. He was reigning when the Old Testament closed. This was by far the most influential factor in the future of the Jews; indeed, with Ezra comes the rise of Judaism. The people are called Jews from his time on. The great factors of Ezra’s coming were: first, he brought back a copy of the Mosaic law, the Pentateuch; second, with him commenced that remarkable body of people called the scribes. Ezra was a notable scribe. They were the publishers of the Bible, not indeed by printing, but they multiplied the manuscript copies of it. We may credit the publication of the Old Testament to Ezra and the scribes. These scribes, by giving the people copies of their Bible, had more to do with the great advance in the period of four hundred years that I am going to tell about than anything else.

With Ezra also commenced the Jewish Council of Elders, which afterward became the Sanhedrin, so well known in New Testament times. With Ezra’s return from Babylon came also the synagogue, and of all the potential things that preserved the Jewish faith from that time on the synagogue takes the lead. Up to that time they were temple ritualists. Theirs was a sacrificial worship. From now on, wherever three or four Jews could be found in a place, they would establish a proseuche, or "prayer-chapel," like the one that Paul found at Philippi.

Where there were more of them they established a synagogue. The synagogue is not a temple, but it is a place of public worship. Every sabbath day, throughout the world, they come up to these synagogues and read a part of the law, and a part of the prophets, and a part of the other writings, and then expound them just as a preacher now reads a portion of the Scriptures and expounds it. Then, that synagogue was a popular assembly. For the first time, anybody in the audience that wanted to, could get up and say what was in his mind.

When Christ went to the synagogue at Nazareth, they handed him the lesson to be read that day. He read it and expounded it. When Paul entered a synagogue, the leader said to him, seeing he was a visitor, a stranger, "Brother, if you have anything to say, say on." It was of tremendous importance that the people should have Bibles and places of worship. The synagogue more nearly embodies the idea of a New Testament church than the temple does, and in the Greek Old Testament, it is sometimes called ecclesia. With the return of Ezra, idolatry by the Jews died forever. Up to that time God had scourged them continually with other nations because of their

idolatry. .But from the time of Ezra throughout all their history to this very hour in which I write) no Jew has been an idolater; they ceased to worship idols. Well might the Jews call Ezra the second Moses.

9. The ninth, and last, great antecedent event is this: In 445 B.C., Nehemiah, the cupbearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, asked to be appointed governor of Judea, and the Persian king, who loved him very much, made him governor. The Babylonians would call him Pekher, the Turks would call him Pasha, the Persian would say Tirshathe, but we say "governor." Nehemiah caused a wall to be built around Jerusalem to protect it from the Samaritans and Arabians, and their other enemies close by, and after staying twelve years he returned to Persia. He remained there a while, then came back and served as governor until 433 B.C.

I will briefly repeat these great events: first, the destruction of the ten tribes by Sargon in 722 B.C. ; second, the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 587 B.C.; third, the destruction of Babylon by Cyrus, king of the Persians, in 538 B.C., and the marvelous advantages of his policy; fourth, in 535 B.C., fifty thousand Jews returned with Zerubbabel as governor and Joshua as high priest; fifth, the Samaritans opposed the building of the Temple and obstructed it for fifteen years; sixth, Darius Hystaspis, the head of the second Persian Dynasty, in 516 B.C., ordered the finishing of the Temple; seventh, Esther became Queen of Persia, 478 B.C. ; eighth, 458 B.C., Ezra led another caravan to Jerusalem; ninth, Nehemiah was made political governor.

We have now before us the books of the Bible that were written in exile, the books of the Bible written after the exile, the histories that cover this period, the literature of the Jews during this period, and the great antecedent events influencing this period.

QUESTIONS 1. What Old Testament books were written during the Babylonian exile?

2. What Old Testament books were written after the Jews’ return from the Babylonian captivity?

3. What then the extent of the period between the two Testaments?

4. From what books may we learn the history of this period?

5. What Jewish literature written during this period?

6. Who was king of Persia at the close of the Old Testament canon?

7. What book mostly influenced the Jewish thought and hope during the inter-biblical period?

8. What is the first great preceding event which influenced this period and how?

9. What is the second, and how?

10. What is the third, and in what four respects was it mighty in influencing this period?

11. What is the fourth, and how?

12. What is the fifth, and how?

13. What is the sixth, and how?

14. What is the seventh, and how?

15. What is the eighth, and how?

16. What is the ninth, and how?

Chapter 35

# 05.06. The Persian Period, Including The Conflict Between The Greeks And The Persians

XV THE PERSIAN PERIOD, INCLUDING THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS

The Medo-Persian Empire established by Cyrus lasted about 200 years – to be exact, 207 years. But from the close of the Old Testament Judah was under the Persian rule about 100 years.

The first great event of the inter-biblical period under Medo-Persian rule was the building of the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizirn, and the establishment of a rival Jehovah worship. It was brought about in this wise: The last chapter of Nehemiah says this (pretty vigorous language, too,) :

In these days also I saw that the Jews of the land had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and crushed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters for your sons, or for yourselves. . . . And one of the sons of the high priest, Eliashib, was son-in-law to Sanballat, the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. – Nehemiah 13:23-28.

That started the event that I am going to tell about. It ends the Old Testament, but it started the event. The woman that Eliashib had married was very beautiful, as famous in her day as Helen of Troy. Eliashib went to his father-in-law, Sanballat, and said, "I must give up either my priesthood or my wife, but I do not want to lose either." Sanballat says, "I will manage it for you. I will build you a temple here on Mount Gerizirn, and you shall be the high priest of that temple." And he carried out his promise. That temple was built. They worshiped Jehovah, and they had for their Bible the Pentateuch only, though the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch does not agree literally with the Hebrew Pentateuch, but nearly so. They admit, as historical value) the book of Joshua. Now, there was a Jehovah religion, with its temple, with its high priest, and with its Bible, within a few miles of Jerusalem. About 107 B.C., John Hyrcanus, one of the descendants of the Maccabees, and next to Judas Maccabeus one of the greatest of them, not only destroyed that temple, but also destroyed the city of Samaria, as he says: "So that a visitor could not even find where that city had stood" – but we will learn all about that later. I am just telling now what became of that rival temple. The destruction of the temple, however, did not stop the feud. It existed in New Testament times. In John 4 we find our Lord talking with a woman of Samaria, who insists that the worship of God ought to be upon Mount Gerizirn. In the life of our Lord the Samaritans would always welcome the Jews passing through going north, but would not give any shelter to a Jew going south to worship at the temple. Because Christ was refused shelter in passing south, that son of thunder, John, wanted to call down fire from heaven on them. So that was a marvelous event as bearing on the subsequent history of the Jews. It came about in connection, as many things do, with a pretty

woman.

The second great event of the inter-biblical period under Persian rule was the union of civil and religious powers in one person by the satrap of the district, making the high priest to be also the governor. The duty of the governor was to collect the tribute coming to the Persian Empire. In order to simplify matters the satrap of Syria made the Jewish high priest governor. The evil consequences, the far-reaching consequences of that act may be gathered, first, from a story in Josephus' Antiquities, book XI, chapter 7. He shows that when Eliashib, the high priest, died he left two sons, Johanan the elder and Joshua the younger. Both of these wanted to be high priest, because to be high priest was also to be governor. Johanan was the one entitled to it, but a very influential general of the Persian king, Bagoses, had promised the high priesthood to the younger son whenever the vacancy occurred, whereupon, in a row in the temple itself, Joshua the younger son was killed. The Persian general came and started to enter the temple, and they stopped him. He said, "Will I defile your temple any more than the man you murdered here in the temple?" And he put this kind of a tax on them: Fifty shekels for every lamb that was offered in sacrifice. Of course, that was a great deal more than the price of the lamb – it was 200 or 300 per cent more, and as they offered thousands of lambs we can imagine only what that tax was. It was a window tax that Victor Hugo went wild over, France taxing light, that is, the poor people could not have windows in their houses because, for every window in the house they had to pay so much more tax. So to tax the very offerings of religion was a tremendous innovation. Suppose every time we gave a dollar to missions, the state should tax us three dollars. That would dry up the source of contribution pretty soon, wouldn't it?

The first evil was in uniting the civil and the religious powers in one person. And the second evil was, that whenever we begin to unite church and state, the state may say, "I have the right to tax all contributions of the church." The third and greatest evil that arose was that the state, from this precedent, began to claim the right to appoint the high priest, claiming that the leader of religion must be appointed by the state.

The next great evil was that the office of high priest became a matter of barter and sale. The one who controlled the revenues, just so he satisfied the central government, could keep just as much as he pleased in his own pocket. For instance, if the Persian governor needed a revenue, say $100,000 a year, and this high priest were to tax them $300,000, he could send the state $100,000 and keep $200,000. Later on in the history this fearful precedent, established at this time, had evil effects more far reaching. In Christ's time, there were two living high priests. Whoever was governor would claim the right to appoint the high priest. Caiaphas and his father-in-law, Annas, were both high priests. In order to illustrate the thought: What if the Tarrant County judge claimed the right to appoint all the pastors of the churches in the county? What if the governor claimed the right to appoint our superintendent of missions) or the president of our convention?

The third event of the inter-biblical period was the overthrow of the Medo-Persian Empire by Alexander the Great, consummated 330 B.C. The several periods of the struggle between the Greeks and the Persians were as follows:

Period the First: Before the Greeks were united into one government under Phillip II, king of Macedonia. This period extends from 500 B.C. to 336 B.C. The three Persian kings most concerned were Darius I, son of Hystaspis, Xerxes the Great, who married Esther; and Artaxerxes

Mnemon, the last only coming within the period. Under Darius I, as I briefly discussed in the preceding chapters, came the defeat of the Persians 200,000 strong by the Athenians under Miltiades, 20,000 strong, at the battle of Marathon, right under the walls of Athens on the plain touching the sea.

Under Xerxes the Great, as I have already said, were gathered an army of 2,000,000 men for the invasion of Greece. There were 1,800,000 by measurement, not by counting. Ten thousand were made to stand in the smallest square possible, the space was marked off, and then, without any more counting, was filled 180 times. The great battles of this invasion were, first the defense of the pass at Thermopylae by Leonidas and his Spartans; second, the decisive defeat of the Persians in the great sea fight at Salamis by the Athenian general, Themistocles; third, the decisive defeat of the Persian land forces at Platea.

The battle of Marathon made such an impression on the young men of Athens that when a man said to Themistocles: "Why is it you cannot sleep? You are restless all night long," he said, "The honors of Miltiades will not let me sleep." I have often quoted that to show the inspiring effect of a great action on the mind of young men; how an achievement by one will suggest and stimulate a like achievement by others. The Persian fleet was almost entirely destroyed.

Now, under Artexerxes Mnemon occurred a great battle east of the Euphrates River, at Cunaxa, against his brother Cyrus – Cyrus the younger. Cyrus rebelled against his brother, Artaxerxes Mnemon. He wanted to be king of Persia, and having found out how the Greeks could fight, he hired 11,000 Greeks for his army. In this great battle east of the Euphrates River, in the first charge, Cyrus was killed and all of his army defeated except the 11,000 Greeks. They swept away everybody that stood in front of them, but when the fight was over, there stood 10,000 Greeks with half a million men around them, but they would not surrender. They were asked to parley, and their generals, under a flag of truce, went to confer with the Persians and the Persians killed them. And that body of Greeks, now without officers, elected new officers, and the most masterly retreat in any history is the retreat of that body of 10,000 Greeks. We find the history of it in Xenophon’s Anabasis. That column of Greeks on their march from the Euphrates to the Black Sea, going over an entirely new country, and without ever breaking ranks or being whipped in a fight, they got safely back home. It was a great enterprise. The effect of that battle was far greater than all the others I have mentioned. It left the impression on the Greek mind that the Persians were very vulnerable, and that the Greeks could whip them under any fair circumstances, and suggested the unity of the Greek states with the view to the destruction of the Persian Empire.

Period the Second: The conquest of Alexander the Great from 336 B.C. to 323 B.C. This is a very short time. Phillip II, king of Macedonia, united the petty Greek states into one government with himself as the commander-in-chief, and made preparations to invade Persia, but was assassinated by an enemy in 336 B.C. His nineteen-year-old boy, Alexander, succeeded him, and he devoted about a year to continuing the preparations of his father, and that same year the last Persian king came to the throne, Darius III Codomannus. Here is a world-ruling empire; there is a nineteen-year-old boy. In the spring of 334 B.C., Alexander crossed the Hellespont. Soon after crossing the Hellespont he met the Persian army at the river Granicus. Indeed, he had to ford the river to get to them. But his men, when he plunged into the stream himself, forded the river and utterly routed the much larger Persian army on the other side. That was the spring of 334 B.C. He

devoted a little over a year to conquering Asia Minor, and as he moved eastward he safeguarded the seaports on the Mediterranean. In 333 B.C., that is, the next year after he started, he met the great army of Darius in a pass in the mountains between Cilicis and Syria, at Issus. It was a pass between the mountains; the mountains went up on one side and the sea was on the other. Alexander, with an equal front, cared nothing how many deep the Persians were packed. The Persian army was almost annihilated, and the mother, wife, daughter, and camp equipage of Darius were captured.

Instead of going right on to Babylon, he determined to make all the Mediterranean coast safe, so he turned aside to conquer the city of Tyre, and all the coast cities to Gaza. Then he turned to Jerusalem and received the submission of that city, which I will tell more about directly. Then he went to Egypt and conquered it, and built a city after his own name at the mouth of the Nile, and called it Alexander, and it has been a great city from that date to this.

Then, to give the next date, in 331 B.C., he crossed the Euphrates River, and gave the final blow to the power of the Persians in the great battle of Arbela. That is a little east of where ancient Nineveh stood, and in that great battle the Persian power was ground to fine dust. Darius fled, but was soon assassinated. Alexander then turned south, and in 330 B.C. he made his triumphal entrance into Babylon. But that did not satisfy him. He marched out still into the Far East, conquering and exploring, and building cities in Afghanistan and Bokhara, crossed the great river, Indus, and conquered the Punjab section of India, and would have gone on to the other ocean but his old veterans said they did not want to go any further. So he turned around, and in 324 B.C. he re-entered Babylon to make it the capital of his empire – and the next year he died from taking too big a drink of ardent spirits. There was an immense cup called Hercules, and because somebody said that no man could drink all that was in that vessel at one time, he, believing himself a demigod, drank it all. He never recovered. That was in 323 B.C. When he died he was just thirty-two years old, and no man known to history had such a career – no Caesar, no Hannibal, no Bonaparte – a boy conquered the world in about six years, including much of the country that England now holds in India.

I have given a brief account of his history, and now we come to the important part about him – his touch with the Jews living in Jerusalem during the inter-biblical period. I will follow the account here given by Josephus. While Alexander was besieging Tyre he wrote a letter to the high priest and governor at Jerusalem, demanding that he send auxiliary troops and supplies. Jaddua replied, "I have taken the oath of allegiance to Darius. I cannot do it." Alexander said nothing, but kept it in his mind. The Samaritans sent the supplies. As soon as he had conquered Gaza he determined to look in on that Jerusalem that would refuse him. When Jaddua heard that Alexander was approaching, he formed a great procession of the priesthood and himself in full regalia, according to the Aaronic custom, marching at the head of it and holding the sacred Scriptures, without a sword or spear, coming simply with the Word of God.

The conqueror of the world and the high priest met. Alexander’s generals expected him to order them all to instant execution. Instead he leaped down from his horse, approached and saluted the high priest with great respect, walked with him back into the city, and paid for the sacrifices to be offered according to the Jewish law, and then turned to the high priest and said, "Ask me what you will." The high priest said, "Our people plant no crops the seventh year; exempt us from tribute on

the sabbatic year."

He said, "Granted."

"Our people want to enjoy our own religion in our own way."

"Granted."

"Our brethren of the dispersion in Babylon and Media, where you are going, want to enjoy their religion in their own way."

"Granted."

"Can we enter your army on a footing of equality?"

"Granted, and I will transport a number of you to Egypt where I am going, and when I build a city there I will give you a separate section of the city to be known as the Jewish quarter."

[Subsequent histories of certain cities tell us of the Jewish quarter. Tacitus, Paul, and the Roman poets tell us about it.]

"In your own quarter of the city you may elect your own magistrates, and have your religion as you wish it."

Parmenio, the leading general of Alexander, was astounded, and in explanation Alexander said:

"While I was in Macedon) before I started on this expedition, and was studying in my mind about this movement, one night I slept, and in my dream I saw this very man in this very dress he is wearing now, come to me and say, 'Hesitate not; cross the Hellespont; the Persians will fall before you.' "

And it is a remarkable fact that in Babylon and in every part of the country that he swayed he gave many privileges to the Jews.

Daniel represents the transition of empire from Persian to Grecian as follows: In Daniel 2:32 he makes the body and thighs of brass of that luminous image seen by Nebuchadnezzar represent Greece, and in Daniel 7:6 the vision of the leopard with four wings, he makes Greece. And in Daniel 8:5 (we find all Grecian history for centuries forecast in Daniel), he says,

And as I was considering, behold a he-goat came from the west over the face of the whole earth and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to the ram that had the two horns, which I saw standing before the river, and ran upon him in the fury of his power. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with anger against him, and break his two horns; and there was no power in the ram to stand before him; but he cast him down to the ground, and trampled upon him; and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand.

We will come to the four horns later, but just now I give the account that relates to the breaking of the one horn, the notable horn: And the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly, and when he was strong the great horn was broken, and instead of it there came up four notable horns toward the four winds of heaven.

QUESTIONS

1. How long lasted the Medo-Persian Empire established by Cyrus?

2. From the close of the Old Testament how long was Judah under the Persian rule?

3. What was the first great event of the inter-biblical period under Persian rule, and how was it brought about?

4. When and by whom was this temple destroyed, and did the destruction of the temple end the feud?

5. What and when is the second great event in the inter-biblical period under Persian rule, how was it brought about, what is its far-reaching developments, and what is its evil?

6. What is the third great event of the inter-biblical period, and how and when brought about?

7. What is the first period of the struggle between the Greeks and the Persians, and who the Persian kings most concerned?

8. What is the author's experience in learning Greek history?

9. What are the relative sizes of the Grecian and Persian armies in this struggle, and what the great battles of the invasion of Xerxes?

10. Describe the battle of Cunaxa and the results.

11. What is the second period of the struggle between the Greeks and the Persians?

12. Describe the various conquests of Alexander the Great, and his death.

13. What is the relation between Alexander and the Jews, how illustrated, and what Alexander's own explanation of it?

14. How does Daniel represent the transition of empires from the Persians to the Grecians?

# 05.07. The Jews Under Greek Rule - 323 B.C. to 198 B.C.

XVI THE JEWS UNDER GREEK RULE, FROM THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE TIME JUDEA PASSED FROM THE RULE OF THE PTOLEMIES OF EGYPT TO THE RULE OF THE SELEUCIDS AT ANTIOCH 323 B.C. to 198 B.C.

This chapter covers a period of 125 years. We have briefly considered in the preceding chapter, first, the struggle between the petty Greek states and the Persians, until the consolidation of the Greek power under Phillip II, king of Macedonia, who was assassinated 336 B.C.; and second, the consummation of that struggle at the battle of Arbela, the overthrow of the Persian Empire, and the conquest of the world by Alexander the Great, who died at Babylon 323 B.C. We found Alexander to be the greatest of all military conquerors in the annals of time, whose greatness was largely attributable to one teacher, Aristotle, who had charge of his education from thirteen to sixteen years of age, and to one inspiring book, the greatest of all epics, Homer’s Iliad, which he carried with him in all his wars and explorations, putting it under his camp pillow every night.

What a lesson that is! The power of a great teacher and the power of a great book, as reproduced in a student’s life!

Our concern with this marvelous ancient history is limited to a single inquiry: How did the Greek conquest of the world affect the kingdom of God? We have considered so much of that inquiry as related to Alexander himself and the Jews. We are now to continue the inquiry on the relation of the Jews and Alexander’s successors. Here we are stopped from limiting our investigation to the comparatively few Jews occupying the small territory around Jerusalem, for that territory at this time, and ever since their return from exile, was very small. Later on in this inter-biblical period, we will see an expansion of territory equal to David’s kingdom.

The first thought of the lesson is that with Alexander there came into crystallized use a new term that will largely affect Jewish history for hundreds of years. In fact, it is very prominent during the New Testament period. This term was "Hellenism," or "Hellenists," which was applied to the Jews of the dispersion, in contrast with the Hebrews living in the Holy Land. The Hellenists were Grecianized in foreign lands, many of them so Grecianized that they could not even speak, either the Hebrew or the Aramaic language. The modification was not one of language only; the Greek cult influenced them in many ways. We find in Acts 6 and many places elsewhere, that it was a problem in the apostolic church. Some of the New Testament books are addressed exclusively to the Hellenists: James wrote to the twelve tribes of the dispersion in Asia Minor, and the letter to the Hebrews was to the same class. All the other letters of Paul concerned the Hellenists more than the Hebrews of Judea. The Jews of the dispersion constituted the overwhelming majority of the Jewish race. There had been many forced deportations of Jews by conquerors into foreign lands, few of whom ever returned to live in Palestine. Many colonies of Jews, by their own consent, were planted in various parts of the world by the rulers. Then their own restless migrations for the purposes of trade and commerce carried them everywhere. They all, however, regarded Jerusalem as their holy city, and their restored Temple as their center of unity. They paid

their Temple tax, and thousands of them from every land went up to the great annual feasts.

At the famous Pentecost, (Acts 2:1-47), they were present from every nation under heaven, as that record says, Parthia, Proconsular Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Cyrene, Rome, Crete and Arabia. The Greek influence, mark you, was not limited to the Jews of the dispersion. The small Judea about Jerusalem was circled by Greek cities, multiplying points of contact with the home Jews. In Alexander's time these environing Greek cities were Gaza, Joppa, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Samaria, Hyppus; east of the Jordan, Scythopolis and Gadara in Galilee; Alexandria and others in Egypt; and under Ptolemy Philadelphus, Ptolemais on the coast was added, and the famous Rabbah of the Ammonites became the Greek Philadelphia.

These Greek cities kept multiplying in the passing years, until Jerusalem was ring-fired by them, and there was no resisting the Greek culture. So powerful was it that it conquered Rome after Rome had conquered the Grecian Empire. Generally, under the Greek rule, as it had been generally under the Persian rule, the Jews enjoyed great privileges, both at home and abroad, under Alexander himself, under Ptolemies, and for a part of the time under the Seleucida at Antioch. Coele-Syria, that is, from Lebanon to Egypt, was a Greek province, of which Judea was a part. We now come to… THE DIVISION OF ALEXANDER'S EMPIRE

For many years after Alexander's death there were stormy times in settling the succession. The various provinces were under the most famous of the Greek generals, who battled with each other for the supremacy. When all of Alexander's children died the issue lay between Antigonus, the old general, on one side, and four other generals combined on the other side, namely: Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander. This issue was settled in the great battle of Ipsus, in Phrygia, 301 B.C. Antigonus was defeated and slain, and the four conquering generals divided the empire among themselves, that is, Lysimachus and Cassander getting the European part of the empire and the Bosporus, while Ptolemy retained Coele-Syria, which he had already held ever since the death of Alexander. This included Judea. The Ptolemies held Egypt for 300 years, succumbing to the Romans, 30 B.C. Seleucus got for his part all of Asia except Coele-Syria, and built for his capital the famous Antioch at the mouth of the Orontes. There the Seleucids reigned for 250 years, until they were broken up by the Romans, 80 B.C. This was the partition expressed in one verse by Daniel (8:8), where he says the one notable horn being broken off, there arose four other horns.

Now, because Judea lay directly between Egypt and Antioch, occupying the most strategical position between Asia and Africa – if not the most strategical position in the world – it became a bone of contention between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and thus connecting those monarchies with the kingdom of God. The Ptolemies held Egypt and Coele-Syria, as I have already said, before the original partition, and held it until 198 B.C. They had already been holding it for twenty-two years before the partition, and that partition merely confirmed the position of the Ptolemies. The Ptolemies held Coele-Syria until 198 B.C., which I will tell more particularly about a little later. Then Judea passed under the reign of the Seleucids at Antioch. That was brought about by a great battle near the head of the Jordan River, Paneas, in which the sixth Seleucid, Antiochus III, named the Great, overwhelmingly defeated the general of the fifth Ptolemy, surnamed Epiphanes, and attached Coele-Syria to his kingdom. From that date on the Seleucids held Coele-Syria and Judea until it was freed under the Maccabees – the most heroic part of the Jewish

history, which we will consider later.

JUDEA UNDER THE PTOLEMIES

We are now to consider Judea under the Ptolemies, from 323 B.C. to 198 B.C. The plan of administration was partly according to the Greek method, and partly accommodated to Jewish home rule. The high priest, assisted by a council, which afterward became the Sanhedrin, was the local governor, who collected all the taxes due the Ptolemies and remitted them to Egypt. Ptolemy Lagus, surnamed Soter, or Savior, held Judea and Coele-Syria when Alexander died, 323 B.C., and was confirmed in it after the battle of Ipsus, 301 B.C., as he had already been holding it over twenty years. Five Ptolemies have to do with this section, and I will cite only one great event in the reign of each one.

1. The first event touching the Jews was an act of treachery and inhumanity on Ptolemy's hart, which called forth the most sarcastic remarks from Josephus on the misfit of his name, Savior. According to Josephus, he came to Jerusalem on the sabbath day under the pretense of offering sacrifice to Jehovah, and was received into the city. There installed, he disclosed the purpose of his expedition to be a slave hunt on a large scale. By unresisted violence there and elsewhere in Judea and in the whole of the province, he enslaved many thousands of the Jews, and transplanted them into Egypt.

Josephus quoted a reproach from a Greek historian that so great a city should allow itself to be captured, while so well fortified, on account of a silly superstition of nonresistance on the sabbath day. The reproach was better justified on another occasion in the later times of the Maccabees, and still later when the Romans besieged Jerusalem. This injustice perpetrated by Ptolemy Soter occurred before the battle of Ipsus, while the war of the four generals against Antigonus was going on. After the partition following that battle, the rule of this first Ptolemy was, on the whole, favorable to the Jews, in both Egypt and Judea. There was no interference with their religion, and they enjoyed many special privileges in the city of Alexandria. The first Ptolemy reigned forty years, that is, from the death of Alexander, 323 B.C.

2. The second great event – and I count it one of the most memorable in the annals of time – (or rather a series of events) occurred in the reign of his successor, Ptolemy Philadelphus. The story as given by Josephus is somewhat too marvelous, though he publishes the original documents of correspondence passing between Ptolemy and the high priest at Jerusalem. This great event was the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek – that famous version known to all subsequent ages as the Septuagint. This was an event of worldwide importance. Greek had become the vernacular of the world. No other language has ever equaled it in expressing delicate shades of thought. The world had now the Hebrew Bible, the Greek Bible, and the Samaritan Bible. In later times there were other Greek versions, but the Septuagint has easily held first place among the versions in subsequent ages. Christ and the apostles quoted the Greek text oftener than the Hebrew. The name is derived from the number of the translators, seventy (or strictly, 72). This version is an expression of the relation between Hellenism and Hebraism.

The history of the version is on this wise: The Greeks the world over were noted for literature, arts, philosophy, rhetoric, oratory, and architecture. And this Ptolemy Philadelphus had gathered at Alexandria the world's greatest library and museum. Alexandria became the world's greatest city

of learning. It was proposed to place in this famous library the Greek version of the Hebrew sacred books. But as the Jews jealously guarded the manuscripts of their sacred Scriptures, an expedient to gain their confidence was suggested, to wit: That Ptolemy, out of his own revenues, redeem from bondage, not only the great multitude of Jews enslaved by his father, Ptolemy Soter, but all Jewish slaves in Egypt, whether brought into bondage before or since that time, including their children, to the number of more than 100,000. He paid cash to the owners of the slaves and redeemed all of them. What a contrast with the Pharaoh ruling Egypt in Moses' time!

Second, that he donate many precious utensils and priceless jewels for the Temple furniture. Third, that he make a large cash contribution for the purchase of sacrifices at Jerusalem. Fourth, that he send an honorable embassy announcing his generosities, and carrying a written petition from the king addressed to the high priest, and all the translators to be his honored guests in Alexandria while they were translating, and then to be dismissed with great honors and precious gifts to each of the scholars.

It is evident from the records that only a version of the Pentateuch was originally contemplated, but once undertaken it finally included all the sacred books, and other Jewish literature besides. The translation began 250 B.C., and all the Pentateuch was translated in a few days, but it was not completed in all its parts until seventy-five or 100 years later. The latter part is very much inferior to the first work done, and it, moreover, included Jewish literature never considered by the Jews as a part of their sacred books. The Ptolemies were after books for their library, whether profane or sacred. Josephus makes a very clear distinction between the sacred Jewish books and other Jewish literature.

If only half the details given by Josephus be true – if we allow much for exaggeration – there is nothing in human history to compare with it. The story of Jerome's Vulgate and King James Version are tame beside it. Ptolemy Philadelphus stands immortalized as a manumitter of slaves, and as a promoter of learning, and is entitled to more enduring fame than any Greek whatsoever.

But this great enterprise did not work altogether for good, because it was through the Septuagint, followed by the Vulgate, that Romanists got their apocryphal additions to the Old Testament, of which I gave an account in a preceding chapter, and it was from the Septuagint that the Greek Catholic Church got the same apocryphal additions. The Reformation restored the sanctity of the Hebrew Scriptures as the Jews themselves held it. Yet to the Greeks are we indebted for that beginning of translation which today gives to every nation our Bible in its own tongue. The story of the versions is one of the most thrilling in the annals of time.

One of the most pleasing parts of the story of Josephus is the account of the impression made on the mind of the great king by his reading of the Pentateuch in Greek. He was profoundly stirred by the sublime and divine majesty of that holy law. How incomparably superior to his Homer, Xenophon, Herodotus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Socrates, Plato, Zeno, Aristotle, and Epicurus. So ever to great and dispassionate minds do God's holy words appear. If Socrates, without gospel light, was a seeker after God, according to Acts 17:26-27, surely Ptolemy Philadelphus, who walked in the light when he saw it, was nigh the kingdom of God, and we may at least indulge the hope that through God's grace in Christ, both of these illustrious heathen may appear in the heavenly kingdom.

3. The third great event, or series of events, of Jewish history under the rule of Egypt occurred in the reign of the third Ptolemy, surnamed Euergetes, 247 B.C. to 222 B.C. The Jewish high priest, Onias II, as Josephus says, was a man of "very little soul," obstinate as a mule, and a contemptible miser who flatly refused to send any tribute to Ptolemy. In vain Ptolemy threatened; in vain the people protested that they would lose their nation and their holy city. This bull-headed priest said, "I don't care; let it bring ruin." He was not going to pay out any money to Ptolemy – and it was not his money, either. This brought on a crisis in Jewish affairs. His nephew, Joseph, a son of Tobias, was allowed to save the situation by an expedient that was a bad precedent, and entailed many disasters. This young Joseph went to Egypt, gained the favor of the king, and modestly had himself appointed assessor and collector of the king's revenue in the whole province of Coele-Syria, which included Judea, at a high fixed rental. Backed by an adequate corps of Egyptian troops he returned, and by violent and oppressive methods farmed the revenue for twenty-two years. He would go to a place and select the names of the wealthiest citizens and confiscate their property until he got revenue from that place. In this way he combined in himself absolute power, both civil and ecclesiastical. Ptolemy got his revenue all right from these abundant confiscations, and Joseph in the meantime feathered well his own nest.

4. The fourth notable event under the Ptolemies was the alienation of the Jews from the Egyptian rule. There had been a smouldering fire against Egypt on account of the methods of Joseph, the son of Tobiah, in collecting revenue. Such methods will always bring revolt, if not revolution, and this prepared the way in the hearts of many Jews for swapping masters. An opportunity was presented in the bitter war being waged between the sixth Seleucid, Antiochus III, surnamed the Great, who reigned 223 B.C. to 187 B.C. and the Ptolemies. In the great battle between them, fought at Raphia, near Gaza, 217 B.C., Antiochus was defeated. Ptolemy, resenting the favors shown by some of the Jews to Antiochus, now thoroughly alienated the whole Jewish nation by two acts:

1. He went up to Jerusalem and outraged their religious feelings by thrusting himself into the most holy place of the Temple, from which he fled, as Josephus says, in superstitious terror as if he had seen some awful apparition.

2. On his return to Egypt he aggravated the general Jewish resentment by cruelty and oppression of the Jews there – quite an unusual thing for a Ptolemy to do. That is, all the ground gained in the Jewish favor under Ptolemy Philadelphus was now lost.

5. The fifth and last series of events of the period of this section was the damage done the Jews by Scopas, the general of the fifth Ptolemy, surnamed Epiphanes. With fire and sword and confiscation he swept the land. But in the decisive battle of Paneas, near the head of the Jordan, 198 B.C., Antiochus overwhelmingly defeated Scopas, and marched to Jerusalem, received him with open arms. And so Judea was lost to Egypt and passed under the rule of the Seleucids at Antioch.

QUESTIONS 1. What teacher and what book most shaped the character of Alexander the Great?

2. What concern have we with all this ancient Greek history?

3. What is the extent of Judea at this time?

4. Where the overwhelming majority of the Jews?

5. What new term came in with Alexander, and what the explanation of it.

6. Give some New Testament traces of it.

7. What cause had brought about the dispersion?

8. What is their relation to .Jerusalem?

9. Explain how Judea itself was somewhat Hellenized.

10. What is the extent of the province of Coele-Syria?

11. Under what Greek general was it when Alexander died, and how long did his successors hold it?

12. Tell about the division of Alexander's Empire, the battle that decided it, and when and where fought.

13. How does Daniel in one verse foretell this partition?

14. Name the four Greek generals and the part of the empire each received.

15. With which two only are we concerned, and why?

16. How long did the Ptolemies hold Egypt, and to whom did its control pass?

17. How long did the Seleucids hold Antioch, and to whom did its control pass?

18. What is the name of the first Ptolemy, and how long did he reign?

19. What great event of his reign touched Judea, and was it before or after the battle of Ipsus?

20. What unjust reproach was cast upon the Jews and Jerusalem by a Greek historian concerning this event?

21. What is the second great event under the Ptolemiea, and what the remarkable story as told by Josephus?

22. When did this work of translation commence, to what extent was it originally limited, and how enlarged, and when completed?

23. What is the effect on Ptolemy's mind in reading the Pentateuch in Greek?

24. What place in history do these events give Ptolemy?

25. What is the importance of this version?

26. Why were apocryphal books included?

27. What is the subsequent evil of this inclusion?

28. What is the third great event under the Ptolemiea, and what evil consequences?

29. What notable event under the fourth Ptolemy, and bow brought about?

30. What are the events under the fifth Ptolemy, and where and when was the decisive battle fought which transferred Judea to the rule of the Seleucida?

LIBRARY QUESTIONS 1. Tell the story of the fate of the great library at Alexandria.

2. Cite some corrupt doctrines taught in the apocryphal books, and yet fostered by Romanists.

3. How does Josephus distinguish between the sacred books and other Jewish literature? Quote the passage.

4. How does Josephus make out the twenty-two sacred books so as to include the whole Old Testament, and how do other Jews make them twenty-four?

5. What other translations of the Old Testament into Greek besides the Septuagint?

6. Origen had in parallel column 6 texts called the Hexapla: What were they?

Chapter 37

# 05.08. The Jews Under Antiochus Iii, Surnamed The Great, And His Son Seleucus Iv, ...

XVII THE JEWS UNDER ANTIOCHUS III, SURNAMED THE GREAT, AND HIS SON SELEUCUS IV, SURNAMED PHILOPATER This period is only twenty-three years, that is, from the battle of Paneas, 198 B.C., to the beginning of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, 175 B.C. In the preceding chapter we considered the Jews under the Ptolemies of Egypt, a period of 125 years, 323 B.C. to 198 B.C. We limited our discussion to one notable event only, touching the Jews under each of the five Ptolemies. First, the treacherous enslavement of many of the Jews by Ptolemy 1, surnamed Soter. Second, the translation of the Scriptures into Greek, with the attendant generosities, under Ptolemy II, surnamed Philadelphus. Third, the stupidity and greed of the high priest, Onias II, resulting in the farming of the revenue of Coele-Syria committed to Joseph, son of Tobias, under Ptolemy III, surnamed Euergetes. Fourth, the alienation of the Jews from Egyptian rule, caused by Ptolemy IV, surnamed Philopater, after his victory at Raphia over Antiochus III of Antioch, surnamed the Great. Fifth (and in my discussion before I did not sufficiently touch this), the great damage to the Jews done by Scopas, the general of Ptolemy V, surnamed Epiphanes, terminating with the defeat of Scopas at the battle of Paneas.

We are now to consider the fortunes of the Jews under Antiochus the Great, and his son Seleucus IV. Throughout the wars of the Ptolemies with the Seleucids for the province of Coele-Syria, including Judea, the Jews were ground to powder as between the upper and nether millstones. In such a brief discussion of this period our trouble has been to condense from such vast historical material, which enlarges as we go on. We have been compelled to touch lightly the Greek historians, and from this point are embarrassed with the riches of material in the contemporaneous Roman historians – Livy, Tacitus, and others, to say nothing of great modern histories – Rollin, Rawlinson, and Brace, and Mommsen's great History of Rome, probably one of the greatest contributions to history of modern times. The matter has been complicated by treaties between the two powers, based on intermarriages. The most notable of these, so far, was the marriage of Antiochus II to Bernice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadeipbus, and later to be followed by a marriage between Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus the Great, and Ptolemy V, surnamed Epiphanes. These political marriages make a great deal of trouble in history.

As I have said before, the prophecies of Daniel constitute the clearest guide to this period. If we want to understand the war between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, we will find it in the interpretation of the Daniel II, connecting Daniel 8:9-26 with Daniel 2:2-20, as both of these refer to Antiochus Epiphanes. A commentary on Daniel from the Cambridge Bible, by Driver, a pronounced radical critic, has as much poison in much of the book as there is meat in an egg. But his exposition of Daniel II and that section of Daniel 8 that touches this period is very fine, very scholarly, and very clear. Josephus is hard to follow because he makes such a mix-up of his historical matter, particularly in his dates. Sometimes he gives a date a hundred years wrong, except where he follows the Maccabees. When he sticks to Maccabees he is generally right. THE

JEWS UNDER THE SELEUCIDS

We now consider the fortunes of the Jews under Antiochus the Great. After the battle of Paneas and his welcome into Jerusalem, after his annexation of the province of Coele-Syria, he was as generous to the Jews as Ptolemy Philadelphus. When he got to Jerusalem and received the joyful welcome in that city, after he had defeated and captured the generals of the Ptolemies, he was so impressed with their devotion to him and the valuable service they had rendered, that he gave a signal proof of his gratitude. I do not know just where we may find a more signal testimony of gratitude, manifested in the letters he wrote to the generals of his empire everywhere with reference to the Jews.

First, he set apart a large pension for Temple sacrifice. He used his treasury to furnish them food and supplies for a year, and seeds for planting. Now) to me that is a very pleasant bit of history to read. True, a selfish motive prompted him. He wanted these faithful Jews as a buffer between him and dangerous enemies. But even then this heathen did it more gracefully than the prescriptive Episcopalians of Virginia reluctantly endured the settlement of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the Shenandoah Valley as a buffer against the hostile Indian tribes.

I had not space in the preceding chapter to tell of the movements of Antiochus after his defeat at Raphia. He had turned his mind to the East) waging successful warfare and enriching himself with spoils until he had re-established boundaries of Alexander’s old empire. Hence, with largely increased resources he returned to defeat the Ptolemies at Paneas and to annex Coele-Syria. Now his thought is toward the West. He wants to break or block the rising Roman Empire, and aspires to restore the western boundary of Alexander’s Empire, which had been pushed east by the Romans. He intends also to absorb Egypt, but just now wants peace with the Ptolemies, that he may concentrate against Rome.

To this end he makes alliance with Philip of Macedon and gives his daughter in marriage to Ptolemy, having two ends in view by this marriage – to secure peace behind him while he wars with Rome, and through his daughter to gain a quasi title to Egypt when opportunity serves to enforce it. Daniel foretells that marriage in these words:

And he shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom, and with him equitable condition: and he shall perform them: and he shall give them the daughter of women, to corrupt her [i.e. – Egypt], but she shall not stand, neither be for him. After this shall he turn his face into the isles, and shall take many: but a prince shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; yea, moreover, he shall cause his reproach to turn upon him. – Daniel 11:17-18.

In the phrase of Daniel "to corrupt her," the pronoun "her" does not refer to his daughter, but to Egypt. The thought is to use his daughter to give him a hold on Egypt. But as Daniel foreshows, the marriage, while it brought temporary peace to the Jews, did not serve the purpose of Antiochus. Like a true wife, Cleopatra stood by her husband, and she bears a glorious name in Egyptian history. She determined that if she was to be married off-hand that way, to suit the political need of her father, she would make a true marriage of it. And she lived and died in Egypt, beloved by all the people. It is refreshing to come to the history of a woman of high mind and a high standard of morals. That marriage, he thought, would enable him to get possession of Egypt, and then, as he was going west, to get all the rest of the old empire, but he made a mistake. That

marriage did not help him with the Romans, but it did help Ptolemy. As Daniel says: "Then shall he turn his face to the isles, and shall take many." The islands here mean the islands of the Mediterranean Sea, along the coast of Asia Minor and Greece, following the track of all the conquerors. He did strike out west with a great army and captured all of Asia Minor. He then crossed the Hellespont, over into Macedonia. Three times he touches the Romans. The last crushes him.

At Lysimalacia the Roman legation met him in warning. He gruffly replied, putting a reproach on them: "You have no more right to inquire into what I do in Asia than I have to inquire what you do in Italy." The Romans never forgot a thing of that kind. Antiochus pursued his march, following the tracks of Xerxes the Great toward lower Greece. But in the pass of Thermopylae he had a battle with the Romans, and they whipped him. That is his second touch with them. He then fled back to Ephesus in proconsular Asia. The Romans after the Punic wars, that is, after they had captured Cartilage, were looking East, and they had already annexed the European part of Alexander's Empire, and when Antiochus came into Greece interfering with their eastward trend, they determined to carry the war into his own country. He had entered into an alliance with Philip V, king of Macedonia, to fight the Romans. The Romans easily disposed of Philip, and crossed the Hellespont, going after Antiochus. The third contact was when the two armies came together in Phrygia at Magnesia. The book of Maccabees gives a very exaggerated account of the numbers engaged and of the war elephants employed, i.e.) if we may trust the more moderate estimates of the Greek historian, Polybius. In this battle, 190 B.C., the Romans entirely broke the power of Antiochus the Great, exacting the following humiliating conditions of peace:

1. The cession of all Asia Minor west of the Taurus Mountains.

2. The surrender of his floats and war elephants.

3. A crushing war indemnity that emptied his treasury and whose annual payments kept it empty. This vast war indemnity was more crushing than that which Germany exacted of France after the war of 1870. This empty treasury brought on all the woes of succeeding Seleucids until the dynasty perished.

4. They required him to give up his children and other kindred as hostages. It became a proverb: "Antiochus the Great was a king." Or, as Virgil describes Troy: Illium fuit. Mommsen comments: "Never, perhaps, did a great power fall so rapidly, so thoroughly, so ignominiously, &s the kingdom of the Seleucidae under the Antiochus the Great.

Daniel's prophecy concludes the story: "Then he shall turn his face toward the fortresses of his own land; but he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found" – fulfilled when he "was attacked and slain by the inhabitants of Elymais whose temple of Bel he sought to rob of its treasures to meet the war indemnity exacted by Rome. "He was not found," disappearing as completely as Enoch and Elijah, but it was not a translation upward. Kings have to have money, especially when they keep up armies, and it occurred to him that the best way to get the money was to rob the temples.

In Mark Twain'sInnocents Abroadis one of his quaint sayings: "When I passed over Italy and saw the poverty and squalor of the people, without clothes, without food and without money, and when I saw the wealth of the ages in the churches and in the cathedrals, it was a wonder to me that they

never thought to rob the churches." While the Italians never thought of it, yet Antiochus the Great thought of it.

There was a very rich temple over in the East, at Elymais. The temples were the banks of the country. They were the sanctuaries – the one place one could keep money free from the robber. The temple of Diana at Ephesus had all the wealth of the East stored in it. Now, this temple was full of riches, and when the priest who had charge of the temple (a heathen priest) heard of the purpose for which Antiochus was coming, he let him and a few of his men enter the temple, then shut and barred the door, and killed them with rocks – all of them.

Well might Daniel say: "But he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found." He left two sons, Seleucus, the rightful heir, and Antiochus IV, called Epiphanes. Seleucus succeeded his father. Daniel describes him: "Then shall stand up in his place one that shall cause an exactor to pass through the glory of the kingdom; but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle." That is his history; twelve years he reigned. And in order to meet these annual payments to Rome he had to become a tax collector. He sent into Coele-Syria after taxes, and after gleaning all he could he still needed much money. In the meantime Judea was prosperous from the account of it in 2Ma 3:1 :

Now when the holy city was inhabited with all peace, and the laws were kept very well, because of the godliness of Onias, the high priest, and his hatred of wickedness, it came to pass that even the kings themselves did honor the place, and magnify the temple with their best gifts: and insomuch that Seleucus, king of Asia, of his own revenue bare all the costs belonging to the service of the sacrifice. [The reference here is to the grant of Antiochus III before the Romans broke his power. But all the treasure cannot remain hidden when the impecunious son of Antiochus is exacting taxes.] But a certain Jew, Simon, of the tribe of Benjamin, who was made governor of the temple, fell out with the high priest about disorder in the city. And when he could not overcome Onias, he got him to Apollonius, the son of Thraseas, who then was governor of Coele-Syria and Phenice, and told him that the treasury at Jerusalem was full of infinite sums of money, so that the multitude of their riches which did not pertain to the account of the sacrifices was innumerable, and that it was possible to bring all into the king’s hand. Now when Apollonius came to the king and had showed him of the money whereof he was told, the king chose out Heliodorus, his treasurer [we will have more to say about him later], and sent him with a commandment to bring the aforesaid money. So forthwith Heliodorus took his journey, under color of visiting the cities of Coele-Syria and Phenice, but indeed to fulfill the king’s purpose. And when he was come to Jerusalem, and had been courteously received of the high priest of the city, he told him what intelligence was given of the money [what Simon had said about all that money in the temple] and declared wherefore he came, and asked if these things were so indeed. Then the high priest told him that there was such money laid up for the widows and the fatherless children: that some of it belonged to Hyrcanus, son of Tobias, a man of great dig-nity, and not as that wicked Simon has misinformed: the sum whereof was in all 400 talents of silver, and 200 of gold; and that it was alto-gether impossible that such wrong should be done unto them that had committed it to the holiness of the place, and to the majesty and inviolable sanctity of the temple, honored over all the world.

Heliodorus said: "All the same I have to have it." The high priest fell into a trance in which his face was marked; all of the priests commenced praying, the women of the city ran out into the streets, the children and the women, in view of such sacrilege as was contemplated, and while the tears ran down the high priest's cheeks, he led this prayer: "Oh Lord God Almighty, intervene, and prevent this horrible sacrilege." Whereupon, as Heliodorus entered the temple he met two flaming angels, one of them on a horse, clothed with gold, that struck him with his hoof and knocked him down. The shock nearly took away his life. And lest Seleucus might misunderstand, the high priest then went into the temple and offered sacrifice unto heaven for the sin of Heliodorus, and asked God to forgive him and raise him up, and on the intercession of the high priest he was restored, and returned to report to Seleucua to this effect: "If you have any man in your kingdom against whom you have a grudge – if you have a special enemy – send him to get that money, for he will meet a doom from God when he seeks to violate that Holy Place."

I cited what Daniel said about Seleucus. He died in twelve years by poison, and that brings us down to 175 B.C. When he died his brother, Antiochus Epiphanes, succeeded him.

What a temptation it is to me when I come in touch with all this ancient Jewish history and so many wonderful things related concerning it, by Greek and Roman historians, both ancient and modern, to switch off from the main point! But I am trying to limit the history to its contact with the Jews, and to do this I must condense two or three thousand pages of history to make one chapter.

QUESTIONS 1. What is the scope of this chapter?

2. Who are the ancient and modern historians of Rome covering this period?

3. What complicates the history of the Ptolemies and Seleucida?

4. What prophet forecasts all the wars between these two Greek kingdoms, and what the sections of his book giving them?

5. What commentary on this part of Daniel is commended, notwithtanding the author's objectionable radical criticism on other parts?

6. What great battle placed Judea under the Seleucids? When and where fought?

7. How did the Jews receive the new master?

8. How did Antiochus evince his gratitude?

9. Compare this heathen with Louis XIV of France and Philip II of Spain.

10. Compare the settlement of the 2,000 Jewish families with the attitude of Episcopal Virginia toward the settlement of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the Shenandoah Valley.

11. What were the motives prompting Antiochus to give in marriage his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy, and how did the marriage fail of its purpose?

12. Cite the three contacts of Antiochus with the Romans, and Mommeen's comment on the battle of Magnesia.

13. What terms did the Romans exact of Antiochus after the battle of Magnesia, what parallel in modern times, and their effect on the subsequent fortunes of the Seleucids?

14. To what expedient did Antiochus III and his successors resort for means to pay the Roman -war indemnity?

15. Why were temples made to serve as banks of deposit?

16. Give Daniel's forecast of the fate of Antiochus III and a Jewish account of its fulfilment.

17. Give Daniel's forecast of Seleucus IV, successor of Antiochus HI.

18. Give substance of the story in 2 Maccabees of the treasure in the temple, how Seleucus heard of it, and his failure to get it.

# 05.09. Antiochus Epiphanes 175 B.C. - 164 B.C

XVIII ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES 175 BC. - 164 B.C. The prophecies of Daniel forecast Antiochus IV, surnamed Epiphanes, first, in Daniel 8:9-14, interpreted by Daniel 8:23-26; second, Daniel 11:2-20. The book of Daniel covers fairly nearly all the inter-biblical period. We stop Daniel's account of Antiochus at Daniel 11:20, and do not go on to the end of that chapter, as all radical critic commentaries do, because we are unable to apply that part of the book of Daniel to the wars of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. There is certainly no historical verification of it in the life of Antiochus Epiphanes. My theory of interpreting Daniel 11:21 to the end of the chapter (Daniel 12:2) is:

First, like many other prophecies, there is in this part of Daniel reference to some things near at hand and some things far distant, as when David's prophecy of Solomon's kingdom glides into the far remote Messiah's kingdom in Psalms 45:11-17 and Psalms 72:1-20.

This blending of things near and remote arises from the perspective in prophecy. It may be illustrated by the appearance of a far distant mountain range. Far-off, it seems to be one mountain, but as we approach nearer, the one mountain becomes a range, and what seemed its high point is a succession of elevations, far apart if they are viewed laterally, but blended into one peak if they are in one line of vision from the observer's viewpoint.

Second, so here, seen from only one angle of prophetic vision, Antiochus, the antichrist of his day, enemy of the Jews, is blended with a far more remote antichrist, an enemy of the Jews, who shall try to destroy them after their final restoration to their own land, and whose own destruction results in the salvation of all the Jewish nation, which we have presented in Revelation 19:11-21, collated with Isaiah 63:1-6; Ezekiel 36:1-38, Ezekiel 37:1-28; Zechariah 12:8-14:11. Now, I am showing how to study this chapter. First, study it in the light of the interpretation of that passage in Daniel.

A certain part of the books of the Maccabees touches the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, viz: 1Ma 1:1-64, 1Ma 2:1-70, 1Ma 3:1-60, 1Ma 4:1-61, 1Ma 5:1-68, 1Ma 6:1-63; 2Ma 4:1-50, 2Ma 5:1-27, 2Ma 6:1-31, 2Ma 7:1-42, 2Ma 8:1-36, 2Ma 9:1-29. There is nowhere a better statement of this discussion than in those chapters from the books of Maccabees. However, I Maccabees is much more trustworthy as history than 2 Maccabees, which was written much later.

Certain parts of Josephus should be read also to understand the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, viz: Antiquity of the Jews, Book XII, chapters 5-9. But I Maccabees is more reliable as history than Josephus.

We now take up the most notable matters in connection with the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. First, we will consider the man himself. His father, Antiochus the Great, died leaving him as hostage in Rome, after the great battle of Magnesia. While in Rome, where he grew up, he became carried away with the Roman fashion of admiring the Greek cult. The second fact about the man himself is that he was not entitled to the throne. His older brother, Seleucus, indeed had died, but Seleucua had a son, Demetrius, a little fellow, also a hostage in Rome, and that boy was

the rightful king of Antioch. Daniel tells how by flattery and treachery this Antiochus usurped the place of his young nephew.

The next thing about him is to consider his character. Daniel says he was a "vile person." He is the little horn of Daniel 2:1-49. He had a very brilliant mind, but he was more impressed by the way things seemed than the way things were. He had no conscience about sacred things at all, indeed, he defied himself. In the "Cambridge Bible" are photographic copies of some of the coins he issued, and on those coins were these inscriptions: Antiochus Basilanos ("king") Theos Epiphanes ("God manifest"), Nicephorus ("victory bearer"). The last is the title of Jupiter, "Victory bearer," and he had the artist who drew the plans for these coins to make his face on the coins resemble the face of Jupiter, as presented in his statues. It needed some change to make it look like that, but he did not mind it.

So much for the man. We will now consider the events. At the close of his brother's reign, Onias III, the good high priest, had gone to Antioch to remove the impression about the temple treasury that had been made by Simon, and Onias is in Antioch when Antiochus Epiphanes comes to the throne. A brother of Onias, named Joshua, who had become an infidel Jew and changed his name to Jason, then went to see Antiochus, and convinced him that he would make a good deal more money if he would depose Onias and make him, Jason, the high priest; that he was already Hellenized and believed in the Greek religion, and it would be a great help if Antiochus would make him high priest. So Antiochus kept Onias there until he died. He never saw his home any more, and this renegade Jew, Jason, was made high priest.

I am glad to notice that a great while after that, a still greater renegade Jew, Menelaus, being sent to Antioch by Jason, persuaded Antiochus to depose Jason and make him (Menelaus) the high priest, and he would get a better bargain still. So one thief turns out another, and Menelaus was made high priest. He made no pretensions to the observances of the Jewish religion. Jason, to show how much he was Hellenized, erected in the holy city, a Greek gymnasium. In these athletic days, when the schools are all turning almost exclusively to athletics, and the glory of a school is its athletics, we may understand what a baleful influence that gymnasium would have in Jerusalem, for both Jason and Menelaus, who succeeded him, persuaded the Jews that the best thing to do would be to attend that Greek theater and let their Temple alone. No Sunday moving picture show in modern times so nearly breaks up worship as did that Greek theater in Jerusalem.

The next event in connection with the reign of Antiochus was his purpose to bring Egypt into his realm. His satrap, Apollonius, informed him that two men in Egypt had charge of the little king, the nephew of Antiochus. Cleopatra, a sister of Antiochus, was sent over there to become the wife of one of the Ptolemies. I have already shown what a good woman she was. Now, her little son at this time was king of Egypt, but those who had charge of the boy after his mother died were renegades. This satrap persuaded Antiochus that if he would make a demonstration in Egypt, be could easily capture the whole country. Now in order to make everything clear behind him, he made his first visit to Jerusalem, where the renegade high priest received him with open arms, and made great promises about what he was going to do for the Jews. He then led his first expedition into Egypt and captured Pelusium, a port of Egypt, on one of the mouths of the Nile. The young king tried to flee, but his renegade tutor betrayed him to Antiochus, who caught him and pretended to act in his name. He subjugated nearly all Egypt, and issued some of those coins I told about and

had himself crowned there.

While he was over there, however, the report reached Jerusalem that he had been killed. Whereupon the superseded Jason, whom I told about, and who had fled over the Jordan, collected a thousand men, returned to Jerusalem and tried to depose Menelaus. Antiochus hears of it, and thinks it to be a revolt of the Jews against his authority. So he comes back by Jerusalem, murders thousands of its people in cold blood, enters the Temple, takes away the sacred vessels, and among them the famous golden candlesticks, and robs the Temple of its treasure, and Menelaus helps him in all of it. He then made a second expedition into Egypt, 169 B.C., and recaptured all of the country except Alexandria, which held out.

He returns again, continuing all this time his oppression of the Jews, and makes a third expedition into Egypt. Cleopatra, that good woman I told about, had left two sons, and these two boys had fled to Rome and appealed for help. Rome sent an embassy to warn Antiochus to let the Egyptians alone.

When Antiochus was within four miles of Alexandria the Roman embassy met him. The leader of it was Popilus. The Roman had nothing but his staff in his hand. He lifted his staff and said:

"In the name of the Senate of Rome I command you to go back to your own country and let Egypt alone." Antiochus said:

"I will call a council of my friends and take it into consideration."

The Roman stopped and drew a circle around him in the sand and said:

"You will answer me before you get out of that circle, yea or no."

Those Romans were stern fellows. Antiochus said:

"Yes," and went home, but he went home mad.

The Romans made him abandon all his conquests in Egypt and the Mediterranean islands. Being exceedingly mad, he sent his general, Apollonius, to Jerusalem with instructions to make all Geole-Syria adopt the Greek religion and particularly required the Jews to abandon their religion.

The general captured Jerusalem, tore down its walls, and erected a fortification that commanded the Temple. He erected a Greek altar to Jupiter right on top of Jehovah’s brazen altar, and sacrificed a sow, the abominable flesh to a Jew, and took the broth and flung it all over the holy place, and had filth cast into the most holy place, and commanded every Jew that had a Bible to bring it to him, and he tore their holy books to pieces and burnt their fragments. He issued an order that no child should be circumcised, and when some of the women disobeyed he had their babies killed and tied around their necks and then murdered the women. He then made every one that professed to be a Jew come up and eat swine’s flesh.

There was one old Jew named Eleazer, so devout and venerable that, even the Hellenizing Jews loved him. They told him they did not want to see him die, and to bring a piece of other meat with him and eat that so that it would seem that he had eaten the hog’s meat. But he said, "No, this is no time for compromising; if I would even seem to eat the swine’s flesh my name would be disgraced. I am an old man, and a few days more or less matters nothing to me. Kill me. I will not

violate my law." And so they murdered him.

A much more notable event we find in 2 Maccabees, concerning a pious widow and her seven boys. I lift my hat to them every time I think about them. This woman and her seven sons were commanded to violate the laws. She exhorted her boys to be faithful. They scalped the oldest one, and put coals of fire on his head, after taking the skin off, and then killed him, his mother looking on. But she exhorted the other six to be faithful. They killed the second one by horrible torture, and she exhorted the other five to be faithful. And they killed the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth the same way. She turned to her baby boy, her youngest, the pride and darling of her heart, and told him that his mother was expecting him to be true to his God and his religion, and they tortured him to death, and she kept on praising Jehovah until they put her to death.

I read that when I was ten years old, and it struck me &a being one of the heroic things in history. It is to such events that a certain passage in Hebrews II refers.

The old proverb is: "When you double the tale of the brick, then comes Moses." So now there arose in Judea an order called Asideans, pious people who preferred religion to everything else, and they entered into a solemn covenant to stand by the faith. When they were attacked on Saturday, their sabbath, because they would not fight on the holy day, they submitted to death without defence; 1,000 were murdered at one time as on another occasion their priests had been done iii the Temple, who kept on offering incense and worshiping God until they were slain at the altar.

There was a man named Asmon, from whom we get the name Asmoneans. A descendant of Asmon, an old Jew, a perfect giant, named Mattathias, had five sons, vigorous men, named John, Simon, Judah, Eleazar, and Jonathan, and the history of this old man and his five sons is more memorable than the history of the woman and her five sons. He determined that he would not be passive if they attacked him on the sabbath, but that he would fight, and that he would not consent to the destruction of the Jewish religion. When the deputies of Antiochus came to Samaria with the demand to adopt the Greek religion, they submitted at once, and dedicated their temple to Jupiter and joined Antiochus in fighting the Jews, as usual. Finally a deputy reached the little village where Mattathias lived, and commanded him to obey the law. He said, "I obey God’s law." They then called up another Jew who offered to obey the law, and when he started to do it Mattathias killed him, and then killed the deputy, and tore down the heathen altar. He and his sons went all over the country tearing down the heathen altars.

The old man, seeing he was about to die, appointed his son Judas to have charge of the army, Judas, sumamed Maccabeus. "Maccabeus" means hammerer; Judas the Hammerer. Edward II of England, was called "the hammerer of the Scots," and in Westminster Abbey there is the inscription: "Edward, Hammerer of the Scots." In Jane Porter’s Scottish Chiefs is given the history of William Wallace redeeming Scotland from the bondage to which Edward the Hammerer had subjected it. I used to read it and cry. No hero of history comes nearer being like William Wallace than Judas the Hammerer. His life, even as told by his enemies, and particularly the account by the Jewish historians, surpass--anything in history, showing the heroic force of a man fighting for his religion and his country.

I remember once, when I was a schoolboy, I had to recite Fitz-Green Halleck's poem, "Marco Boyario" – Greeks fighting Turks (just as they are doing now) ; that part of it where the Turk awoke to hear his sentry shriek: "To arms I They cornel The Greek! The Greek!" when he awoke to hear Bouaris cry:

"Strike till the last armed foe expires!

"Strike for your altars and your fires I

"God and your native land," may be given an original turn by applying it to Judas Maccabeus. The reader should cover the whole period, and even its approaches, by giving some account in order of the following battles:

1. Marathon, Salamis, Thermopylae, Plataea, Cunaxa.

2. Granicus, Issus, Arbela.

3. Ipsus, Raphia, Paneas, Magnesia.

4. Beth-horon, Emmaus, Beth-zur, Beth-Zecharias, Capharsalama, Adasa, Eleasa.

5. Pharsalia, Philippi, Actium.

These five series of battles give an outline of the period. The fourth series names not all but the most of the great battles fought by Judas Maccabeus. None of these, however, comes within three of his greatest campaigns, to wit, the redemption of Galilee, the conquests east of the Jordan, and the war against Edom.

Judas then brought Esau back to Jacob. He conquered Edom that had helped always in oppressing Judah, and from that time on Esau and Jacob were together. He and his brothers crossed the Jordan and drove the armies of Antiochus out of that country; they redeemed Galilee, and brought back to Jerusalem the persecuted Jews that were there. Antiochus, in the meantime, had left a general to take charge of his army and continue the war against the Jews, while he went on a temple-robbing expedition, like his father before him, and the same temple at Elymais. When he got there the gates were shut against him and he could not rob that temple. While there he heard the account of the overthrow of his army by Judas Maccabeus.

I will close this chapter by giving an account of Antiochus' death, from I Maccabees, in the one hundred and forty-ninth year (not of his age, but of the Greek Supremacy):

Now, when the king heard these words [about the defeat of his armies by Judas] he was astonished and sore moved; whereupon he laid him down upon his bed, and fell sick for grief, because it had not befallen him as he looked for. And there he continued many days: for his grief was ever more and more, and he made account that he should die. Wherefore, he called for all his friends and said unto them: "The sleep is gone from mine eyes, and my heart faileth for very care. And I thought with myself into what tribulations am I come, and how great a flood of misery it is, wherein now I am I for I was bountiful and beloved in my power. But now I remember the evils that I did at Jerusalem, and that I took all the vessels of gold and silver that were therein, and sent to destroy the inhabitants of Judea without cause. I perceive, therefore, that these troubles have come upon me, and behold I perish through great grief in a strange land." Then called he for

Philip, one of his friends, whom he made ruler over all his realm, and gave him the crown, and his robe, and his signet, to the end he should bring up his son Antiochus, and nourish him up for the kingdom.

The account of his death in 2 Maccabees, which is not as good history as 1 Maccabees, is varied from the account in the first book and less historical.

QUESTIONS 1. What the subject and period of this chapter?

2. What sections of Daniel refer to this man?

3. Why not apply Daniel 11:20-12:1 to the war of the Seleucids & Ptolemies?

4. What parts of the books of the Maccabees refer to Antiochus Epiphanes?

5. What parts of Josephus?

6. How was Antiochus a usurper?

7. Give his character.

8. How does his blasphemy appear on the coins issued by him?

9. Give, in order of time, the first relations of Antiochus to the Jews as present-ed in the history of three high priests, Onias, Jason, and Menelaus.

10. What was the effect on Jewish temple worship of Jason’s Greek gymnasium? Illustrate by events of our day.

11. How and through whom was Antiochus persuaded to add Egypt to his realm?

12. Tell of his first visit to Jerusalem and his promises.

13. What occurred at Jerusalem while he was in Egypt to inflame his mind against that city & what the result of his second visit returning from Egypt 14. Give the dramatic account of his retirement from Egypt on the third invasion.

15. In his fury against Jerusalem what fearful havoc was wrought there by his general Apolloniua?

16. In this case what was the "Abomination of Desolation" spoken of by Daniel the prophet?

17. In that case how do you explain Matthew 24:15?

18. How does Daniel give the time from this desecration of the temple by Antiochus to its cleansing by Judas Maccabeus, and what is the time in years?

19. What general policy looking to uniformity in religion did Antiochus now adopt and its sweeping character toward the Jews?

20. How did Samaria respond to this religious demand?

21. Cite two notable instances of Jewish martyrdom from 2 Maccabees.

22. Who were the Asideans, and what their attitude toward this religious persecution?

23. What massacre of them occurred, and why did they not resist?

24. Tell about Mattathias and his sons, the commencement of their revolt, and their policy of fighting on the sabbath.

25. Of whom was Mattathias a descendant, and what long line was named after this ancestor, and can you tell now the person of the line and her fate?

26. In view of death to whom did Mattathias commit the military lead, and to whom the high priesthood?

27. What the meaning of "Maccabeus" and what English king bore a similar cognomen?

28. To what Scottish hero may Judas Maccabeus be compared?

29. What great battles did he fight, and in which two was he defeated?

30. Can you name the most distinguished generals of Antiochus fought?

31. Describe some of his campaigns, particularly in Galilee, east of the Jordan, and against Edom.

32. Up to what point in his conquests did all the pious Jews support him, and for what was he striving beyond that point?

33. Where do we find two variant accounts of the death of Antiochus and which the most historical?

34. Describe his horrible death, 35. What five series of battles give a battle history of the inter-biblical period and its approaches?

36. At the close of the study of the period be ready to date and analyze these battles, and tell their leaders and the issues decided by them.

37. By the conquest of Edom Judas Maccabeus annexed Esau to Jacob. How can you anticipate subsequent history by showing how this annexation ultimately resulted in placing both Esau and Ishmael on the throne of Jacob in one obnoxious person?

# 05.10. The Maccabees 164 B.C.-65 B.C.

XIX THE MACCABEES 164 B.C.-65 B.C.

We have about 100 years of exciting history to consider in this chapter. Our last chapter closed with Judas Maccabeus in power, and with Menelaus, the renegade Jew, as high priest appointed by the Syrian king. Menelaus, having been driven out by Judas, made an appeal to the king at Antioch, and a number of the Jews sided with him – those who had gone into copying the Greek spirit. He went to the king at Antioch and told him that Judas had driven out all his friends and was taking the country away from the Seleucids at Antioch, whereupon the Syrian king sent against Judas the old general, Lysias, who had served under Antiochus Epiphanes, with a great army. They went down on the east side of the Jordan and around the Dead Sea, and came up on the south. It was a very strong army. Judas) at that time besieging the stronghold in Jerusalem still held by a garrison of the Syrian king, had to rush hurriedly to meet this vast invasion with a very inferior force, about 3,000 men. Many of the 3,000 advised him not to fight – that it was impossible for 3,000 Jews to overcome such a host as stood opposed to him. The battlefield was at Beth-Zecharias. But Judas fought anyhow – he always fought.

A great many elephants were in the army of Lysias, and one of them being larger than the others and having more gorgeous trappings, was supposed by Eleazar to carry the commanderin-chief, Lysias. So he dashed forward alone and got under the elephant and, stabbing upward, killed him. But the elephant in falling crushed Eleazar and killed him. Judas was defeated and fell back on Jerusalem. Lysias, when he got in eight of Jerusalem and saw how formidable were the preparations made by Judas, and being very much disturbed by the fear of the increasing Roman power, advised Antiochus to make peace, and so peace was made on the condition that the Jews were forever after to be free in their religion, but remain subject to the Syrian government.

This peace secured the main thing for which the war was undertaken by Judas' father, Mattathias, and the Pharisees from this time on were opposed to the war. That is, they cared very little about political freedom. They were willing enough to be subordinate to another government if they were allowed to retain their religion. And about this time the renegade, Menelaus, died. From this time on the war between the Maccabees and Syria was a political rather than a religious war.

Just about this time the right heir to the throne at Antioch, Demetrius I, surnamed Soter, came to Antioch, dethroned the son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and killed him and Lysias, the general. Now comes to the front Alcimus – a man as bad as Menelaus or Jason. He wants to be high priest. He is thoroughly filled with the Hellenistic spirit, and in favor of Syrian domination. Demetrius appoints him high priest, and sends John Bacchides with an army to install him in office. The Pharisees thought they could accept him as high priest, inasmuch as he was a descendant of Aaron, in spite of the warning of Judas. But Alcimus, with Bacchides and his army to help him, killed a portion of the noblest of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in cold blood. Judas comes and drives out Alcimus, who makes a second appeal to Demetrius. Demetrius sends another great army to meet this great host of Syrians at the battle of Capharsalama, in Joshua's old battlefield at Beth-horon. Judas

twice overwhelmingly defeats the Syrian general, kills him, and brings such spoils to Jerusalem as had not been seen for years.

Just at this time Judas began to be depressed in mind, thinking how often he had to fight great armies with only a handful of men, so he made an appeal to Rome – which was a mistake on his part. Woe to the nation that ever appealed to Rome! He made an appeal to Rome and sent an embassy empowered to enter into a treaty of alliance with Rome, and also with Sparta in Greece. That treaty was made, but Judas was dead before the news came. The following is the treaty, from page 45 of 1 Maccabees:

Good success to the Romans, and to the people of the Jews, by land and by sea forever; the sword also and enemy be far from them. If there comes first any war upon the Romans, or any of their confederates throughout all their dominion, the people of the Jews shall help them with victuals, vessels, money, or ships, as it hath seemed good unto the Romans; but they shall keep their covenants without taking anything therefore. In the same manner, also, if war come first upon the Jews, the Romans shall help them with all their hearts, according as the time shall be appointed them; neither shall victuals be given them that take part against them, or weapons, or money, or ships, as it hath seemed good to the Romans, but they shall keep their covenants, and that without deceit. According to these articles did the Romans make a covenant with the Jews. Howbeit if hereafter the one party or the other shall think meet to add or diminish anything, they may do it at their pleasures, and whatsoever they shall add or take away shall be ratified. And as touching the evils that Demetrius doeth to the Jews, we have written unto him, saying, wherefore hast thou made thy yoke heavy upon our friends and confederates, the Jews? If therefore they complain any more against thee, we will do them justice, and fight with thee by sea and by land.

Now that is what is called a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive. An embassy had been sent to Sparta as well as to Rome, and here is the most singular document of history that came from the Spartans:

Areus, king of the Lacedaemonians, to Onias, the high priest, Greeting: It is found in writing that the Lacedaemonians and the Jews are brethren, and that they are of the stock of Abraham: now, there-fore, since this has come to our knowledge, ye shall do well to write unto us of your prosperity. We do write back again unto you that your cattle and goods are ours, and that ours are yours. We do com-mend, therefore, our ambassadors to make report unto you on this wise,

If I had that king of the Spartans before me, I would ask for a sight of the document proving that the Spartans, like the Jews, were the descendants of Abraham. I would like to see how he makes out his case. I cannot do it. That is a singular claim.

Let us now consider the death of Judas, which took place before the knowledge of the Roman treaty came to him. Demetrius had sent a still greater army under Bacchides, and sent back Alcimus, the high priest. Judas met him at Eleasa; Judas had 3,000 men, but Bacchides had 22,000 men. The men of Judas' army could not stand to face such a multitude and they went home and left him with only 800 men. He said, "It is not for me to flee; what if I am killed, I perish for my country." Never did 800 men make a braver fight than they made at Eleasa; but the little Jewish force was destroyed, except a very few, and Judas was killed. His brothers, Simon and Jonathan, rescued the body and buried it in the family cemetery, beside the aged father and the

other brother that had fallen. That was in 161 B.C.; Jonathan was then made both high priest and commander-in-chief. We have seen two of Mattathias' sons pass away – Judas and Eleazar. Jonathan is now the commanderin-chief, and about this time Alycimus died.

I must now refer to an event, one of the most important in the inter-biblical period. It took place 160 B.C.: Onias IV, the son of the good and pious Onias, whom Antiochus had killed, went to Egypt. He was entitled to the priesthood, but he did not believe there would ever be any chance to have regular worship at Jerusalem, so he asked the Ptolemies to have a temple built in Egypt. He read to him a verse from Isaiah (Isaiah 19:19): "In that day shall there be an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Jehovah." Onias quoted that passage from Isaiah, and a temple was erected at Leontopolis, or On, that stood as long as the Temple at Jerusalem. So now there are three temples: one at Jerusalem, the Samaritan temple, still standing, and the temple over in Egypt.

The next important event is that Bacchides, finding out that Jonathan was as wise as Judas, and that the people were going to stand by him, made a treaty of peace with Jonathan, agreeing that Jonathan should take the office of high priest which the Jews had conferred upon him.

We now come to another very important event. In 153 B.C. Alexander, a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, claimed to be the legitimate ruler of Syria, and opposed Demetrius. Both of them, Demetrius and Alexander, began to make bids for Jonathan's help. Jonathan is now the arbitrator of the war – he has the ball at IMS feet and keeps it rolling between these two and each one keeps raising his bid as to what he would do if Jonathan would lead the Jews to support him. Jonathan accepted the proposition of Alexander. To further strengthen himself, Alexander entered into a treaty of peace with Ptolemy king of Egypt. This treaty was based upon a marriage between Alexander and Cleopatra, the daughter of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. But Ptolemy begins to change his policy of friendship toward Alexander, wishing to make himself ruler of the kingdom of the Seleucida. To this end he negotiates a treaty with Demetrius, the contestant for the throne of the Seleucids against Alexander, and promises to take his daughter Cleopatra, away from Alexander and give her to Demetrius. I wonder how the woman felt in being swapped off that way – first to one man, then to another, for political reasons. The daughters of kings have a hard time of it on the marriage question, since they are disposed of for political reasons without regard for their own will or affections.

I have not the space to continue the history of the Maccabees in detail. It is sufficient to say that Jonathan, who succeeded Judas, was not only a great general, but a great diplomatist. He maintained his treaties of peace with the Romans and Lacedaemonians; he won many important victories and established himself thoroughly in the affections of the people, and enlarged the territory of his country.

The tragic termination of his life was on this wise: A certain Trypho, minister and general of Alexander, began to aspire to be king at Antioch himself, and knowing that the most formidable adversary in his way was Jonathan and the Jewish army, he ensnared Jonathan under false pretenses to visit at Ptolemais. Jonathan accepted the invitation, taking with him only a thousand men. As soon as they entered the city the gates were closed, the thousand men were killed and Jonathan placed in prison. Jonathan's brother Simon raised an army to rescue his brother, and Trypho, dreading the result of an engagement, proffered to restore Jonathan for an immense sum

of money, and provided that Jonathan's sons be left with him as hostages. Simon sent the money and the boys. Trypho kept the money and put Jonathan to death. Simon then succeeded Jonathan as both high priest and commander-in-chief. We find his great history set forth in detail in the first book of Maccabees. He brought the Jews into great prosperity; he expelled the Syrian garrison from the tower in Jerusalem, and occupied Joppa as a seaport. The territory of the Jews was greatly enlarged. If Judas was the hero of the Maccabees, and Jonathan was the diplomatist, surely Simon was the great statesman. I have not space to tell of all his great deeds, but will give from the first book of Maccabees a pleasing bit of his history:

Then did they till their ground in peace, and the earth gave her increase, and the trees of the field their fruit. The ancient men sat all in the streets, communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He provided victuals for the cities, and set in them all manner of munition so that his honorable name was renowned unto the end of the world. He made peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. For every man sat under his vine and fig tree, and there was none to fray them; neither was there any left in the land to fight against them; yea, the kings themselves were overthrown in those days. Moreover, he strengthened all his people that were brought low. He searched out the law, and every dissenter of the law and wicked person he took away. He beautified the sanctuary and all the temple, and multiplied its vessels. [He is the last of the Maccabean brothers. His brother John was killed by the Arabians.]

We now relate the tragic termination of Simon's life. His son-in-law, Ptolemy, was a governor of Jericho, and this son-in-law aspired to occupy the priesthood and the generalship held by Simon. He invited Simon to visit him. Simon went and took his wife, his eldest son, Judas, and his youngest son, Mattathias, with him. His most illustrious son, John Hyrcanus, was, fortunately, not with him. Ptolemy infamously murdered Simon and the two sons, and John Hyrcanus came with an army to punish him. Ptolemy led John's mother out on the walls and threatened to put her to death if John did not retire from his position. His mother implored him to storm the place and not to mind her being killed. But he could not stand to bring his mother to death, and turned away. Then Ptolemy killed the mother anyhow and fled the country. I am sorry that we have no record of his being hanged.

John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon, is now made the high priest and commander-in-chief, and under him Judea wonderfully enlarged its territory. He destroyed the Samaritan temple and the city so that one could not tell where the city ever stood. He invaded Edom, the home of Esau, and annexed it to Jacob. Little did he think that in thus uniting Esau with Jacob he was arranging unwittingly for the placing of an Edomite on the throne of Judea, Antipas, an Edomite, was made local governor of Edom, to be succeeded by his son Antipater, whose policy will be considered in the last chapter on this inter-biblical period. John was now at the height of his power and influence, but a quarrel was developed between him and the Pharisees.

I here stop to make some explanation of the three Jewish sects – the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. The Pharisees were derived from the scribes. The scribes originated with Ezra, and the Pharisees were a development of the scribes. They held as binding the written Bible and the oral traditions. These oral traditions, as they claimed, were handed down from Moses, and afterward were embodied in the Talmud. Now, there are some good things about them. They believed in the resurrection of the dead, in the immortality of the soul, in the existence of angels;

they kept alive the hope of a coming personal Messiah. But they became intense ritualists and formalists.

Now, the Sadducees. The word means simply Zadokites, that is, they claim to be the followers of the high priest, Zadok, away back yonder in Solomon's time. As the Pharisees were derived from the scribes, the Sadducees were derived from the priests. The Sadducees rightly held to the written Bible only, and rejected all traditions. But they were sceptics; they did not believe in angels, nor in spirits, nor in the immortality of the soul, nor in the resurrection of the body. In the next place, they were simply a political party; they believed in religion as an institution, but not as an inspiration. Like many politicians now that think they should hold on to religion to keep the people under control, but do not believe in it for themselves.

The Essenes were neither a political nor an ecclesiastical party. They were rather a monastic order. They abjured marriages; they were vegetarians; they would not eat any meat, and would not let a woman come into the settlement at all. They perpetuated themselves by adopting children and training them to be monks. They would not go into trade nor commerce, and, like the Quakers, would not take an oath. They were the Pharisees gone to seed. They prayed, but, like the ancient Persians, they prayed toward the sun and not toward the temple.

I have not space to relate in detail the illustrious deeds of John Hyrcanus. He was the last great Maccabee. The illustrious members of the family were as follows: Old Mattathias, who led in the rebellion against Antiochus Epiphanes; the great Judas, who succeeded him; Jonathan, who followed Judas; Simon, who followed Jonathan; and John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon, who followed his father. John Hyrcanus died about 105 B.C. His sons were the first to crown themselves as kings. There were none of them equal to or worthy of the five great Maccabees whose names have been given above. While the sons of John were ruling, Rome comes upon the scene and history rapidly develops until the coming of our Lord.

QUESTIONS 1. What is the name and extent of the period discussed in this chapter?

2. At what point did the last chapter close?

3. Describe the occasion of the battle at Beth-Zecharias.

4. Tell of the death of Bleazar, the brother of Judas.

5. What prompted Lyaias to advise Antiochus to make peace with Judas, and what the result of the peace?

6. From this time on, what the nature of the war between the Maccabees and Syria?

7. Tell how Demetrius I became king at Antioch.

8. Whom did he appoint to be high priest, and why did the Pharisees accept him?

9. What outrage was committed by this high priest which caused Judas to drive him out of Jerusalem?

10. What was the occasion of another invasion of Judea by the Syrians? Describe the battle of Capharsalama.

11. What two noted embassies were sent out by Judas?

12. Give the treaty between the Romans and the Maccabees.

13. Give the transcript of the letter from the Lacedaemoniana.

14. Describe the battle of Eleasa and the death of Judas.

15. Who succeeded Judas as high priest and commander-in-chief?

16. Give the history of the temple in Egypt at Leontopolis.

17. What new claimant for the throne at Antioch?

18. Describe the third marriage between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and the ultimate result.

19. Toll of the tragic death of Jonathan, and who succeeded him.

20. What was the fate of John, the brother of Simon?

21. What was the relative excellencies of Judas, Jonathan, and Simon?

22. Give the quotation from I Maccabees showing a pleasant part of the history of Simon.

23. Give an account of the tragic death of Simon.

24. What was the great achievement of John Hyrcanus, son of Simon?

25. Give some account of the three Jewish sects – the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.

26. About what time did John Hyrcanus die?

27. Which one of his sons first became king of the Jews?

28. What may we say of the Asmonaean kings in comparison with the five preceding Maccabees?

Chapter 40

# 05.11. The Jews Under The Romans And Herod 65 B.C. - The Birth Of Christ

XX THE JEWS UNDER THE ROMANS AND HEROD 65 B.C. – The Birth of Christ I commence this chapter with these opening remarks:

First, I have not been able, in the space allowed, to even name all of the Jewish books of the period, nor to distinguish sufficiently between them. The classifications of that literature are: The Wisdom literature, such as Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; the Romance literature, such as Tobit and Judith; and the Apocalyptic literature, such as Baruch and Enoch – though it is doubtful if any part of Enoch was written before Christ; and the spurious prophetic literature, such as the Sibylline books and the imitation Psalter literature; the philosophic literature of the Alexandrian Jews; and the historical literature, such as 1 and 2 Maccabees; and the forged epistolary literature, such as the letter of Jeremiah; and the literature of forged prayers, such as those attributed to Manasseh and Azarias.

Second, There has not been space enough to examine critically the discrepancies between Jewish historians on the one hand and the Greek and Roman historians on the other hand. Third, There has been such condensation of names and dates and little chance to differentiate enough to make Jiving pictures before the mind.

It will, therefore, be understood that these seven chapters do not constitute a full discussion on the inter-biblical period, but are intended merely as a guide to a more extended study of this period.

I will now give a very brief summary of the preceding six chapters:

1. The names, "Jews" and "Judaism," came into prominence with Ezra, the scribe, called the Second Moses.

2. With him also rose the order of the scribes, who were the copyists, multipliers, and expounders of the sacred Scriptures, and the synagogues as places of worship and biblical instruction, and the council of the elders, which later became the Sanhedrin.

3. With him also came the revival of the law, the sanctity of the sabbath, the sanctity of the marriage relation, the permanent renunciation of idolatry by the Jews, and ever-increasing hopes of immorality and of the coming of the Messiah.

4. The Judea of the restoration, after the Babylonian exile, was a small territory around Jerusalem, not as big as some of the counties of Texas, to be vastly enlarged under the Maccabees.

5. Following the refusal to recognize the Samaritans as Jews, and the strict construction of the marriage law, arose the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizirn, which stood until destroyed by John Hyrcanus.

6. Judea was subject to Persia until annexed by Alexander the Great, 332 B.C.

7. After his death it was subject to Egypt, from 323 B.C. to 198 B.C.

8. The greatest events under the Ptolemies were the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek and the rise of Hellenism, distinguishing the Hebrews from the Hellenists.

9. From 198 B.C. to 128 B.C. Judah was subject to the Seleucids of Antioch.

10. The events of this subjection were: First, the attempt of Antiochus IV, surnamed Epiphanes, to utterly destroy the Jews' religion, bringing the kingdom of God into greater peril than ever in human history except in the days of Noah and in the days of Elijah when he stood alone against the world. Second, the heroic resistance of Mattathias and his five sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan, all of them dying violent deaths in the violent struggle, continued by John Hyrcanus, son of Simon.

11. In these Maccabean wars the following great results were obtained: (1) religious liberty by Judas Maccabeus; (2) political independence by his brothers Jonathan and Simon and by John Hyrcanus, son of Simon; (3) great expansion of the Jewish territory until it almost reached the old boundaries of David's kingdom – this expansion included Samaria, Perea, Galilee, Gilead, Iturea, Idumea, and Philistia; (4) that Aristobulus, son of John Hyrcanus, was the first to put on the royal diadem; (5) in this period came to the front the three noted Jewish sects – the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes; (6) that a Jewish temple was established in Egypt, which lasted until A.D. 70, when the Jerusalem Temple was also destroyed.

12. The kings of the Asmonaean Dynasty were unworthy of their illustrious Maccabean ancestry.

The foregoing remarks refer to the preceding chapters on the inter-biblical period, and we are now to consider the last section of the period, from 65 B.C. to the birth of Christ, in which Judea is subject to the Romans, and the Asmonaean Dynasty is succeeded by Herod, sometimes called the Great, an Idumaean, whose mother was an Arabian. The countries now to the front are Rome, Pontus under Mithridates, Parthis, which Rome never conquered, and the dying kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Let us glance now for a moment atROME

At this time Rome, as a republic, had become utterly corrupt. Indeed, it was no longer a republic in any true sense. There is the distinction between a democracy and a republic. In a pure democracy the people rule directly; in a republic they rule representatively. The United States is a republic, ever approaching a democracy. The Baptist churches are the only pure democracies in the world. The Presbyterians have a republican form of government; they govern by representatives. The senate of Rome constituted its republican feature, and had become the most corrupt oligarchy in history. They appointed the proconsuls who governed all the provinces, except those ruled by military appointees of Caesar. The tribunes, elected by the citizens, constituted the only democratic element – but the elections became a mere farce. The lands of Italy were now owned by a few corrupt landlords who used up the resources of the farms to support a vicious city life. The overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of Italy were slaves, captives of foreign wars, who tilled all the farms, built all the imposing edifices, constituted the entire class of mechanics, artisans, scribes, and domestics. These slaves were not of an inferior race, but were the nobles, patriots, the picked men and women of the conquered nations from all over the world, and in thousands of instances far superior to their masters in education and nobility. They had no legal rights. Their labor, their persons, their honor, their lives, were absolutely at the disposal of their

luxurious, and oftentimes vicious masters. The sturdy yoemanry had passed away. Those who were counted citizens, and could vote for the tribune, did not work, and lived on gratuitous distribution of rations and free shows. Whoever could most liberally supply them with "bread and circuses" could command their votes. Only by the spoils of conquered nations, or by the spoils of robbery of subject provinces could one have means enough to thus feed and amuse the pampered and fickle body of so-called Roman citizens. Goldsmith, inThe Deserted Village, well says,

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey, Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

About the beginning of our period, Cicero, the great orator, was consul exposing the Cataline conspiracy, in those famous orations which are studied as a preparation for college. Three men, by combination, controlled the world. This was the first Roman Triumvirate, that is, three-man power, or three-man government – Julius Caesar, Gnaeus Pompey, and Publius Crassus. There were two formidable enemies of Rome at this time – Mithridates, king of Pontus, and the Parthians from the shores of the Caspian Sea. Pompey conquered Mithridates, and also overthrew the last of the Seleucids at Antioch, winding up this division of the Greek Empire, and this brought him in touch with Judea. Pompey besieged and captured Jerusalem and pushed his way into the holy of holies, and was astounded at what he found. Tacitus tells what he found: "He found within no images of the gods, a vacant mercy seat, and an empty ark."

Thus passed away the Asmonaean kingdom. The Jews never forgave this impiety of Pompey. While the Asmonaean kingdom passed away, members of the family yet remained for some years, with a kind of princely dignity. The Jews were more tolerant to Pompey’s fellow triumvir, Crassus, who nine years later (54 B.C.), when governor of Syria, robbed the temple of all its treasures, amounting in cash value to about $10,000,000. A year later, 53 B.C. Crassus was defeated by the Parthians, his army annihilated, and himself slain at the battle of Carrhae. This downfall of Crassus the Jews interpreted as the vengeance of the Almighty for his robbery of the Temple. At any rate, this victory of the Parthians, 53 B.C., brought about two results:

1. It opened the way for them to come in touch with Judea, which I will tell about later.

2. It opened a way for the rupture between Caesar and Pompey (49 B.C.), the other triumvirs, and which led to the famous civil war which was settled at the battle of Pharsalia, in which Caesar with 22,000 of his veterans defeated and captured Pompey’s army of 50,000 men. Caesar’s grim old veterans were told that Pompey’s legions were "city dandies," and hence were instructed to strike at their faces, since they prided themselves so much on their good looks that to hit at their prettiness scared them worse than to hit at their hearts. Pompey fled to Egypt, and was assassinated as soon as he stepped ashore. Caesar followed him, and was temporarily snared by the witchery of the famous Cleopatra. Caesar is now the ruler of the world.

ESAU AND ISHMAEL ON THE THRONE OF JACOB IN THE PERSON OF HEROD, THE IDUMAEAN, WHOSE MOTHER WAS AN ARABIAN.

In a former chapter was recounted the final conquest of Idumaea, or Edom, by John Hyrcanus, and its incorporation into Judea, thus forcibly uniting Jacob and Esau. Antipas, a shrewd and powerful Idumaean, was left as local governor of the conquered Edom. He left as his successor a greater and more unscrupulous son, Antipater. This Antipater had sided with Pompey against Caesar, but when he learned the result of the battle of Pharsalia, he flopped over to Caesar in the

snap of the fingers. He hurriedly gathered an army and rushed to Caesar's help at Alexandria, where Caesar was having a time of it trying to conquer that great city, and so says Milne Rea: "The Idumaean mouse helped the Roman lion, and the lion was grateful." On the rupture with Pompey, Caesar had released Aristobulus, one of the contesting Maccabees, and loaned him to legions to create a diversion in Judea against Pompey. Pompey's friends poisoned Aristobulus and executed his brother Alexander. Now, for the help rendered him at Alexandria, Caesar made Antipater a Roman citizen and procurator of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. Hyrcanus II was made high priest and a Roman senator, and also was made hereditary ethnarch, that is, subordinate governor. Antipater at once began to advance his family, as fathers are wont to do. His son, Phasael, was made governor of Jerusalem, and his greater eon, known later as Herod the Great, then just twenty-five years old, was sent into Galilee to put down bands of desperadoes, robbers, and religious zealots, who as patriots, sheltered themselves in caves and warred against Rome.

Many years ago Harper's Magazine gave a richly illustrated account of Herod's successful war against these devoted Jews, who so desperately resisted the Roman supremacy. From the mountaintops Herod let down huge boxes, as big as a flat car, by chains, filled with Roman soldiers, until they were just level with the mouth of the caves, and there, swung in the air, these grim Roman soldiers gained an entrance by desperate fighting, killing and capturing these so-called robbers. If they had succeeded they would have passed into history with the fame of William Tell, Sir William Wallace, or Francis Marion, and we must not think of these men as ordinary robbers. Barabbas, who was preferred to Christ, was this kind of robber – not an ordinary highwayman – and one of the apostles was Simon the Zealot. We may, therefore, understand why the Sanhedrin summoned Herod, in this case, to answer at its bar for murdering "free Jews," who counted themselves patriots, and why they later preferred Barabbas to Christ. The two so-called thieves crucified with Christ were also of this kind. When summoned to appear before the Sanhedrin, Herod came with an armed band and overawed the court. Only one member, Shammai, dared to move his condemnation, and before the motion could be put the weak old Hyrcanus, the high priest, the mere tool of Herod's father, adjourned the court. Soon after this Rome was turned into a bedlam by THE ASSASSINATION OF CAESAR IN THE ROMAN SENATE (March 15,44 B.C.)

Bedlam is the name for a madhouse. There was an old English madhouse called Bedlam, and ever since a madhouse has been called a bedlam. Sixty senators, led by Brutus and Cassius, participated in the murder of Caesar. Read Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Froude's Sketch of Caesar, and Mommsen's History of Rome at this period. The senate was far more corrupt than Caesar. It was impossible, out of such material, to reconstruct a republic, and this led to the second Roman Triumvirate, to wit: Octavius Caesar, a nephew of Julius, and his adopted son, Mark Antony, and Lepidus. Antipater was raising an army to help Brutus and Cassius when, in 43 B.C. the Jews poisoned him. Herod, his son, would have followed his father's course, but at the famous battle of Philippi the incipient republic perished, where Octavius and Antony defeated Brutus and Cassius, who both committed suicide, as did the great Cato somewhat later, in Africa. Mark Antony also captured and slew Cicero, who also favored the republic, just as he was about to get into a boat to escape. There is a great painting of Cicero stopping out of his litter to meet his murderer.

Herod now cajoled Mark Antony, who commanded in the East, and who against all Jewish accusations made both Herod and Phasael tetrarchs under the nominal sovereignty of the Maccabee, Hyrcanus II. This was 41 B.C.. Antigonus, the younger son of Aristobulos and brother of Hyrcanus, claimed the throne, and was supported by the Parthians. They made him king, and upheld him in power for three years, 40 B.C., to 37 B.C., and for this time Judea was under control of the Parthians. With their help Antigonus, the last of the Asmonaean kings, captured Jerusalem and with it Phasael and Hyrcanus. He cut off the ears of Hyrcanus, the mutilation barring him from the priesthood, and sent him to Babylon. Phasael committed suicide, and Herod fled to Masada at the southern end of the Dead Sea, and left his women folk there with his brother Joseph, and he himself went first to Egypt, and then to Rome, telling how Antigonus welcomed the Parthians, the enemies of Rome, and so cajoling both Octavius and Antony, and by a decree of the senate was made king of Judea. Thus passed away the Asmonaean line – or Maccabee line – and thus Herod, the descendant of Esau, whose mother was a descendant of Ishmael, takes his seat on the throne of Jacob. Herod returned with two Roman legions, and swelled the number to about 100,000 by enlisting renegade Jews, and besieged and captured Jerusalem on the twenty-sixth anniversary of its capture by Pompey. He also captured Antigonus, whom the Parthians had put in power, and sent him to Antony at Antioch, who executed him. Antonv railed him "Antierona." which is the female name for Antigonus. He thus changed his name to a woman’s name because he cried and whined, but I have known some women who would neither whine nor cry. Antony executed him, and that was the first time in history that a sovereign of a nation suffered death under the ax of the Roman lictor. THE REIGN OF HEROD, 37-4 B.C.

We now take up the reign of Herod from 37 B.C. to the birth of Christ. Before he captured Jerusalem he had married the beautiful Asmonaean princess, Mariarnne, hoping to secure thereby the support of the favorers of the Maccabean line. The marriage was unfortunate for this beautiful woman, for she was persecuted by Herod’s sister, Salome, and by Cypros, his Arabian mother. In the end – for these two women never stopped – Herod was induced to murder his beautiful wife, the only woman he ever loved – and he married a great many women – and later to murder his two sons by this wife. Remorse for murdering the woman that he loved kept biting him like an undying worm, and kept stinging him like a scorpion as long as he lived.

Here we can do no more than summarize his reign.

1. When he captured Jerusalem he put to death forty-three members of the Sanhedrin, which had once summoned him to trial.

2. He made Ananel, an obscure Jew of Babylon, high priest, and when this raised a clamor he yielded and appointed the brother of his wife, Mariarnne, a boy seventeen years of age, very popular and very much beloved of the people.

3. There was an appeal by the people, by the Maccabean women, to Cleopatra, who had completely ensnared Antony. Influenced by Cleopatra, Antony summoned Herod to appear before him at Alexandria, but having heard him, notwithstanding that Cleopatra was against him, he dismissed the charges against him, and added Coele-Syria to his kingdom. Nearly everybody would be willing to be put on trial if followed by such a verdict as that.

4. When on the death of Lepidus civil war was waged between the two remaining triumvirs, Herod sided with Antony, but the great sea battle at Actum decided the war in favor of Octavius, 31 B.C.

5. Herod instantly flopped over to the other side, sought Octavius in the Island of Rhodes, cajoled him, was confirmed in his kingdom, and in the next year Octavius enlarged his territory by adding Gadara, Hyppo, Samaria, and the seaports of Joppa, Anthedon, Gaza, and a place called Straton's Tower, which afterward became the Caesarea of the New Testament.

6. Soon after this, Herod, as I have said, put to death his wife, the beautiful Maccabean princess, and mother of two sons, 28 B.C., and one year later he executed her mother, Alexandra.

7. He began to Hellenize the country by erecting in Jerusalem a Grecian theater, and an enormous amphitheater, and instituted Grecian games and gladiatorial combats. He erected heathen temples in all the new cities that he built, particularly Caesarea and old Samaria. Herod rebuilt that and called it Sebaste, in honor of Augustus. He erected a splendid palace in Jerusalem, which we read about in the New Testament, and he also erected that famous tower of Antonia, which we also read about in the New Testament, and which commanded the approach of the Temple.

8. Feeling that he was hated of all men, he sought to regain popularity by the Roman method of free distribution of bread, and as this was in the time of both famine and pestilence, he did thereby regain much popular favor.

9. But his greatest exploit in this direction was the restoration and enlargement of the Temple built five centuries before by Zerubbabel. This mighty enterprise, far superior to either Solomon's Temple or the one by Zerubbabel, was commenced 20 B.C., and was not finally completed until A.D. 65, which was just live years before Titus destroyed it. This is the famous temple whose huge stones excited the wonder of the apostles, and called forth our Lord's great prophecy in Matthew 24:1-51, Matthew 25:1-46, and which Christ twice purified, once at the beginning and once at the end of his ministry.

10. Herod murdered his two sons by Mariarnne, where their mother before them had been' murdered.

11. He was now the subject of a loathsome disease, somewhat like what we now call the bubonic plague. His life was miserable.

12. He put to death his son, Antipater, by his first wife Doris, which caused Octavius (now Augustus Caesar) to say, "It is safer to be Herod's swine than his son," for a superstition kept him from killing a hog.

13. In 4 B.C. he slaughtered the infants at Bethlehem, so graphically told in Matthew 2:16-18, in an effort to destroy him who was "born King of the Jews," and for whom the angels sang their great Christmas hymn. His own death was as horrible as that of Antiochus Epiphanes, or that of his grandson, Herod, told about in Acts 12:1-25, who died eaten up by worms, while the word of God lived and prospered.

HEROD'S CHARACTER

Just a glance at his character. He is not entitled to be called "the Great." He was a shrewd politician, easily cajoling greater men than himself, as he did Julius Caesar and Antony, and Augustus Caesar, and was never himself cajoled by Cleopatra, though she tried her best on him, and she did captivate Julius Caesar and Antony, though she failed when she tried her charms on Augustus Caesar. Herod wanted to kill her in the interest of Antony when she visited him some time before this near Jerusalem. And he doubtless regretted that he allowed his friends to overpersuade him not to kill her. He was a fearless man, and a really great soldier.

He was a great builder. Look at the great city he built up at the source of the Jordan. Look at the city of Samaria. Look at the city of Caesarea. Look at that great temple and the tower of Antonia. He was an unscrupulous murderer. He was not a persecutor of the Jews' religion, like Antiochus Epiphanes, though he had no religion himself, and had no respect for any religion.

My last remark is concerning his descendants mentioned in the New Testament. The tetrarch, Philip of Luke 3:1, the Archelaus of Matthew 2:22, the Herod Antipas who murdered John the Baptist (Mark 6:14) and who mocked Christ when sent to him by Pilate – these were all his sons. The Herod who murdered James (Acts 12:1-25) was his grandson. The Drusilla who sat with Felix when Paul was tried (Acts 24:1-27), and the Agrippa and Bernice, before whom Paul appeared, were his great-grandchildren.

QUESTIONS 1. Give the title and extent of the last section of the inter-biblical period.

2. Why may not these seven chapters constitute a full course on the inter-biblical period?

3. Classify the Jewish literature of the period.

4. Give a summary of the six preceding chapters.

5. What nations were to the front in this last section of the period?

6. State the conditions at Rome at the beginning of this section.

7. Who constituted the first great Triumvirate at Rome?

8. What were the results of the war with Mithridates?

9. Describe the end of the Seleucids' Empire at Antioch and its effect on Judea.

10. When did Pompey capture Jerusalem?

11. Of what sacrilege was he guilty, and how does Tacitus describe what he found?

12. How many Jews did Pompey deport as slaves to Rome, and how did this possibly affect the citizenship?

13. Who nine years later robbed the temple of all its treasures?

14. What was the fate of the triumvir, Crassus, and what the two great results?

15. When and where was the issue between Caesar and Pompey decided, and what the fate of Pompey?

16. What was the last division of this section of the inter-biblical period?

17. When Edom was incorporated into Judea, what Idumaean was made local governor?

18. Who his greater and more unscrupulous successor?

19. What was the part played by Antipater in the war between Caesar and Pompey, and by what rapid change and help extended did he secure the friendship of Caesar?

20. State the honors conferred upon Antipater by Caesar.

21. State how Antipater advanced his family.

22. What magazine a few years ago gave a richly illustrated account of Herod's war against the Galilean Jews, and how was the war conducted to a successful issue?

23. If these zealots and so-called robbers had been successful, with what illustrious names would they have been classified?

24. What was the result of the Sanhedrin's summoning Herod to answer for destroying these Galileans?

25. What great event March 15, 44 B.C., converted Rome into a bedlam?

26. Give the names of the second Roman Triumvirate.

27. What four illustrious Romans opposed the Triumvirate?

28. When and where was decided the great issue between the Republicans and the Triumvirate?

29. What was the fate of Brutus, Cassius, Cato, and Cicero respectively?

30. With what party did Antipater sympathize?

31. After the assassination of Antipater, how did Herod, who succeeded his father, cajole Mark Antony, and what honors were received?

32. Show how the Parthians came in touch with Judea, and whom they placed on the throne at Jerusalem.

33. When Antigonus became the governor of Jerusalem, what the result to the Herodian family?

34. By what experiment did Herod turn the scales? How did he conquer Jerusalem, and what the fate of Antigonus.?

35. What was the period of the reign of Herod?

36. Tell the story of Mariarnne, his Maccabean wife, and of her two sons by Herod.

37. When Herod captured Jerusalem, how did he avenge on the Sanhedrin their once summoning him to trial?

38. Give the relations between Herod and Cleopatra, queen of Egypt.

39. When on the death of Lepidus civil war was waged between Octaviua Caesar and Antony, with which side did Herod align himself?

40. What great sea battle decided the war in favor of Octavius, and what its date?

41. After this battle, how did Herod cajole Octavius and what new honors were conferred upon him?

42. How did Herod attempt to Hellenize the country?

43. By what two great expedients did Herod seek to placate the hatred of the people?

44. What loathsome disease now came upon him?

45. What remark was made by Augustus Caesar when Herod put to death his son Antipater, by his first wife Doris?

46. What was his last murderous exploit, and where in the New Testament do we find an account of it?

47. Give a summary of Herod’s character.

48. Give the proofs that he was a great builder.

49. Name his descendants and their part in New Testament history.

# 05.13. Introduction - The Four Gospels

I INTRODUCTION – THE FOUR GOSPELS The New Testament is the ultimate authority for the life of Christ. In that collection of books, this life is set forth in four distinct phases:

His eternal existence, essential Deity, relations and activities as pure spirit prior to all time and history.

His foreshadowing in time prior to his incarnation. This is done by an interpretation of the Old Testament.

His incarnation, or earth life, from his birth to his death. The glory life of his exalted humanity, from his resurrection to the end of time.

Usually, however, when men speak of the life of our Lord they mean his earth life from his birth to his death. Even in studying his earth life only, it is helpful to know well:

His human antecedents, as set forth in the Old Testament history of his people.

The history of that people in the 400 years interval between the close of the Old Testament and the opening of the New Testament.

The geography and topography of the land of Palestine, the scene of his life and labors, together with the political, religious, and social conditions of his people at the time of his birth and during his life.

The successful preacher or teacher must often repeat, or restate in new forms, what he has preached or taught before, because there is little remembrance of former things, and because there is constant change of hearers or students unfamiliar with his previous teaching or preaching; and because no one statement of any truth sufficiently fixes itself in the mind of the hearer or reader. Repeated hammering is needed to drive a nail to its head, and even then we need to clinch it.

On account of this necessity for repetition, we commence with definitions many times given before. Our English word, "scriptures," means, etymologically, any kind of writings as contrasted with oral statements. Our English words, "Holy Scriptures," mean "sacred writings," or inspired writings, as distinguished from profane writings. Our English word, "Bible," means a library, or collection of books. And hence, "Holy Bible," would mean a sacred library. This sacred library consists of two grand divisions, entitled "Old Testament" and "New Testament." The Old Testament consists of thirty-nine books, arranged in a threefold division of Law, Prophets, and Psalms. Likewise the New Testament consists of twenty-seven books, divided into three general classifications – that is, five books of history, twenty-one letters or books of doctrine and discipline, and one book of prophecy.

This classification, however, must not be strictly pressed, since the five books entitled histories contain letters, doctrines, and prophecies; and the twenty-one letters contain history, prophecy,

and doctrines; and the one book of prophecy contains letters, history, and doctrines.

Of these New Testament books, Paul wrote fourteen; John, five; Luke and Peter, two each; Matthew, Mark, James, and Jude, one each. And since Paul influenced both of Luke's books, a majority of the books, and more than half of the contents of the New Testament may be attributed directly or indirectly to Paul.

The English word, "testament," whether Old or New, was derived from the Latin, based on such passages as: Luke 22:14-20; 1 Corinthians 11:25; Hebrews 8:9-13; Hebrews 9:16-17, and is a misnomer, since the Greek word so rendered means "covenant," but in the Bible it is never applied to a collection of books. The word, indeed, has the meaning of a last will and testament in two instances only, of Biblical usage, both in the game connection, Hebrews 9:16-17. So used in that sense it simply points out one analogy between a covenant and a last will and testament, to wit: that the death of a victim ratifies a covenant, as the death of a testator precedes inheritance under his will. The mischievous effect of this rendering "testament" in other instances of usage not only obscures the connection of thought between the Old and New Covenants, but appears historically and particularly in the fact that one large and modern Christian denomination, popularly known as Campbellites, deduces the most distinguishing articles of their creed and practice from this incorrect rendering, together with their faulty interpretations of some other passages. Substantially, their argument is this:

The New Testament is God's last will and testament.

Its provision of inheritance cannot be effective until after the death of the testator, Jesus Christ.

The chief blessing of the inheritance is the forgiveness of sins.

Sins under the Old Testament, and up to Christ's death, were not actually forgiven, but only passed over until the coming and death of the Testator, quoting Romans 3:25.

Therefore, in determining the New Testament law of pardon, they contend that we must not consider the Gospels by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, but must consult only the books concerning matters after his death. Hence they find the law of pardon in Acts 2:38, and contend that then was Christ's kingdom set up, and then only was this law of pardon published, to wit: "Repent and be immersed in his name, in order to remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Therefore, they make baptism a condition of salvation and of the reception of the Holy Spirit, and an essential part of regeneration.

Their contention, based on this argument, is set forth elaborately in a book by Ezell, one of their teachers, entitled, The Great Inheritance. We defer until we come to Acts 2:38, the correction of their erroneous exegesis of that passage, and merely state now that the capital defect of the whole contention consists in confounding expiation toward God with remission of sins toward man. It is true that the expiation of sins toward God did not historically take place until Christ died, but it is utterly untrue that the remission of sins toward man did not precede this expiation, since remission came as truly in the Old Testament times as in the New Testament times, because of God's acceptance of the pledge of expiation by his Son.

While we think it well to show the incorrectness and mischievous tendency of this misnomer, yet the term, "testament," is so fixed in our literature as applied to the two collections of books so styled, we accept the common usage, modified by this explanation.

In like manner the Greek word rendered "gospel" means, etymologically, good tidings of any kind, but in this collection of books it means the good tidings of salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord. Nowhere in New Testament usage does the word "gospel" mean a history, as when we say, "the Gospel according to Matthew." The word "gospel" occurs often alone, or with the article only; as "preach the gospel," or "believe the gospel." In connection with the Father we have the usage: "The Gospel of God," "The Gospel of the grace of God," "The Gospel of the glory of the happy God." In connection with the Son we have the usage: "The Gospel of the Son," "The Gospel of Christ," "The Gospel of Jesus Christ," "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." It is also used with another modifying term, "The Gospel of the Kingdom," and it is used with reference to its purpose, "The Gospel of Salvation," and to its duration, "The Everlasting Gospel."

Our English word "gospel," however, is derived from the Anglo-Saxon, "godspell," meaning "a story of God." We employ the word in this narrative sense when we say, "Matthew's Gospel " or "The Gospel according to Matthew." In this last sense, meaning a narrative, there have come down to us in writing five Gospels – Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul. Of these, Paul's was first reduced to writing, and John's, last. Three of these Gospels, in the sense of histories, are called synoptics: Matthew, Mark, and Luke, because they present a common view.

These five Gospels, or histories, must be considered as an independent and complete history of our Lord from each author's viewpoint. They were written by different men, at different times, for different purposes – for different ends – and each, I repeat, must be considered as a complete view. That is to say, notwithstanding the multitude of books that have been written upon the subject, there is no satisfactory evidence that any one of them had before him, or was influenced by a copy of any other from which he consciously borrowed, or which he designedly abridged or enlarged or supplemented in any way. Nor is there any reliable evidence that any two or more of them had access to a common original written gospel now lost. There was, of course, before any writing, a common oral gospel, but mere human memory could not be relied upon to recall with accuracy the minute details such as we find in Mark, nor the very words of long discourses, such as we find in John and Matthew. We must look elsewhere for an adequate explanation of their agreements and differences. At the last analysis, the inspiration of each historian best accounts for the plan of his history, not only in the material he selects, but in what he omits, in his historical portrait of our Lord.

Westcott in his introduction to the Gospels, cites the fact that three portraits of Charles I were painted, one giving the front view, the others the right and left profile views, and these three portraits were to enable a sculptor to carve a lifelike statue of him. The sculptor could not carve this statue with accuracy from a front view only, nor from either one of the two side views only. In the same way we have five complete historical portraits of our Lord, in order that we, in the study of them from their different angles of vision, may get a full view of our Lord and Saviour.

We have already said that the New Testament considers the life of our Lord in four distinct phases: his pre-existence, his Old Testament adumbration, his incarnation, and the glory life of his exalted humanity. Each historian considers only so much of these four phases as is essential to his plan.

Mark, with very vivid details, considers the public ministry of our Lord, having little to do with either his pre-existence, his foreshadowing in the Old Testament, or his life after his ascension. Matthew and Luke alone treat of the infancy of our Lord. Matthew and Paul particularly consider the interpretation of the Old Testament, foreshadowing of our Lord. Luke, in a second volume, discusses much the exalted life of our Lord in the establishment of the churches. John and Paul both treat of his pre-existence, and both, of the activities of his exalted life. This John does in his second volume – Revelation.

We may profitably study these histories of our Lord in two ways:

Considering each history alone, in order to get before our minds the author's complete view according to his plan. This study must not be omitted.

The harmonic study of our Lord, putting in parallel columns so much as each history has to say on a given point, and looking at the testimony of all the witnesses.

In the first method it is easy to see that Matthew writes for Jews, and his is the gospel of the King and of his kingdom, according to a correct interpretation of Old Testament foreshadowings. We find, therefore, in Matthew, many Old Testament quotations. He seeks to prove to the Jews that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament. Paul unites with Matthew in making the same proof, but with reference to a larger purpose than the limitation of Matthew.

Mark's Gospel may be called the Gospel of deeds rather than of teachings. It is limited to the earth life of Jesus, and describes the mighty things which he did. It is most vivid and minute in details and has much of narrative. It is the "straightway" gospel. As only an eyewitness could give the vivid and minute details of gesture, posture, indeed the very look of the actors and observers, this has been called Peter's Gospel. There is both external and internal evidence that Peter supplied most of the material of Mark's Gospel. As Mark limits himself almost exclusively to one of the four phases of our Lord's life and to only his public ministry, and as he makes but little special contribution to the sum of discourses, parables and miracles, we must find his most valuable contribution in his vivid and minute details, therein far surpassing all others. He surrounds his incidents with all the circumstances that make them impressive. We see the posture, gesture, look, and the effect. His particulars of person, number, time, and place are peculiar. His transitions are rapid, his tenses often are present not past, and we hear the very Aramaic words spoken, in direct quotation. It is more than a moving picture show, since we hear the very Aramaic words: "Boanerges," "Taitha cumi," "Corban," "Ephphatha," "abba."

Luke's Gospel may be called the Gospel of the Saviour and of humanity, his purpose being not so much to convince the Jews that Jesus is the Messiah, as to show his relation to all mankind. Because Luke's is the Gospel of the Saviour and of humanity, his genealogy extends back to Adam. Luke was not a Jew, and was the only Gentile who wrote a book of the Bible. His writings, Gospel and Acts, treat elaborately of the earth life of our Lord, and of his ascended life up to Paul's first Roman imprisonment. Renan the infidel, calls Luke's Gospel "the most beautiful book in the world." Speaking of them as masterpieces of human literature, Isaiah and Luke surpass all other books of the sacred library.

One cannot, in a few words, enumerate all the special contributions of Luke's Gospel. We may note a few:

He alone gives an account of the birth and training of John the Baptist.

He alone gives us the five great hymns: The "Hail Mary," the "Benedictus" of Zacharias, the "Magnificat" of Mary, the "Gloria in Excelsis" of the angels, and the "Nunc Dimittis" of Simeon.

He recites more miracles and parables than any other historian, and of these at least six miracles and seventeen parables are not given elsewhere.

More than the others it is the Gospel to woman, to the poor, to the sick, the outcast, and the foreigner.

To him we are indebted more than to all the others for the incidents and teachings of our Lord's ministry after the rejection in Galilee and up to the last week of that ministry.

It is more than the others the Gospel of prayers and thanksgiving in giving not only the occasions when our Lord prayed, and often the prayers themselves, but the lessons on prayer, taught to the disciples.

John's Gospel may be called the Gospel of positive knowledge, assurance, and comfort. It is more the subjective than the objective history. He means, evidently, to give to every Christian absolute knowledge, and internal assurance of the certainty of that knowledge.

Paul, less than the others, treats of the details of the earth life, discussing more the purposes of that life than its historical facts. It is interesting in comparing Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul to note each one's special contribution to the complete history of our Lord. No mere human historian would have omitted from his history what any one of them omits. We cannot account in a mere human way, for the omission of the early Judean ministry by the Synoptic Gospels, nor for John's omission of the bulk of the Galilean ministry. A careful student of the several histories of our Lord cannot fail to be impressed that no one of them alone, nor all of them together, intend anything like a complete biography like we find in the human history of a man. Each employs only that material essential to his plan, designedly leaving out everything not necessary to his purpose. John, at the close of his Gospel, rightly says, "Many other signs, therefore, did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name." A similar statement could well have been made by every historian. What is true with reference to the facts of his history, is also true with reference to his teachings. No one of them gives all of his teachings, or intended to do it, but only so much of the teachings as is necessary to his plan of history.

Indeed, Luke, in his second volume entitled "The Acts of the Apostles," says that his Gospel is an account of what Jesus began to do and to teach, implying that his second volume will tell of what Jesus continued to do and to teach in his exalted life. It is interesting as well as profitable to collect together the incidents, miracles, parables, and discourses given by each historian alone.

For example, Matthew alone gives the miracle of the healing of the two blind men, in Matthew 9:1-38, and of the finding of the stater in the fish's mouth. Matthew alone gives ten of the great parables – the tares, the hidden treasure, the pearl of great price, the drawnet, the unmerciful servant, the laborers in the vineyard, the two sons, the marriage of the king's son, the ten virgins, and the talents. Matthew alone gives a somewhat full account of the great Sermon on the Mount,

and the great discourses on the rejection of the Jews, and our Lord's great prophecy extending from Matthew 21:1-46, Matthew 22:1-46, Matthew 23:1-39, Matthew 24:1-51, Matthew 25:1-46 of his book. He alone gives us certain incidents of the life of our Lord – the coming of the Wise Men, the massacre of the innocents, the flight into Egypt, the return to Nazareth, the covenant of Judas for thirty pieces of silver, his repentance and his end, the dream of Pilate's wife, the appearance of the saints in Jerusalem in connection with Christ's resurrection, the watch placed at the sepulcher, the bribing of these watchmen to spread false reports, and the earthquake.

It is in John alone that we find the early Judean ministry, the Samaritan ministry, the great discourse on the bread of life in Capernaum, the discourse of the Good Shepherd, and particularly the great discourse after the Lord's Supper, as embodied in John 14:1-31, John 15:1-27, John 16:1-33, John 17:1-26. These four chapters of John constitute the New Testament book of comfort, Isaiah 39-66 constitutes the Old Testament book of comfort.

Of course these examples of special contributions are samples only, not exhaustive.

It is in Paul's history alone that we find an addition to Luke's genealogy, that is, from the first Adam to the Second Adam. But as four of these Gospels are continuous histories, and as Paul's, the Fifth Gospel, is scattered throughout his many letters, we will consider in the next chapter the Fifth Gospel.

QUESTIONS 1. In what distinct phases does the New Testament set forth the life of our Lord?

2. What things are helpful to know, even when we study only the earth life of our Lord?

3. What is the meaning of our English word, "scriptures"?

4. Meaning of "Holy Scriptures"?

5. Meaning of "Bible"?

6. Meaning of "Holy Bible"?

7. What are the two grand divisions of our Holy Bible, of what does each consist and what the three subdivisions of each?

8. Why may we not strictly press the three general classifications of the New Testament books?

9. Who were the authors of the New Testament books, and how many did each write?

10. What is the proportion, of Paul's contribution to the New Testament?

11. Give derivation and meaning of our English word, "testament," and show how it is a misnomer when applied to our collection of sacred books.

12. In what two instances only in Bible usage may the Greek word, diatheke, be rendered "testament"? And in those instances show the one point of analogy between a "covenant" and a last will and testament.

13. Cite a notable historic instance of the mischief of confusing "covenant" and "testament."

14. What of the Campbellite argument based on this contention and in what book is it elaborated?

15. What is the radical defect of the argument?

16. Meaning of the Greek word rendered "gospel" in the New Testament? And in the New Testament, does it ever mean a narrative?

17. What are the uses in the New Testament of the word rendered "gospel" with the article only? In connection with the Father? With the Son? With the kingdom? With salvation?

18. What is the derivation and meaning of our English word, "gospel"?

19. In the sense of a narrative, how many gospels have come down to us in writing, which first reduced to writing, and which last?

20. Which are called Synoptics, and why?

21. In accounting for these several written histories, were any two or more based on any written history now lost?

22. Is there any reliable evidence that any one of the historians had before him a copy of any one of the other four histories, from which he consciously borrowed material, which he designedly condensed, elaborated or supplemented in any way?

23. How, then, must these five histories be regarded, and what the only common original?

24. How alone may we account for their agreements and differences?

25. Why five Gospels? Cite and apply the illustration found in Westcott's "Introduction."

26. Show, in the case of each historian, what phases of our Lord's life are treated – his pre-existence, his Old Testament foreshadowing, his earth life, his ascended life.

27. In what two ways may we profitably study these histories?

28. How may we characterize Matthew's Gospel, what is his chief design and what are the more important of his special contributions to the history?

29. How characterize Luke's Gospel, what is his chief design and what are some of his special contributions?

30. How characterize John's Gospel, what is his chief design and what are some of the most important of his special contributions?

31. What chapters of John constitute the New Testament book of comfort?

32. As Mark limits himself almost exclusively to only one of' the four phases, that is, the earth life of our Lord, and to his public ministry only, and as he contributes little to the sum of the parables, miracles and discourses, what is, in the main, his special contribution to the story of our Lord?

# 05.14. Introduction - The Fifth Gospel

II INTRODUCTION – THE FIFTH GOSPEL

In the preceding chapter we were considering the inspired histories of the life of our Lord. A reason for considering very particularly the Fifth Gospel, arises from a trend of modern thought, pregnant with menace. This trend is embodied in a method of treating the Bible, which appears to be concerted and systematic, and which comes in the garb of an angel of light with most attractive watchwords, and with the avowed object of best serving human interest by promoting a higher degree of morality. The slogan of this method is: "Back to Christ," meaning, "Back to Christ's own words." The object of the method is to strip the Gospels of all inspired value in their statements of what Christ is, or what he did, and confine them to an application of what he actually said. It matters nothing to the leaders of this method that our knowledge of what he said is dependent on the trustworthiness of the very witnesses whose evidence they discredit concerning what he is and what he did.

But this is not all of the method. It arbitrarily limits the sources of what he said to the records of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, commonly called the Synoptic Gospels, rejecting the Gospel of John. Even with this limitation they claim the right to discredit all the reported sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels not in accord with their preconceived notions. But the limitation of Christ's own words to the record of the Synoptic Gospels is, after all, not so much to eliminate John as to get rid of Paul, who is most in their way. Their misleading slogan, "Back to Christ," means simply "Back from Paul."

Unwittingly this method bears strong testimony to the clearness and value of Paul's teaching. It is a virtual confession that if Paul stands they must fall. While this method is called modern, it is in fact only a revival of ancient error prevalent in Paul's own day, and in later days.

In this connection we may recall a recent discussion in Congress on the advisability of printing what is called "Jefferson's Bible" in connection with his other works. This socalled Bible is merely a patchwork of clippings from the Gospels of Christ's own words – or so many of them as Mr. Jefferson approved, the object being to classify the ethical teachings of Christ and to eliminate all the supernatural settings. Not a few of the most alert and clear-eyed sentinels on our watchtowers, discern in this trend of thought a menacing sword to the unwary, and have diligently sounded a note of alarm. Articles, pamphlets, and books on the subject, pro and con, are being rapidly multiplied, some of them valuable, others worthless contributions to religious literature.

Two of the many may be noted. The most scholarly, perhaps, is by Dr. Bruce, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland and is entitled Saint Paul's Conception of Christianity. It was published in 1894. While very instructive throughout, some parts of this discussion are justly liable to adverse criticism. The other, not nearly so pretentious, is yet pure gold in its saneness and simplicity. It is by a plain but earnest and successful gospel preacher, Dr. Malcolm McGregor, of the Southern Baptist Convention, and is entitled The Divine

Authority of Paul's Writings. It was published in 1898. Dr. McGregor has classified the objections or objectors to Paul thus:

Some who profess to believe in the inspiration and authority of the Bible in vague general terms, but whose inherited or acquired dislike for certain of Paul's teachings lead them, with great inconsistency, to evade, modify, and explain away their force.

Preconceptions of rationalistic philosophy, the blinding influence of unscriptural customs, the warping force of adventurous love of novelty, overweening self-conceit, and headstrong self-will, account very fully for most of this dangerous anti-Pauline drift.

To these classifications of Dr. McGregor we may add a graver cause. When we consider the garb, watchword, concert, system, and effect of this method, we are constrained to recognize back of the movement that mighty and malignant intelligence who, from the beginning, comes as an angel of light, and by beguiling seduces many good people to serve him, and renders tributary to his purpose all the objections and prejudices of the unregenerate. It is immaterial that the leaders of this trend of thought are unconscious of the satanic influence prompting them.

So far as this modern method relates to the Four Gospels, we may content ourselves with this double reply:

If we accept the testimony of the synoptic historians as to the sayings of Christ, then we must accept it as to his being and doings. The evidence is the same.

The argument which destroys the trustworthiness of John's record of Christ's sayings, will equally destroy the credibility of the record in the Synoptic Gospels.

But our present concern is with the effect of this method on another historian. There is a Fifth Gospel, quite distinct from the others, equally necessary and credible with the others. The same inspiration which gave us the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, gave us also the Gospel of Paul. No one of the five tells all the story; each one of the five contributes an important and indispensable part to the completeness of the history. Here and there two, three, four, or five, may bear testimony to the same particular event of this history, or to the same particular teaching. Even in that case we need all the testimony, as each brings to light some detail not noted by the others. But here and there also an incident or a teaching is dependent upon the testimony of only one of the five. Each one of the five makes special, peculiar, unique, and indispensable contributions. And in both of these respects we recognize God's uniform method of inspiration: "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." And this speaking was recorded partly by Mark, partly by Matthew, partly by Luke, partly by John, and partly by Paul.

Now of these Five Gospels by far the most extensive, the most comprehensive and the most important, is the Gospel by Paul. We are so accustomed to the thought of only Four Gospels that we compare them to the four rivers which watered the garden of Eden.

Before considering in detail the merits of the Fifth Gospel, let us first consider an antecedent matter – the nature and qualifications of the apostolic office. This office was extraordinary. It was limited to the times of the institution of the Christian system. There was no provision for its perpetuity in the church, though some of our Baptist brethren of Virginia once ventured to elect an

apostle. Upon certain persons appointed by our Lord' himself as ambassadors were conferred plenipotentiary powers to act for him in the matters entrusted to them. They were, primarily, witnesses of his resurrection from the dead. Indeed, one could not be an apostle who had not seen the risen Lord. They were inspired revelators of his will, and infallible judges and expounders of the doctrines and discipline he inculcated. They were also the executors of penal judgment, when necessary, as when Peter smote with instant death Ananias and Sapphira, and when Paul smote Elymas with blindness. They were accredited by miraculous signs, as when men were healed by the shadow of Peter, and others afar off by contact with a handkerchief that Paul had touched. They were immune from deadly poisons, and could, by the laying on of their hands, impart the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. There were two classes of these apostles – twelve to the Jews, and one to the Gentiles. In the case of an apostle to the Jews, it was necessary that he should have companied with Jesus all the time of his Jewish ministry, from the baptism by John to the ascension into heaven. In the case of the Apostle to the Gentiles, it was necessary that he had personally seen the risen Lord, been put into office by him, and had received directly from him the gospel he preached.

Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles. He had seen the Lord, was directly commissioned and accredited by him, and by direct revelation received his whole wonderful gospel. It was not of man, nor by man. His knowledge of the gospel was entirely independent of any teaching, preaching, or writing of the other men. For example: Matthew wrote of the institution of the Lord's Supper as he saw it, Mark and Luke as they received the story of the testimony of eyewitnesses, but Paul wrote of it as the Lord Jesus Christ himself reported it to him, and to Paul are we indebted for more knowledge of the institution and meaning of this ordinance than to all other sources put together. The other apostles could tell it as they saw it, but Paul tells it as Jesus saw it. He commences his account of it by saying, "For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you." In like manner, when summarizing his gospel, he says, "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised from the dead on the third day, according to the scriptures."

In every way possible he not only emphasizes that his gospel was independent of any human source of information, but makes the reception of it as from God a test of the claims of others: "For if any man thinketh himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandments of the Lord." In this plenipotentiary power he ordained decrees for all the churches; he commanded, restricted, enjoined with all authority. The content of his gospel is marvelous in its fulness, clearness and comprehensiveness. On the pro-existence, original glory and activities of the Son of God, he surpasses John; on the foreshadowing of the coming Messiah in the Old Testament he surpasses Matthew; on his assumption of human nature and the reasons therefore, on his offices as prophet, king, sacrifice, priest, and judge he surpasses all. He alone reveals the termination of the kingdom of God. On the plan of salvation, and on the connecting links of the whole chain of its doctrines, he stands alone. From him, certainly as to its fulness, come the revelation of the universality of the gospel, and the marvelous wisdom of God in the election of Israel, the stumbling of Israel, the call of the Gentiles and the restoration of Israel. The doctrines of the nature, universality and cure of sin, the nature, scope, and purpose of the law, the resurrection of the dead are mainly derived from Paul's Gospel. Concerning the church, not only as an institution, and not only as an ideal to be realized hereafter,

but as a working business body, and concerning its officers, ordinances, discipline and commission, Paul's Gospel reveals more than all the rest of the Bible. From his gospel also we get the truest and clearest teachings concerning the person, offices, and gifts of the Holy Spirit. There is yet a point touching his gospel of transcendent importance. I refer particularly to the offices and activities of the ascended and exalted Lord. Where is our Lord now? What is his employment there? How long will he remain there, or when will he return to earth again? And why will he come again, and to do what? And what the outcome of that return? Luke, indeed, devotes an entire volume, the Acts of the Apostles, to the activities of the ascended Lord up to a definite time, and so John devotes another book, Revelation, to the same matter projected to the end of time, but certainly it is in Paul's Gospel that we find most clearly set forth the present reign of Christ on the heavenly throne, the giving and dispensation of the Holy Spirit and the dispensation of the churches.

In this connection I desire to commend with great earnestness to all readers a modern book entitled, The Ascended Christ. It is by H. B. Sweet, and was published in 1910, by the Macmillan Company. There are interpretations of some passages of Scripture in this book that I deem faulty, but on the whole it is a marvelous contribution to the literature concerning our ascended Lord.

These are a few of the things that may be truthfully said concerning the scope and value of the Fifth Gospel. Why is it, then, that harmonies ignore the Fifth Gospel, Great indeed will be the victory of Satan if, by the catchy phrase, "Back to Christ," he can succeed in backing us away from the Gospel of Paul. Though an angel from heaven bring another gospel, let him be accursed. It is an objection to all harmonies extant that they either slightly recognize the Fifth Gospel, or utterly disregard its correlative material, thus giving the student an imperfect view of OUT Lord's nature, person, offices, and teachings.

It is frankly conceded that the correlation of very much of the material of the Fifth Gospel with the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, is on many accounts a matter of serious difficulty. Not the least of these difficulties lies in the fact that while the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are mainly historical, each one being in some form a continuous story of our Lord's life on earth, the Fifth Gospel is mainly doctrinal, and is not in one continuous statement, but widely scattered in many letters, the revelations coming, moreover, from our Lord in heaven. Another difficulty consists in knowing how to limit the amount of the material used and just where to place it in a given case. To some minds a yet graver difficulty would consist in determining just what books of the New Testament contain the Fifth, or Pauline, Gospel. This need not be a difficulty when we accept as certain from Paul the thirteen letters usually ascribed to him, and while some dissent, we count the letter to the Hebrews as Paul's. In any event, whether Apollos wrote it, as many erroneously claim, or Luke wrote it, as some conjecture, embodying a sermon by Paul, it is immaterial to our purpose and use. It is unquestionably Pauline in its origin and doctrine. Let us not forget that all harmonies of even the first three or four gospels are human, imperfect, obnoxious to objections, and attended with considerable difficulties. The obvious difficulties necessitate imperfection in any human attempt at perfect correlation of the material of the five gospels. But notwithstanding the difficulties, confessedly great, and the objections, confessedly forceful, and the imperfections of the work when done, frankly conceded, it is profoundly believed that by harmonic use of much of the material of the Fifth Gospel the result will be manifold and great, and so justify the effort.

Somewhat is gained at least by fixing the fact in the Bible student's mind that there are five gospels, equal in authority, and all indispensable parts of a complete revelation of our Lord's person, nature, offices, relations, and teachings in the four phases of his life already named. The mere fixing of this fact in the mind helpfully serves to check the current of semi infidelity in many schools which seek to discredit Paul by magnifying Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Wherein are their credentials, as reporters of our Lord's person, doings and teachings, superior to Paul's? Moreover, the inclusion of the matter of the Fifth Gospel in the correlation will make more apparent the important fact that the Pauline doctrines considered by objectors as most obnoxious or as innovations, will be shown to be in perfect harmony with the very words of our Lord as reported by the other historians, to wit: the doctrines of his essential deity, of the vicarious expiation, justification by faith, election, and eternal punishment.

Yet again, this method affords to the student, on one canvass, a more nearly complete portrait of our Lord, and in one view a more comprehensive summary of his teachings. It is a signal merit of harmony of Dr. John A. Broadus that he includes Paul's testimony concerning the institution of the Supper and the appearances of our Lord after his resurrection. Why not equally meritorious to correlate Paul's testimony of Christ's pre-existence, and his assumption of human nature, with the corresponding records in the other gospels? Certainly to Paul was revealed many most important facts concerning the incarnation and its objects, which belong properly to our Lord's earthly life, and hence may harmonize with other histories of that life.

Just here we may restate the terminals of the several gospels.

Mark's Gospel is the gospel of Christ's deeds, written for Romans, and so he leaves to others the report of all antecedent matters, commences with the public ministry of our Lord, abruptly plunges into the heart of his subject, and as abruptly closes with some evidence of the resurrection. The scope of Mark's history is like the survey of a small section of a mighty river, which takes no account of the whence, and but little of the whither. He finds it a river, but far from the source, and leaves it a river, far from the sea. The baptism and resurrection of Jesus are the terminal points of his history.

Matthew, who gives the gospel of the King and of the kingdom, writing for Jews to convince them of the messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, goes back 2,000 years beyond Mark to find a starting point in Abraham, and closes with the Great Commission.

Luke, who writes the gospel of the Saviour, recognizing Christ's broader relation to humanity, goes back of the Jewish limitations of Matthew's view another 2,000 years, and starting from the first man, projects his history, including the Acts, into the triumphant years of world evangelization by the apostles. Commencing with Adam, he ends in Paul's hired house at Rome. But even he strikes the stream at only its human source, or appearance in the realm of time, and leaves it flowing, yet far from the sea.

John, who writes for the Christian the gospel of positive knowledge, assurance, and comfort, and from a more subjective point of view than that of the others, goes back beyond all time, even leaving far behind the initial sentence of Moses: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and starts with the ultima thule of revelation in one direction: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Thus fastening one end of the chain

of his story on this altitude of eternity, he swoops far down to the history of creation by Moses, floods it with light, enters into the earth life of our Lord and projects his history, including Revelation, beyond the second coming and the Judgment, into the antitypical paradise. But the river has not yet reached the sea.

Paul, writing for all men, with the broadest view, commences indeed with John, for none can go beyond him in that direction, parallels his course through time, with him entering into the antitypical paradise, and finds the other ultima thule of Revelation in this termination: "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; . . And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him, that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all" (1 Corinthians 15:24-28).

Thus eternity speaks across all time to eternity, and thus we have the four phases of the life of our Lord: his preexistence and essential deity; his adumbration in the Old Testament history; his incarnation, that is, his earth life; his life and activities after ascension and exaltation at the right hand of God.

This is the life we are to study. As stress was laid upon the thorough study of the Genesis of Moses, how much more the study of this Genesis! My father impressed upon the minds of his boys this great principle: In erecting a building, never try to economize on site, foundation, or roof. A good building on a faulty location is a waste; a big house cannot stand on a flimsy foundation; and a faulty roof is a ceaseless eye-sore, abomination, and expense. We should, therefore, take time and exercise the patience necessary to root our faith deep down and ground it solidly on these beginnings and endings in eternity. If we start right we go on well. If we make a pitiful start we drag an ever weightier chain on to the end, and can never answer the supreme questions – who is our Saviour? or, "What think ye of Christ?" They can never be answered if we leave out any of these four phases of his life. Before we consider Mark’s grown man, Luke’s infant, or Matthew’s Jew, we must follow John and Paul back to the real beginning and on to the real end.

Then will we know whom we have believed, whom we worship. Then, when the question is asked in the words of our Lord, "Who say ye that I am?" not as an Arian, not as a Socinian, not as a Sabellian, not as an Unitarian, not any kindred folk, we find the truer answer that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son and Christ of God, the God-man appointed to be prophet, priest, sacrifice, king, and judge.

We are not to understand that all of these five gospels together give a complete biography of Christ as judged by the standard of human historians. Only such matter as is pertinent to the plan of each writer is used. Near the close of John’s Gospel he says, "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book, but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name." And later he adds the more remarkable words: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

A harmony is an orderly correlation in parallel columns of the matter of several independent historians, or the testimony of several independent witnesses.

Having now considered somewhat the inspired histories of the life of Christ, I name some of the many human histories of that life. While many more could be named, those that are named have been carefully examined upon every point set forth in our discussion of the life of our Lord. They are: Edersheim's Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah; Farrar's Story of a Beautiful Life; Noah K. Davis' Story of the Nazarene; Stalker's Life of Christ; Deems' The Light of the Nations; Young's The Christ of History; David Smith's In the Days of His Flesh; Sweet's The Ascended Christ; McLear's New Testament History; that infidel's romance, Renan's Life of Jesus; Henry Ward Beecher's Life of Christ; Fleetwood's Life of Christ; and the following parts of Josephus: Antiquities, books 14-18, War of the Jews, from Book I, chapter 10, to Book 2, chapter 9.

Of all these human lives of our Lord, it is a matter of surprise to find Beecher's the weakest and poorest.

QUESTIONS 1. How many gospels are there?

2. What evil trend of modern thought necessitates special emphasis on the Fifth Gospel?

3. What is its garb and slogan?

4. What is the limit and effect of its method?

5. What is the real meaning of its slogan, "Back to Christ"?

6. Name and estimate two valuable books called forth by this discussion.

7. How does Dr. McGregor classify the objections to Paul's Gospel?

8. Who is the real person back of the whole movement against Paul?

9. What is the nature, limitation, and qualifications of the apostolic office?

10. What two classes of apostles?

11. In what respect does Paul's knowledge of his gospel differ from Matthew's and John's, from Mark's and Luke's and illustrate by the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper by Matthew, by Mark and Luke, and by Paul.

12. Set forth the merits and superiorities of Paul's Gospel.

13. What are the difficulties of correlating Paul's Gospel in a harmony with the other four?

14. Notwithstanding the difficulties, what is the gain?

15. What two items only of Paul's Gospel does Dr. Broadus include in his harmony?

16. What are terminals of each of the Five Gospels?

17. What is a harmony?

18. What books covering the life of our Lord are named, and what parts of Josephus are recommended for reading?

# 05.16. The Nature, Necessity, Importance, And Definition Of Repentance

XIII THE NATURE, NECESSITY, IMPORTANCE, AND DEFINITION OF REPENTANCE In the preaching of John the Baptist we come to the words "repent" and "repentance," and here, as well as elsewhere, we may at length consider the whole Bible doctrine of repentance. We will find that great prominence is given in the Bible to the duty of repentance. It is a staple of preaching and teaching in both Testaments. Among the noted Old Testament preachers of repentance may be named Enoch, Noah, Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Jonah, and Malachi. The more noted of the New Testament preachers of this doctrine are John the Baptist, our Lord himself, Peter, Paul, and John, the apostle. The universality of the obligation to repent was announced by Paul at Athens in these words: "God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30). Of the necessity of repentance, our Lord himself declares, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3).

It may be observed that all of God’s commandments are not of equal importance. Our Lord himself mentions one as the "first great commandment." A mistake in obedience to some of these commandments is not necessarily fatal. For example, a penitent believer may make a mistake about baptism. He may honestly intend to be baptized, and yet, through a false education, he may not have obeyed the commandment of God as to the act and design and administrator of this ordinance. This mistake is not fatal, because God has not made baptism essential to salvation, but salvation essential to baptism. But we cannot make a mistake as to repentance with like impunity.

No matter how much one may desire to repent, nor how often he may resolve to repent, unless he actually repents he is lost, because God has made repentance a prerequisite to eternal life.

Another fact suggests its great importance. Paul declares it to be one of the first principles of the oracles of God (Hebrews 5:12; Hebrews 6:1). The first principles in any science are valuable because they are fundamental, that is, knowledge of them is essential to further progress in that science. So Paul argues in the scriptures cited. He complains that he must go back and teach them again the first principles before they are ready to go on unto perfection. Fundamental means "pertaining to a foundation," and in one of the scriptures cited Paul says, "Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works." This not only implies the fundamental character of repentance, but its permanence. Indeed, this foundation can never be laid but once. Following his hypothetical argument the apostle shows that if a regenerated man should fall away it would be impossible to renew him again to repentance, so that this work once done is done once for all. The reader will understand me in this to refer to that primary repentance which precedes and induces the faith which saves the soul. A Christian may often repent.

One cannot build a big house on a little foundation. The relation of a foundation, therefore, to its superstructure is quite important. The size, weight, and durability of the latter depend on the depth, breadth, and solidity of the former. Hence it is never wise to economize in foundations. Our Lord

illustrates the value of the foundation at the close of his Sermon on the Mount, both positively and negatively, in the following language; "Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these saying of mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it" (Matthew 7:24-27). The same value appears in David's inquiry: "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Psalms 11:3). Those vain imaginations which have no foundation in fact are called air castles. From their insubstantial nature may be inferred the little value of a profession of personal religion not bottomed on repentance.

Repentance appears further as a first principle in that it is the required preparation for the reception of Christ. The work of John the Baptist is the most illustrious example of repentance as a preparatory work. John is called the harbinger, or forerunner, of our Lord, and was commissioned to "prepare the way before him and make ready a people prepared for him" (Matthew 3:3). This he did by "preaching repentance" (Matthew 3:2). The nature of his work as a preparation was foretold by both Isaiah (Isaiah 40:3-8) and Malachi (Malachi 3:1). The following words of Isaiah in a striking figure foreshow a part of the characteristics of repentance: "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain" (Isaiah 40:4). Elsewhere he uses the following words: "Cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people" (Isaiah 57:14); "Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people" (Isaiah 62:10). All the import of these figures can be expressed in the one word "grading," so that the work of John the Baptist was compared to the grading of a highway over which Christ was to come to his people. The value of such work in the material things indicated by the figure is sufficiently attested by those movements of ancient skills, the Roman and Peruvian roads, and the modern railroads. Jeremiah presents the same thought negatively by combating the evil results of impenitence to walking in a way not "cast up" (Jeremiah 18:15). We may describe, therefore, the folly of trying to be a Christian without repentance, by this similitude: An engineer trying to run a train of cars through the woods, over the mountains, across rivers and ravines, where there are no prepared tracks. But the richness of prophetic description was not limited to one figure. We find Isaiah turning in the same connection from the figure of grading to one of agriculture, expressing thereby the same preparatory nature of John's work. The image employed is that of burning the grass off a field (Isaiah 40:6-8). John's preaching subsequently fulfilled this figure, of withering the grass of the flesh, in the most striking manner, by destroying all hope of fitness for the kingdom of God based on fleshly descent from Abraham (Matthew 3:9). Both Hosea and Jeremiah employ the agricultural figure, showing the preparatory nature of repentance. The words of Jeremiah are: "For thus saith the Lord to the men of Judah and Jerusalem: Break up your fallow ground and sow not among thorns." According to this figure we may express the folly of trying to be a Christian without repentance, under the similitude of a farmer expecting to reap a harvest from seed sown in a field whose stubble and thorns had not first been burned off and whose sod had not been broken. Our Saviour aptly describes the outcome of the folly of omitting this preparatory work in the parable of the sower, where he compares such people to stony, thorn-poisoned, pathtrodden ground which brought forth

no fruit.

Mark emphasizes the preparatory work of repentance by calling John's preaching of it "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark 1:1), and Luke by the declaration, "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it" (Luke 16:16). This is varied somewhat in Matthew's statement: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force" (Matthew 11:12).

The foregoing figures and images touching the nature of repentance enable us to express its relation to eternal life in the statement that it is an essential prerequisite to salvation to all subjects of gospel address.

Philosophically considered, repentance must precede faith. As a sick man must be convinced that he is sick before he will turn to a physician, or take his medicine, so the carnal mind must be withered before the renewed mind can be superinduced. This precedence is proved also from the Scriptures. John the Baptist put repentance before faith (Acts 19:4) ; so did our Lord (Mark 1:15); and Peter (Acts 2:38-41); and Paul (Acts 20:21; Hebrews 6:1-2; 2 Timothy 2:25). Indeed, there is no passage in the New Testament, naming both faith and repentance, in which faith comes first.

From the discussion so far we may sum up the nature, necessity and importance of repentance in the following brief statement: It is a staple of preaching in both Testaments. It is of universal obligation. It is a first principle of the gospel. It is fundamental and vital, being prerequisite to salvation. It is to personal religion what the clearing and breaking up of new ground is to a harvest, what the foundation is to a house, what the grading is to a highway, what the initial point is to a survey. It is the boundary between the covenants. It is the killing which precedes the making alive. It is that conviction of sickness which turns the sick man to the physician.

We may then say of the preacher who dares to leave out repentance in his preaching, that he leaves out one-half the terms of salvation and vitiates the other half; that he builds only air castles; that he vainly attempts to run the gospel relief train where there is no prepared track; that he commends the doctor to well people; that he baptizes raw sinners and whitewashes the carnal nature; that he sows among thorns and in stubble land, in stony ground and on underlying rocks. We may also say of the preacher who minifies this doctrine that he thereby minifies the necessity for Christ; hence dwarfs the Redeemer himself. It is little sick – little physician; little sinner – little Saviour. It must be evident, therefore, that it is the duty of every preacher of the gospel to preach repentance just as often, and with as much emphasis, and to as many people, as he preaches faith. As illustrative of the value of such preaching it may be justly said of all the great preachers, like Spurgeon, Bunyon Whitefield, Moody, Jonathan Edwards, and, indeed, all who have been successful in winning souls to Christ, that they all laid great and frequent stress on the duty of repentance. From all these things it certainly ought to fol- low that preachers at least should have clear conceptions of the meaning, place and relations of repentance. Usually, however, they have not these clear conceptions. Many cannot define the term. If a thousand were asked to write out in succession a definition in the fewest possible words, but few of them would give the right definition, and there would be great vagueness, variety and contradiction in the others. It is proper to state a few examples of variant definitions given by prominent people:

Sam Jones: "Quit your meanness."

D. L. Moody: "Right about face."

Alexander Campbell: "Reformation."

The Romanist Bible (rendering Matthew 3:2) : "Do penance."

A. W. Chambliss: "Godly sorrow for sin."

Our common version, in Matthew 27:3, makes it equivalent to "Remorse of conscience."

Many speakers and writers: "Restitution."

M. T. Martin: "Knowing God and turning from dead works."

Such variations in definitions (and many others might be added) sufficiently indicate the necessity of a closer study of this doctrine in the New Testament than is ordinarily given to it. Here it is important to observe that the New Testament was written in Greek. Happily for us, we find in one brief paragraph in 2 Corinthians 7:1-16 a number of terms covering the whole ground.

The verb,lupeo, to grieve, to make sorry.

The noun,lupe,grief, sorrow.

Lupe tou kosmou, a phrase signifying "worldly sorrow."

Lupe kata theon, another phrase meaning "godly sorrow."

The verb,metamelomai,to regret.

The noun,metanoia, repentance.

The adjective,ametameletos,not regrettable.

In this context, and elsewhere, our common version rendersmetamelomai,"repent." As the instances of its use in the New Testament are few, I now cite every one:

Matthew 21:29 : "Afterward he repented and went."

Matthew 21:32 : "Ye repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

Matthew 27:3-5 : "Judas repented himself . . . and went and hanged himself."

2 Corinthians 2:8 : "I do not repent, though I did repent."

Hebrews 7:21 : "The Lord swear and will not repent."

A better rendering, perhaps, in every case of this usage would be obtained by substituting the word "regret." "Repent" is an inappropriate rendering for this verb, because, first, metamelomai does not express the full idea of New Testament repentance. For example, Judas repented and went and hanged himself, but "repentance is unto life," and it is worldly sorrow that worketh death. Second, because there is another term always employed in expressing New Testament repentance. That other term is the noun, metanoia, from the verb, metanoeo.I cite for the benefit of the reader every New Testament use of the verb, and ask him to look at each reference and note

its application to our doctrine. Matthew uses the term five times, as follows: Matthew 3:2; Matthew 4:17; Matthew 11:20-21; Matthew 12:41. Mark twice: Mark 1:15; Mark 6:12. Luke ten times in his Gospel: Luke 10:13; Luke 11:32; Luke 13:3; Luke 13:5; Luke 15:7; Luke 15:10; Luke 16:30; Luke 17:3-4; Luke 17:30. In Acts five times more: Acts 2:38; Acts 3:19; Acts 8:22; Acts 17:30; Acts 26:20. Paul once: 2 Corinthians 12:21. John eleven times: Revelation 2:5; Revelation 2:16; Revelation 2:21-22; Revelation 3:3; Revelation 3:19; Revelation 9:20-21; Revelation 16:9; Revelation 16:11. Thirty-four times in all. Matthew uses the noun three times: Matthew 3:8; Matthew 3:11; Matthew 9:13. Mark twice: Mark 1:14; Mark 2:17. Luke five times in his Gospel: Luke 3:3; Luke 3:8; Luke 5:32; Luke 15:7; Luke 24:47. Six times in Acts 5:31; Acts 11:18; Acts 13:24; Acts 19:4; Acts 20:21; Acts 26:20. Paul seven times: Romans 11:4; 2 Corinthians 7:9-10; 2 Timothy 2:25; Hebrews 6:1; Hebrews 6:6; Hebrews 12:17. Peter once: 2 Peter 3:9. In all, twenty-four. We thus observe that this term, as a noun or verb, is employed fifty-eight times in the New Testament, occurring in books by Matthew eight times; Mark four times; Luke twenty-six times; John eleven times; Peter one time; Paul eight times; and in every instance refers unmistakably to the New Testament doctrine of repentance, and to nothing else.

It should be noted also carefully that repentance is declared to be the product of godly sorrow, lupe kata theon; and that it always ends in salvation, eternal life (Acts 11:18; 2 Corinthians 7:7-10). Hence it follows that repentance is always ametameletos, "not regrettable." This adjective is compounded from the verb melein and the preposition, meta, and the privative particle a.

We advance in our knowledge of metanoeo, to repent, and metanoia, repentance, by considering that there is a Greek noun, nous, the mind. There is also a Greek verb which tells what the mind does –noeo,to think, perceive, understand. Then there is the preposition, meta, which, in composition withnoeo, expresses the idea of change, transition, sequence. Therefore, we may say thatmetanoeoalways means "to think back, to change the mind," while the noun,metanoia,always means afterthought, asoonosedto forethought,chanereof mind We may, therefore, give as the one invariable definition of New Testament repentance that it is a change of mind, from which it is evident that its domain is limited. It is necessarily internal, not external.

The necessity for its universal application as a prerequisite to Christian character and life lies in the fact that the carnal mind, which is the normal mind of fallen man, is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be. To be carnally-minded is death, since they that are in the flesh cannot please God. Hence, from enmity against God, repentance is a change of mind toward God. It is a reversal of, or turning upside down, the carnal mind. Perhaps one may say this makes repentance the equivalent of regeneration. My reply is that our exercise of both repentance and faith is but the underside, whose upper or divine side is called regeneration. This fact explains how repentance is a grace. Hence the saying, "Jesus Christ was exalted a Prince and Saviour to give repentance to Israel," and "God hath granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life."

We are now prepared to show seriatim the folly of the false definitions cited. First, worldly sorrow, or remorse of conscience, cannot be repentance because of its origin and end. It is from the world and worketh death. For example, Judas; for illustration, Byron’s "Scorpion Girt with Fire:" So do the dark in soul expire, Or live like scorpion girt with fire; So writhes the mind remorse hath given; Unfit for earth, undoomed for heaven, Darkness above, despair beneath, Around it flame, within it death.

Second, godly sorrow is not repentance, for it worketh repentance, and we may not confound the producer and the product. For example, the Bible says, "Tribulation worketh patience," and one would not say, "Tribulation is patience." So neither should we say, "Godly sorrow is repentance."

Third, Sam Jones' definition, "Quit your meanness," is not to repent, for that is only one half and a negative half at that of Campbell's definition, "Reform." Isaiah gives both halves thus: "Ceasing to do evil and learning to do well." But neither the one nor the other is a definition of repentance, since reformation is the "fruit meet for repentance," so well stated in the following scriptures: "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" (Matthew 3:8). ''Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the tree; every tree, therefore, which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. And the people asked him saying, What shall we do then? He answered and said unto them, he that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise. Then came also the publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, and what shall we do? And he said unto them, do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages" (Luke 3:8-14). "So the people of Nineveh believed God and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them. For word came unto the king of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles, saying, let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste anything; let them not feed, nor drink water; but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God; yea, let them turn every one from his evil way and from the violence that is in their hands" (Jonah 3:5-8). "For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you; yea, what clearing of yourselves; yea, what indignation; yea, what fear; yea, what vehement desire; yea, what zeal; yea, what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter" (2 Corinthians 7:11). "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow" (Isaiah 1:16-17). "Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men; and they counted the price of them and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver" (Acts 19:19).

Fourth, acknowledging a fault or saying we are sorry is not repentance, though repentance leads naturally to confession of sin, as appears from the fact that John's penitents were baptized "confessing their sins," and from what is said of the Ephesian penitents (Acts 19:18): "And many that believed came and confessed and showed their deeds."

Fifth, Mr. Moody's definition, "Right about face," is not repentance, for that is conversion in literal import. In the divine influence originating it, conversion precedes repentance as thus expressed by Jeremiah 31:19 : "After that I was turned I repented." But in our exercise it follows repentance, as expressed by Peter, "Repent and be converted" (Acts 3:19). Sixth, "Do penance." The Romanist translation of Matthew 3:2 conveys an idea antipodal to repentance. Repentance is internal. Doing penance is external. Repentance deals directly with God; penance obeys an earthly priest. Penance inflicts punishment on the flesh. Repentance turns the spirit lovingly to God.

Seventh, restitution is not repentance, but only one of its ripest fruits. Zaccheus well illustrates this in his words to Christ: "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold" (Luke 19:8).

Eighth, M. T. Martin's definition, "Knowing God and turning from dead works," is not a definition of repentance, and without a clear explanation is misleading as an equivalent. The idea of this so-called definition is derived from two scriptures, to wit: "Repentance from dead works," (Hebrews 6:1) and "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John 17:3). In this latter scripture the definer assumes that "knowing God" is repentance, and "knowing Jesus Christ" is faith. The assumption is more plausible than correct. In effect it changes the scriptural order of repentance and faith, for we cannot know the Father except through the Son, which under the definition would make us get to repentance only through faith. Moreover, if knowing the Father and the Son as a means to eternal life must have an equivalent, it would be more exact to make faith the equivalent of both. But, arguing logically, the true equivalent of the "knowing" in this case is eternal life, and as the life is a result, so must knowing, its equivalent, be a result; and as the life results from faith, so must the knowing, its equivalent, so result. The liability to abuse arising from making the phrase "knowing God" a definition of repentance, and the phrase, "knowing Jesus Christ" a definition of faith, lies in the common misconception of the import of the word "know" in variant Bible usage. It is often employed to express the idea of approbation rather than information. There is no eternal life in the knowledge that stops at mere information. The demon said to Jesus, "I know thee, who thou art, thou Holy One of God" (Mark 1:24). And James also says, "The demons also believe and tremble." It is therefore not so much information which men need as a renewed mind. The fact is both notable and significant, that those who most insist on knowing God as a definition of repentance are those who most minify its importance, preach it seldom and virtually make it equivalent to a mere intellectual perception logically resulting from a clear statement of a truth.

Ninth, benevolence is not repentance, though surely an accompaniment or fruit of it. A man once said in my hearing, "I can do more repentance with a barrel of flour and a side of bacon than was ever found at a mourner's bench." If this statement could be construed to mean that true repentance evidences itself more in deeds of charity to the needy than in mere bemoanings of one's self, whether at or aside from a bench, it might claim some merit, but it is not fairly susceptible of such construction; hence is faulty at both ends. The sneer at the mourner and the affirmation that one repents by deeds of charity are alike unscriptural. Yea, they both embody deadly heresies. From the first as a root, two baleful branches shoot out, to wit: One, that we may cultivate the carnal mind into a Christian mind by a process of giving; the other, that we may atone for sin by subsequent benefactions. Both are antipodal to repentance, in that it signifies a supernatural renewal of the mind and leads to faith, which lays hold on substitutionary atonement.

It may be said that there is in the most of these false definitions either such an element of truth, or such nearness to truth, that the heresy is dangerous, because plausible. It is important to account for this looseness in definition. The average mind is not given to analysis, and hence, Judging from phenomena alone, illogically blends or interchanges cause and effect, attributes manifestations to wrong causes, or confounds things externally similar but internally dissimilar. This may be illustrated by any one of the false definitions cited. For example, the external symptoms of remorse, or worldly sorrow, and godly sorrow, may easily be confounded by a superficial judge.

Even Dr. Adam dark evinces great lack of discrimination by finding hope of salvation in the case of Judas, because under the promptings of remorse he threw down the blood money, saying, "I have betrayed the innocent blood." So through the ages, over-sanguine and sympathetic temperaments have been accustomed to deduce most unwarranted inferences from the remorse of the ungodly manifestations in a dying hour, and particularly in the case of criminals about to be executed. Herein consists one of the excellencies of the divine judgment. It is not according to appearances.

Again, because godly sorrow, the mediate agent of repentance, and confession, conversion, reformation and restitution, its unfailing results, all have external visibility; while repentance, itself being internal, is inscrutable, it is quite easy for one who judges by the sight of his eyes, to miscall any one of them repentance. We may get somewhat nearer to the heart of this matter by noting the fact that, if from a given sentence you erase a word and substitute an alleged definition therefor, the definition, if accurate, will not only invariably make good sense, but will also certainly convey the true sense, while a false definition so substituted will not likely make good sense, and will certainly change the original meaning. For illustration, suppose we write on a blackboard this sentence: "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance," then erasing the word "repentance," substitute therefore successively the ten false and the one true definitions heretofore given, and see which one not only makes the best sense) but conveys the original sense. In trying this experiment it must be remembered that in this sentence "without repentance" refers to God, and not to the one who receives, or who is called.

The gifts and calling of God are without worldly sorrow, that is, on his part.

The gifts and calling of God are without godly sorrow, that is, on his part.

The gifts and calling of God are without quitting his meanness.

The gifts and calling of God are without reformation, that is, on his part.

The gifts and calling of God are without conversion, on his part.

The gifts and calling of God are without his doing penance.

The gifts and calling of God are without restitution, that is, on his part.

The gifts and calling of God are without his knowing God and turning from dead works.

The gifts and calling of God are without benefactions.

Here let us substitute the true definition, "The gifts and calling of God are without a change of mind," which means what? That God never takes back what he gives; that he never reconsiders when he calls. That if he gives one eternal life all the devils in hell can never pluck it away; that if he calls one unto eternal life, that calling will insure every other step in the process of salvation. The same thought is expressed in that other scripture, which says of God, "He is without variableness or shadow of turning," or that other scripture which declares him to be "the same yesterday, today and forever." It follows that this scripture teaches the doctrine of the final preservation of the saints, based upon the unchangeableness of the divine purpose.

QUESTIONS 1. What is prominence is given in the Bible to the duty of repentance?

2. Mention some noted Old Testament preachers of the doctrine; some New Testament preachers.

3. What says Paul about the universality of the obligation?

4. What says our Lord of its necessity?

5. Are all God’s commandments of equal importance?

6. Is a mistake about baptism fatal? Why not?

7. A mistake as to repentance? Why?

8. What other fact suggests its importance?

9. State the value of first principles in any science.

10. What is the meaning of fundamental?

11. Cite a scripture which calls repentance a part of the foundation of Christian doctrine.

12. Can one build a big house on a little foundation?

13. State the relation of a foundation to its superstructure. Is it wise to economize in foundations? How does our Lord illustrate the value of the foundation? How David?

14. What do we call these vain imaginations which have no foundation in fact?

15. What then is the value of a profession of religion not bottomed on repentance?

16. How else does it appear that repentance is a first principle?

17. Illustrate this by the work of John the Baptist.

18. What prophets foretold the nature of John’s work?

19. Cite Isaiah’s words foreshadowing a part of its characteristics.

20. Elsewhere what words?

21. What one word expresses all this work?

22. Apply this to ancient Roman and Peruvian roads and to modern railroads, showing its utility.

23. Cite the words of Jeremiah showing the evil results of impenitence, by comparing it to walking in a way not cast up.

24. What similitude, therefore, describes the folly of trying to be a Christian without repentance?

25. What agricultural figure does Isaiah also employ to express the nature of this preparatory work?

26. How did John’s preaching fulfil this figure of "withering the grass" of the flesh?

27. How did other prophets extend the agricultural figure, showing the preparatory nature of repentance?

28. According to this figure what similitude expresses the folly of trying to be a Christian without repentance?

29. How does our Saviour describe the outcome of the folly of omit ting this preparatory work?

30. In what way does Mark emphasize the preparatory work of repentance? How Luke? How Matthew?

31. What then may we say of the relation of repentance to eternal life?

32. Why, philosophically, must repentance precede faith?

33. Prove this precedence from the scriptures.

34. Is there any passage in the New Testament containing both terms in which faith comes first?

35. From the discussion so far, sum up the nature, necessity and importance of repentance.

36. What can you say of the preacher whose preaching leaves out repentance?

37. Of the one whose preaching minifies it?

38. What, then, is every preacher's duty concerning this doctrine?

39. What may be justly said of all the great preachers who have been successful in winning souls to Christ?

40. What ought to follow from all these things?

41. Have they usually these clear conceptions?

42. Cite examples of variant definitions by prominent people.

43. Are you now willing to go into a New Testament examination of this fundamental and vital doctrine?

44. In what language was the New Testament written?

45. What Greek terms bearing on this subject are to be found in one paragraph of 2 Corinthians 7:1-16?

46. How does the common version render the verb metamelomai in this chapter?

47. Does it always so render this verb?

48. Cite every instance of its use in the New Testament.

49. How may you give a better rendering?

50. Why is "repent" an inappropriate rendering of this verb?

51. What is the other Greek term?

52. Cite every New Testament use of both the verb and the noun, noting its application to the doctrine.

53. What may be said of this use?

54. Of what is repentance declared to be the product?

55. In what does it always end?

56. What follows?

57. What other New Testament use of this adjective?

58. Tell us more about metanoeo, to repent, and metanoia, repentance.

59. Therefore what do these terms always mean?

60. What, then, is the one invariable definition of New Testament repentance?

61. How, then, is the domain limited?

62. Wherein lies the necessity of its universal obligation as a pre requisite to Christian character and life?

63. But does this make repentance the equivalent of regeneration?

64. What fact does this explain?

65. Show now seriatim, the folly of all the false definitions.

66. If from a given sentence we erase a word and substitute therefore an alleged definition, what follows?

67. Illustrate the folly of the false definitions given by a blackboard exercise on the sentence, "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

# 05.17. The Object Of Repentance

XIV THE OBJECT OF REPENTANCE

It was recognized as impossible to embody in one discussion a well-rounded view of the doctrine of repentance. The first discussion closed with an illustration designed to impress the accuracy of the definition that repentance is a change of mind toward God, and to expose the inaccuracy of prevalent popular definitions. This illustration consisted in taking the sentence, "The gifts and the calling of God are without repentance" (Romans 11:29), and substituting in turn the various so-called definitions in the place of the word "repentance," to determine which one made the best sense. Resuming the discussion at that precise point, attention is called to a possible objection based on the fact that the phrase "without repentance" in Romans 11:29, is but a rendering of the adjective ametomeletos, which is not derived frommetanoeo, but from metamelei. If anyone should be disposed to consider that this fact impairs the force of the illustration, he may bring out the idea sought to be conveyed just as forcibly by using as a base some sentence which has in it unmistakably metanoia. For example, let the reader try the same procedure with Hebrews 12:17 : "Esau found no place of repentance though he sought it carefully, with tears." Here it is important to observe that the repentance of this verse does not, as is commonly supposed, refer to an exercise of the mind of Esau. The sentence means that Esau found no place for a change of mind on the part of his father, Isaac, though he sought to change his father’s mind with many tears. This change on the part of Isaac was impossible, notwithstanding he preferred Esau above Jacob, because he could not change the blessing pronounced on Jacob through divine inspiration. Hence the margin of the common version renders the passage, "Esau found no way to change Isaac’s mind," thus harmonizing with Paul’s version of the same matter as thus expressed: "And not only this, but when Rebekah also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of him that calleth), it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy" (Romans 9:10-16). If, therefore, we want an illustration of confusion confounded, we have only to write Hebrews 12:17, erase the word "repentance," and substitute therefore successively the false definitions heretofore cited.

Here another objector may ask: If we define repentance as only a change of mind, does not that belittle a great doctrine? That depends on the "from what" and the "to what." Remember that the carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be. To change that mind into love of God and subjection to his law is no small change. It is as difficult as to raise the dead or make a world. It calls for the exercise of supernatural, creative, omnipotent energy.

It still may be objected: How, then, can we repent, as a stream can rise no higher than its source? The answer is obvious. We cannot repent except by divine grace. Remember this scripture cited: "Jesus Christ was exalted a prince and a Saviour to give repentance," and remember also what has been stated, that the exercise of repentance on our part is but the under side; the upper side is regeneration. We work out what God works in, both to will and to do according to his good pleasure, and therefore our "confession of faith" makes repentance a fruit of regeneration.

If it be objected again that according to this definition there is no element of sorrow in repentance, our reply is, etymologically and abstractly, no. But again, everything depends OD "from what" and "to what." We should never forget the standpoint. Gospel repentance necessarily involves the idea of sorrow, because we repent from the standpoint of sin against the holy God, whose righteous law that sin has transgressed. Hence, like Job when he saw the Holy One, our convicted spirit cries out, "Behold, I am vile. What shall I answer thee? I will lay my hand upon thy mouth. . . . I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore, I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." This view makes clear the relation of repentance to godly sorrow.

Godly sorrow, or contrition, is God-wrought sorrow, that is, God is its author. This makes godly sorrow the result of conviction of sin. Conviction is the work of the Holy Spirit. Contrition is our exercise under conviction.

In referring to the Holy Spirit our Lord says, "When he is come he will convict the world of sin." The sinner’s way, though leading to death, seems right to him until he is convicted that it is wrong. When so convicted, he changes his mind and thus godly sorrow worketh repentance. The Day of Pentecost furnishes a notable example of this order of procedure. On that day the Holy Spirit came down, enduing the disciples with power, and through their preaching convicted the Jews of sin. When these so convicted cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied, "Repent ye." The phrase expressing this conviction is, "They were pricked in their heart." This fulfils an Old Testament prophecy. Jeremiah, in stating the nature of the new covenant, says, "I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts." Paul refers to the same thought when describing the conversion of the Corinthians: "Written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God; not on tables of stone but in fleshly tables of the heart" (2 Corinthians 3:3).

It is very important to observe just here that when we say that the carnal mind is enmity against God and that repentance is a change of mind toward God, we by no means intend to teach by the change alleged that the carnal mind itself is transformed, converted into a loving mind, because the carnal mind is inconvertible. It can never be made subject to God’s law by any possible process. The change of mind is not the turning of one mind into another, as wheat is converted into flour, retaining its substance while changing its form, but it is a change by substitution. One thing takes the place of another radically different thing, as a child is said to be a changeling who in infancy was substituted for the true offspring that had first been removed.-Only we must remember that in repentance the mind substituted for the carnal mind is a new creation. Ezekiel expresses that thought thus: "A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my Spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." Paul calls this the "putting off of the old man and the putting on the new man." Observe,

however, that when speaking of repentance, or faith, as the under, or human side of regeneration, we do not mean that repentance alone expresses all the change set forth in the paragraphs from Ezekiel and Paul. Faith must be included to insure this full result. As our Articles of Faith declare, "Repentance and faith are inseparable graces wrought in our souls by the regenerating Spirit of God." We may well here be asked, "How then can we discriminate between the work of repentance and faith?" By recurring to the illustration of a changeling we may be able somewhat to discriminate. Repentance takes away the first child; faith substitutes the other. The taking away is but preparatory, as John’s preaching withered the grass of the flesh, utterly consuming any hope of fitness for the kingdom of heaven based on carnal descent from Abraham, to make them ready by faith to receive Christ. And so in Hebrews 8:13 Paul describes the changing of the covenants, "In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." In other words, one is taken away as a preparation for the institution of the other, and this is equally a change. Having now considered somewhat in detail its nature and meaning, some attention will be given to the object of repentance.

Paul discriminates sharply between repentance and faith, as to their respective objects, when he says, "Repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21). Observe, therefore, that gospel repentance is only toward God, but as repentance is a general term, we must not forget that we may repent toward other objects. One may change his mind about multitudinous matters, from one thing or person to another thing or person. He may repent toward his earthly parents, toward death, toward shame. From this fact arises a liability to mistake one of these repentances for gospel repentance. Indeed, it is often done. A wild young man, away from home, has been stirred to tears by some preacher’s description of the old homestead, and reflecting upon the grief and pain his disobedience has wrought in the parental heart, he is led by sorrow to change his mind toward his faraway parents. In this case, his repentance is toward his earthly parents, and may not have in it a single element of spirituality, in the gospel sense. Again, a profane, dissipated, and wicked man, when suddenly confronted with death, or threatened with exposure of his unrighteousness, is stricken with remorse, which leads to a change of mind as to the evil done, or rather its consequences. Here the repentance is either toward the horrors of apprehended death or toward the shame of being found out. That we may be well guarded against this liability to mistake, it may be necessary to illustrate repentance of this kind.

Years ago a Texas paper recited a thrilling incident aboard a ship in the Gulf of Mexico. It was just after a gale. The passengers, rejoicing in the subsidence of the storm, were variously occupied, according to inclination or habit, some swearing, some drinking, some gambling. Suddenly the captain, his face white, his lips quivering, rushed into the cabin and startled the unprepared passengers with the awful announcement, "The ship has sprung a leak and will go down in five minutes!" The effect was instant and all-pervasive. The oath and ribald jest were arrested, half-uttered, on the lips of profanity; the drunkard dropped untasted the half lifted bottle; the gamblers threw down their unplayed cards and ignored the tempting gold they had staked on their game. All of them, panic-stricken, by one impulse) fell on their knees in prayer. They all repented toward sudden death. Now, if that ship had gone down, instantaneously engulfing all but one of that crew in a watery grave, and that one survivor had reported that all his shipmates died in the act of prayer, having each one "quit his meanness," their relatives at home would have deduced great hopes of their condition in eternity, and some preachers in funeral services would have

preached their souls right into heaven. But, alas! for such repentance, such hopes, such preaching, in the light of subsequent facts. The history proceeds to say that while yet in their fear-prompted devotions the carpenter of the ship appears with the cheering statement that the pumps are lowering the water in the hold and the leak will soon be stopped. The effect of this assuring announcement was like that ascribed to the touch of a magician's wand. Devotion and panic depart together and wicked inclinations and habits resume their wonted sway. Indeed, the oaths are more frequent, the jests more obscene, on profanity's lips. The gamblers renew their interrupted game with doubled stakes to make up for loss of time. The drunkard treats himself to an extra two fingers in compensation for his brief abstinence. We may call this "India rubber repentance," because it is like the schoolboy's hollow ball, which flattens under pressure but resumes its original form when the pressure ceases.

Mark Twain in a very humorous account of this method of getting religion gives us a second illustration, substantially after this fashion: He tells of three men lost in a snowstorm, wearily riding in a circle, until the increasing cold admonishes that they must have a fire or die, and how every match and every powder flash failed to ignite the wet boughs gathered by their benumbed fingers, and how at last the certainty of death called for a preparation for eternity, and how each proposed to get religion by quitting his particular meanness. The first throws down his pipe and promises never to smoke again. The second hurls away his bottle and vows to drink no more. The third scatters to the winds his pack of Mexican cards, pledging to deal monte never again. And then, shaking hands and crying all around, they yield up their ghosts to – sleep. The beautiful snow gathered around them its white mantle as a shroud, but lo I when morning came they awoke to find themselves alive and within sight of the very stage stand they had vainly sought in the darkness. With sheepish faces and in silence they sought its hospitable walls, where, after thawing the outside at the blazing hearth and filling the inside with generous food and drink, they were surprised to find how secular they felt. But each was ashamed for the others to know he had so soon fallen from grace, and so sought solitude after his own fashion. The smoker, when left alone, slipped out, sought, found, and filled his pipe, and stealing behind one corner of the barn to surreptitiously strike a match, surprised the drunkard at the other corner just lifting his recovered bottle to his lips, while both stood aghast at beholding under an old stagecoach the third playing solitaire with his refound pack of Mexican cards.

Henry Ward Beecher says that "one might as well repent toward the jaws of a crocodile as toward the law." The question then may well be asked, "How may one safely distinguish between gospel repentance and repentance toward other objects?" This may be done by keeping in mind the following characteristics of gospel repentance: First, as to its nature. It is spiritual, a new creation, wrought by the omnificent energy of the Holy Spirit. The tree is first made good. Second, it is always the product of contrition, whose marks are thus described by Paul: "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of, but the sorrow of the world worketh death; for behold this self-same thing that we sorrow after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you; yea, what clearing of yourselves; yea, what indignation; yea, what fear; yea, what vehement desire; yea, what zeal; yea, what revenge. In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter." Third, as to its objects. It is always toward God. It recognizes, abhors and turns away from sin as a transgression of his holy law, and confesses the guilt of alienation from it. Fourth, it always leads to loving acceptance by faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the soul's only prophet,

priest, and king. Fifth, being a radical and fundamental change, it always bears fruit in confession, conversion, reformation, and even restitution when possible.

When theologians speak of repentance in a somewhat broader sense than its etymological import, that is, including both anterior and subsequent or accompanying exercises, they find in it these three elements: First, an intellectual element, which recognizes sin as involving personal guilt, defilement and helplessness. Paul calls this "knowledge of sin," Greek,Epignosis, Hamartias, Romans 3:20. Second, an emotional element, called contrition, or godly sorrow, Greek,lupe kata theon. Third, a voluntary element, Greek,metanoia,that is, a change of mind or disposition which turning from sin and self-help seeks pardon and cleansing in a Redeemer.

Here, as a guard against a widespread misconception, it is important to observe that the penitent state is not a passive state, but exceedingly active. The mind acts, the heart acts, the will acts, the whole being is stirred, every faculty is alive and employed, and every means or resource available is utilized. The penitent is indeed no sluggard. With him there is no folding of the hands, no lying supinely on his back, no foolish waiting. He burns, he moves, he tries. He is a very live man. It is well to specify three phases of this activity. First, the penitent is a mourner on account of sin. Second, the penitent prays for pardon and cleansing. Third, the penitent is a seeker after salvation. It perhaps would take up too much time and space to cite the very words of all the scriptures proving these three phases of activity, and yet the reader should take down a list of the more important ones and privately examine them. I suggest the following: Zechariah 12:9; Zechariah 13:1; James 4:8-10; Isaiah 57:15; Psalms 34:18; Psalms 51:1-10; Jonah 3:4-10; Luke 18:9; Psalms 4:1-3; Psalms 107:10-14; Psalms 107:17; Psalms 107:20; Isaiah 55:6-7; Jeremiah 29:12-13; Jeremiah 50:4-5; Luke 18:13; Matthew 6:33. The characteristics of the gospel mourner presented in the passage from Zechariah it is quite important to note. First, it was a great mourning; second, it was an individual mourning, husband and wife apart; third, it is declared to be such a mourning as parents indulge over the death of their first-born, or as Israel indulged over the death of Josiah, their king. Fourth, it was truly lupe kata theon; that is, the Holy Spirit was its agent. Fifth, the preached word, lifting up Christ, was its instrument (compare John 19:37 and Acts 2:17-37). And finally it leads to the fountain of cleansing (Zechariah 13:1). Our Lord, in referring to the mourning of the Ninevites, who put on sackcloth and ashes and cried mightily to God, says that they repented at the preaching of Jonah. He had just said that if Tyre and Sidon had received the light bestowed upon Chorazin and Bethsaida they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.

While discussing the penitent’s activity as a mourner, it may be well to refer somewhat to what is popularly called the mourner’s bench. Within modern times revivalist preachers fell upon the method of inducing movement upon the part of those whom they addressed by asking them to come forward to a designated seat, where they might be instructed and where the people of God could approach them knowing that the approach would not be offensive to them. This method has its dangers and its abuses. There is always danger of making it a fixed institution, and even without intending it, of allowing the popular mind to regard it as a fact that salvation can be found nowhere else than at the mourner’s bench. Then well known excesses have taken place in connection with what are called altar scenes, which have brought this method into reproach with many pious, thinking people. There is equal danger in the opposite extreme of preaching which has no tendency to induce action, movement, decision, which draws no line of demarcation. The

Baptists and the Methodists employ the mourner’s bench, as it is called, or some form of that method, more than other denominations. Those popularly known as Campbellites and Martinites most oppose it. Where one is wise a golden mean between these extremes can be profitably found.

A notable case of the second activity, the penitent’s praying, is furnished by our Saviour in the case of the publican, whose prayer is thus expressed in the Greek:“O theos, hilestheti moi toi hamartoloi."It may be translated: God, be propitious to me, the sinner; (or, forgive me through the atonement) . As Baptists usually teach the penitent to pray for the pardon of his sins, it may here be asked whether they call upon him to pray for pardon independent of the atonement wrought by Christ. No one who has ever taught a penitent to pray, at least no Baptist inculcates such teachings apart from the means appointed to secure the remission of sins. If then the penitent is taught to seek pardon in prayer through the appointed means of pardon, this conforms our Baptist teaching to that of our Lord Jesus Christ in the parable of the publican.

And, indeed, it is improbable that any man was ever saved who did not mourn on account of his sins and pray for pardon through Christ and seek eternal life. And we may regard with well-grounded distrust any alleged Christian experience unaccompanied with these exercises of mind and heart.

False teachers have applied to this mourning, praying, and seeking activity of the penitent the opprobrious phrase, "dirt and straw religion." If modern seekers after eternal life were to act as did the Ninevites, fasting, putting on sackcloth and crying mightily to God in prayer, doubtless these dry-eyed, short-cut teachers would ridicule it as "dirt and straw religion," or as doing penance; and yet our Saviour, in referring to these exercises says that the Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah. Most probably the real objection of these false teachers to what they call the mourner’s bench, lies more against the mourning, the praying, and the seeking than against the bench. In an effort to avoid the opprobrium heaped upon this method we should take good heed lest we run into the opposite extreme, that is, leave out the mourning, praying, and seeking, while leaving out the bench. The Scriptures prescribe no fixed measure of mourning, praying, and seeking as necessary to salvation. Indeed, it is not a measure of time and process. If in one moment the soul is contrite enough to turn in abhorrence of sin against God from all self-help to our Lord Jesus Christ by faith, it is sufficient.

The reader is called upon to note that when we say that repentance is toward God, we do not mean that only preaching about the law or about God the Father can produce repentance. That is not meant at all. The preaching that leads to repentance toward God is the preaching of Christ and him crucified, for in Christ alone is the Father revealed and the majesty of his law fully set forth. This is abundantly proved by the Scriptures. Our Lord said that in his name should repentance and remission of sins be preached throughout the world. Peter’s sermon on the Day of Pentecost is an illustrious example of how preaching Christ leads to repentance, and the passage from Zechariah, before quoted, says that it is only after they looked on him whom they had pierced that they mourned, and then was opened a fountain for sin and uncleanness. What the Scriptures teach) experience corroborates. Observation of revival meetings shows that hearts are not broken by dry, abstract preaching of the law, but are melted into contrition by Christ lifted up, and set forth as crucified before the eyes of the people. On this account Paul declared that be gloried in nothing

save the cross of Christ, and in his preaching knew nothing other than Christ and him crucified. I would commend, therefore, to young preachers and all Christians desirous of leading men to repentance or faith or consecration, or any other gospel exercise whatever, the supreme theme, Christ and him crucified; always Christ, whether to saint or sinner. Preach Christ – not morality, not philosophy, not deeds of charity, not civilization, never anything but Christ.

QUESTIONS

1. How do you meet the objection that the phrase "without repentance" in Romans 11:29 is a rendering of the adjective ametameletos and is not derived from melanoeo?

2. Show how the definition, "Repentance is a change of mind," does not belittle a great doctrine.

3. If repentance calls for the exercise of supernatural, creative and omnipotent energy, how then can we repent?

4. Is there necessarily an element of sorrow in repentance? Show clearly the relation of repentance to godly sorrow.

5. Cite a notable example of this order of procedure.

6. What phrase expresses the conviction?

7. What Old Testament prophecy did this fulfil?

8. How does Paul express the same thought?

9. By the change of mind in repentance is it meant that the carnal Blind itself is transformed, converted into a loving mind?

10. How does Ezekiel express the nature of this change? How Paul?

11. Does repentance alone express all of the changes set forth in the paragraphs from Paul and Ezekiel?

12. How then can one discriminate between the exercises of repentance and faith?

13. How does Paul discriminate between repentance and faith as to their respective objects?

14. May we not repent toward other objects?

15. Is there a liability to mistake one of these repentances for gospel repentance?

16. Illustrate repentance of this kind.

17. Recite substantially Mark Twain’s humorous account of getting religion after this fashion.

18. How did Henry Ward Beecher describe repentance toward the law?

19. How then may one safely distinguish between the real repentance and the spurious?

20. What three elements do theologians find in repentance considered in a broader than the etymological sense?

21. Is the penitent state active or passive?

22. Specify three phases of this activity.

23. Cite scriptures proving that the penitent is a mourner.

24. Proving that he is a seeker.

25. Proving that he prays for pardon.

26. What are the characteristics of the mourning mentioned in Zechariah?

27. What does our Lord say about mourning and praying of the Ninevites?

28. What about Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matthew 11:20-21)?

29. Cite the origin and history of the mourner's bench.

30. What are its dangers and abuses; dangers of opposite extreme?

31. What denominations most employ this method? Who most oppose it?

32. What is the golden mean?

33. Cite the Greek text of the publican's prayer; its meaning.

34. Do Baptists teach the penitent to pray for pardon of sins in dependent of the atonement wrought by Christ?

35. If then the penitent is taught to seek pardon in prayer through the appointed means of pardon, to whose teaching does this conform?

36. Is it probable that any man was ever saved who did not mourn on account of his sins, pray for pardon through Christ and seek eternal life?

37. How may we regard any alleged Christian experience unaccompanied with these exercises?

38. What opprobrious phrase do false teachers apply to mourning, praying and seeking?

39. If modern seekers after eternal life were to act as did the Ninevites, what would these dry-eyed teachers say about it?

40. What does our Saviour say about it?

41. What does he say of Tyre and Sidon?

42. What most probably is the real objection of these teachers to the mourner's bench?

43. What caution is necessary in avoiding the evils of the so-called mourner's bench?

44. What measure of mourning, praying, and seeking do the Scriptures require as necessary to salvation?

45. What kind of preaching most conducive to repentance?

46. Prove this by the Scriptures.

47. How does experience corroborate this?

48. On this account what said Paul as to the matter of his preaching?

49. What theme is commended to young preachers and other Christians desirous of leading men to repentance, or faith, or any other gospel exercise?

# 05.18. Motives And Encouragements To Repentance

XV MOTIVES AND ENCOURAGEMENTS TO REPENTANCE

Before considering the Bible motives and encouragements to repentance let four correlative thoughts take deep root in the reader's mind.

First, sinners alone can or should repent. The righteous are not called to repentance, because just men need no repentance. Second, and therefore, men ought and must repent of their sins only. We ought not, must not repent of righteousness. Where there is no transgression, there is no obligation to repentance, no necessity for it, no propriety in it.

Third, since all men are commanded to repent, it follows that all are sinners. Let us never allow ourselves to be deceived at this point by the familiar phrases of worldly judgment. Men are called good or righteous by the world on account of their supposed conduct toward men. Women are called good or righteous because of supposed amiability of character or propriety of conduct in human relations. The world does not take into account our relations to God. And yet sin cannot be sin unless against God. And all people, aside from the provisions of divine grace, are out of harmony in their relations toward God. The world's best man, even if he be our father, society's fairest, sweetest, most amiable woman, even if she be our mother, wife, or sister, or daughter, is a sinner, under the just condemnation of God.

Fourth, without repentance they are forever lost. God himself cannot forgive the impenitent. The following scriptures may suffice to prove that it is sin alone that must be repented of: "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee" (Acts 8:22). "Lest . . . I shall bewail many who have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness, which they have committed" (2 Corinthians 12:21). "I gave her space to repent of her fornication; and she repented not. Behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds" (Revelation 2:21-22). "And the rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk. Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts" (Revelation 9:20-21). In all these instances the thing calling for repentance is sin.

Just here the reader is requested to note a difference between the idiom of the Greek and of the English. We observe that in our English translation of all these passages the verb "repent" is followed by the preposition "of" – "repent of" the sin, whatever it may be. But strictly speaking, we cannot "repent of" anything. Our English idiom, "repent of," is used to avoid circumlocution. It does not, however, strictly accord with the definition or grammatical usage of the Greek verb, metanoeo, or its noun, metanoia. This is evident in the Greek text of all the passages just cited. In Acts 8:22 : "Repent of thy wickedness," the preposition following the verb is apo – "repent from" which phrase, according to Dr. Hackett, is used in a pregnant sense and is equivalent to

"repent and turn from." With this compare Hebrews 6:1 : "Repentance from dead works," and the Septuagint of Jeremiah 8:6 : "No man repented him from his wickedness." In 2 Corinthians 12:21 : "Have not repented of the uncleanness," etc., the preposition is epi, i.e., "have not repented on account of uncleanness." It is true that Meyer and others, connect epi, in this passage, not with metaiweo, i.e. "repent on account of the uncleanness," etc., but with penthesa i.e., "mourn on account of the uncleanness." But both the common and revised version are against this construction. Moreover, passages may be cited not only from classic Greek authors and the Septuagint, but also from postapostolic authors connecting metanoeo with epi, i.e., "repent on account of" (cf. Joel 2:13; Jonah 3:1-10, Septuagint). Lucial (A.D. 160), says, "Repent for what {epi) or on account of what he did." Josephus (Greek text) referring to Exodus 14:5, says, "The Egyptians, however, soon repented that the Hebrews were gone," i. e., on account of (epi) the departure of the Hebrews, (Ant. 2, 15, 3). In all the passages cited from Revelation, "to repent of fornication," "repent of their deeds," "repented not of their works," "repented not of their murders," the preposition is ek ("out of," or "from") which is elliptical and is somewhat more than equivalent to "repent and turn from." The difference between apo and ek is one of degree, not kind,ek having greater force; as, "to drive from (apo) the gate and to drive from within (ek) the gate." It conforms therefore more accurately with the meaning and usage of the Greek terms to Bay, "repent on account of sin," rather than "repent of sin," and to say, "repentance from sin," rather than "repentance of sin."

We now approach the subject of motives. As man is a rational, accountable, moral being, his actions are induced by motives, and in these motives, lies very largely, the moral quality of the actions. These facts should bear heavily on the conscientious preacher of repentance. His zeal should not be allowed to outrun his knowledge. He should, as a teacher of the gospel, urge only right motives to induce sinners to repent. All appeals, based on mere expediency, or on worldly reasons; and all help sought in mere human devices to attract and hold and stir a crowd are unworthy of his high calling, and unsuitable and inefficient in themselves. A change of mind or reformation brought about by merely worldly considerations, is devoid of any religious element and transitory in nature, however promising or startling at first.

The fleeting results of meetings conducted by some sensational evangelists serve for illustration. There is no step taken in religion that steps not toward God. Sin is against God. Repentance, being on account of sin, is toward God. Nor is there need to seek beyond the Scriptures for motives and encouragements to repentance, because they abound with all incentives that will likely quicken the conscience, stir the heart, or influence the will; and because the word of God alone has the promise of the Spirit’s power without which there-can be no repentance. No evangelist, however abundant his labors or frequent his services, need fear an exhaustion of this Bible material or a monotony of service in confining himself to it. The supply is inexhaustible in quantity, infinite in variety, perfect in adaptation and omnipotent in efficacy. It must be premised, therefore, that our present citation of scriptural motives and encouragements to repentance pretends to indicate only a very few of many available resources, and our brief exposition thereof pretends to be suggestive only and not exhaustive in any case.

MOTIVES AND ENCOURAGEMENTS

"The Lord is willing that all should come to repentance" (2 Peter 3:9). This scripture expresses not an irresistible decree, but the attitude of the divine mind toward all men. As repentance must be toward God, if he, one of the two at variance, and withal the one aggrieved, is willing to accept the repentance of the transgressor as a step toward reconciliation, it places the responsibility of decision on the man, and teaches that the final damnation of any soul on account of sin is suicide – the sinner destroys himself. The emphasis should be placed on "willing" and "all." The Lord is willing; is the sinner willing? The willingness of God is toward all, excluding no nation, no class, no individual: "How often would I have gathered you but ye would not," "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life," "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." No view of the divine decrees, no interpretation of the doctrines of election and predestination should be allowed to obscure the brightness, or limit the broadness, of this attitude of the divine mind toward sinners. Our own hearts should be full of it when we preach or teach the gospel to lost men. And we should prayerfully and diligently labor to possess their minds with the conviction that if everything else in the universe be a lie, it remains true that "God wishes all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Timothy 2:4). We must not, dare not, doubt his sincerity, nor impugn his veracity, when he says, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live" (Ezekiel 33:11).

This willingness of God that all should come to repentance is evident (a) by his abundant provision of mercy – "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life," (John 3:16) ; "That by the grace of God he should taste death for every man," (Hebrews 2:9); "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world," (1 John 2:2). (b) It is evident in that the terms of this mercy are simple and easy — repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ (Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21; Romans 10:8-9). (c) It is evident in that, by the church and ministry, he has provided for a perpetual and worldwide publication of this mercy and its terms (Luke 24:47; Matthew 28:19; Acts 17:30). (d) It is evident by the earnestness and broadness of his gracious invitations (Isaiah 55:1; Matthew 11:28; Revelation 22:17). (e) It is evident by his suspension of the death penalty, assessed against the sinner, that space for repentance may be allowed (Genesis 6:3; Matthew 3:10; Luke 13:6-9; Romans 2:4; 2 Peter 3:9; 2 Peter 3:15; Revelation 2:21). (f) It is evident by his joyous welcome to the penitent (Luke 15:20; Luke 15:24) who returns in this space, (g) It is evident by his sincere grief over the finally impenitent who allow the space to pass away unimproved (Luke 19:41-44). What mighty motives are in all these thoughts! What an inexhaustible supply of sermon themes! What preacher has drawn all the water out of these wells of salvation? For an elaborate discussion of God’s willingness that all sinners should come to repentance, it may not be regarded as immodest for me to refer the reader to the sermon, "God and the Sinner," in my first volume of published sermons.

The sinner’s great need and heaven’s great supply. "And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father’s have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger!" (Luke 15:17). How touching, how realistic this picture! He has spent all. He is in want. He perishes. He is a prey to dissatisfaction, unrest, unutterable woe. Well might he make his own the words of England’s great poet, Byron:My days are in the yellow leaf, The flowers, the fruits of love are gone; The worm, the canker and the grief Are mine alone. The fire that on my bosom preys Is lone as some volcanic isle; No torch is lighted at its blaze, A funeral pile.

Over against this, behold the light, the feasting, the joy, the merry-making in the father's house, and hear its music I Another scripture sharply contrasts the needs and the supply: "Thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve, that thou mayest see. . . . Be zealous, therefore, and repent" (Revelation 3:17-19).

The prodigal was deeply conscious of his needs and heaven's supply. The Laodiceans were profoundly ignorant of both. The latter said, "I am rich and increased with goods and have need of nothing." With the former there was complete disillusion. This fact, man's need and heaven's plenty, or rather the awakened soul's consciousness of it, will never cease to be an effective plea for repentance till Jesus comes. Let the evangelist, therefore, who would be successful in winning souls to Christ, play often on his harp. It has many strings and many tunes.

But this special motive is only a shoot from a greater radical motive which bears many other offshoots, to wit: God is the only satisfying portion of the soul.

Who has God and nothing beside is rich indeed; who tins him not, though all things else, is poor indeed.

"The Lord is my portion," said David and Jeremiah (Psalms 73:26; Lamentations 3:24). "All my springs are in thee," says the psalmist (Psalms 87:7). From the fact, inhering in the very constitution of our being, that alienation from God is bankruptcy, arises the vanity of all other sources of satisfaction. To the ' demonstration of this proposition the whole book of Ecclesiastes is devoted, which aptly closes: "This is the end of the matter; all hath been heard: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Any earnest preacher may find a suitable text for enforcing this motive in Jeremiah 2:12-13 : "Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord. For my people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." An easy and natural outline for the sermon suggests itself: (a) It is needless work to build cisterns where there are natural fountains. (b) It is hard work to hew them out of rock. (c) It secures at best only a limited supply, the biggest cistern being unequal in capacity to a living stream, (d) This limited supply is always insecure through a possible break in the cistern. (e) It fills the heavens with astonishment, horrible fear and desolation that men should be guilty of this folly in spiritual things, (f) Illustration: If this whole earth, 8,000 miles in diameter, 25,000 miles in circumference, were a full cistern, without a leak, there would come a time when one soul alone would exhaust its limited supply, and then confront an eternity of thirst, ever tantalized by the memory of a forsaken and now inaccessible fountain, whose perennial and inexhaustible flow, clear as crystal, cold as ice, refreshing as life, constitutes the mirage of eternal hell.

QUESTIONS 1. Who alone should repent?

2. Of what alone should they repent?

3. What follows if all men are commanded to repent?

4. What follows if they repent not?

5. Cite all the New Testament passages, common version, expressly showing that men should "repent of" sin.

6. Strictly speaking, can we "repent of" anything?

7. Explain the difference between the English idiom, "repent of" and the Greek original in Acts 8:22; 2 Corinthians 12:21; Revelation 2:21-22; Revelation 9:20-21, setting forth clearly the import of the several prepositions following the Greek words for "repent" and "repentance."

8. According to the meaning of these words and their grammatical usage with the prepositions opo, epi, ek, what should we say instead of "repent of" and "repentance of"?

9. What illustrative passages can you cite from the ancient classics, postapostolic authors, Septuagint, and Josephus, connecting metanoeo or metanoia with the prepositions, apo, epi or ek?

10. Why are man's actions incited by motives?

11. In what resides, very largely, the moral quality of his acts?

12. Where must the preacher find the motives to repentance he urges on the sinner?

13. Why no need to seek elsewhere?

14. Cite first motive given in this chapter (2 Peter 3:9) and state its force.

15. Cite other scriptures of equal import.

16. How much, in your own thought and practice, are these scriptures weakened, or how much are you hampered in their use, by your views of election and predestination?

17. State in their order the seven evidences of God's willingness that all should come to repentance given in this chapter and cite clear scriptural proof of each.

18. If you are a preacher and were conducting a meeting, would it not be well to prepare and preach a sermon on each one of these seven evidences as taught in the Scriptures cited, or in others that may occur to yourself?

19. Have you read the sermon, "God and the Sinner," referred to in this chapter, as an elaborate discussion of God's willingness to save all men?

20. Cite second motive to repentance given in this chapter based on Luke 15:17, and state its force.

21. What other scripture showing the great contrast between the sinner's needs and heaven's supply, is cited in the chapter?

22. What difference do you note in the sinner's consciousness of the need and its supply in two cases cited (Luke 15:17 and Revelation 3:17-19)?

23. Repeat the poetic excerpt illustrating the first case, give name of author, and the connections of the extract.

24. Of what greater radical motive is this special motive but an off shoot?

25. Cite the pertinent declarations of David and Jeremiah (Psalms 73:26; Lamentations 3:24). What else, David (Psalms 87:7)?

26. What book of Bible is wholly given to a discussion of the subject?

27. State its summary of the whole case, revised text.

28. What scripture is commended as a suitable text for a sermon on this subject?

29. State the outline suggested.

30. Recite the illustration given: "If the earth were a cistern," etc.

31. Recite for further illustration what Pollok, in "The Course of Time." writes of Byron.

Chapter 46

# 05.19. Motives And Encouragements To Repentance (Continued)

XVI MOTIVES AND ENCOURAGEMENTS TO REPENTANCE (CONTINUED)

"Repent ye and turn again that your sins may be blotted out" (Acts 3:19).

This motive – one of the mightiest that ever influenced human action – is, in the Scriptures, urged on sinners with many shades of variety, and from many standpoints. Appealing, as it does, to the conscience and to that inherent and indestructible craving for happiness and permanent future good, lodged in every heart, this motive must ever be a mighty factor. Let us first inquire what it implies:

It implies man's accountability to God.

It implies a law measuring that accountability, prescribing the right and proscribing the wrong.

It implies transgressions of that law.

It implies a record of every transgression.

It implies a provision of grace by which the sinner may escape the penalty of sin.

It teaches, first, that this way of escape from penalty consists in blotting out, effacing, erasing the record of sin, so that the book of indictments, or accusations, presents no charges against the transgressor. This cancellation of offenses is so accordant with principles of righteousness, so meets every demand of the violated law, so satisfies the law-giver, that no being in the universe can revive the charges, and no competent court would entertain them if revived. In such case, indeed, the Scriptures triumphantly inquire: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?" The blotting out is represented as so complete that the sins become invisible forever; they are put so far away none can find them; they are buried so deep none can revive them. There remains no more trace of them than passing clouds leave in the bright blue sky after they are gone – than fleeting shadows impress on the sunlit lawn when they have vanished.

Very expressive, very beautiful, sublime, and consoling are the scriptural declarations on this point: "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins" (Isaiah 43:25). "I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins" (Isaiah 44:22). "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us" (Psalms 103:12). "Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea" (Micah 7:19).

The Scripture teaches, second, that repentance is an indispensable prerequisite to the blotting out of sin, and herein lies the strength of the motive. Here we strike the bedrock of essential and vital doctrine: "Repent ye, THAT your sins may be blotted out." If the repentance be not indispensable the motive is broken and the exhortation becomes sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. It is as empty as a blasted nut – as lifeless as a hearted grain of corn. There is no escape from the

doctrine of universal salvation if sinners may be forgiven without repenting of their sins. Moreover, the most prevalent delusion in the world today is the impression cherished by guilty hearts, that in some way they shall become the beneficiaries of divine mercy at last, even though they do not in this life repent and turn from sin. And so regarding repentance as not absolutely essential they despise the exhortation to repent. It becomes a matter of supreme importance therefore that teachers and preachers of the gospel should be so thoroughly rooted and grounded in the doctrine of the necessity of repentance as a term, or condition of forgiveness, that they will, in their teaching and preaching, sternly and relentlessly shut every gate of hope for pardon except the one approached by penitence. Here apply the words of our Lord: "Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art with him in the way; lest haply the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou have paid the last farthing."

The relation between repentance and its fruits (confession, reformation, and restitution where possible) on the one hand, and remission of sins on the other hand, is so essential and withal so little understood, the reader may profitably give the matter special attention. As indicative of this relation we cite and emphasize the following scriptures: "Thus it is written . . . that repentance and [rather unto; see Vatican Mss.] remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Luke 24:46-47). Thus our Lord.

"Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins" (Acts 2:38). Thus his apostle. "Beginning from Jerusalem, John . . . preached the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins" (Mark 1:4). Thus his harbinger in "the beginning of the gospel."

The God of love and mercy and forgiveness cannot forgive the impenitent. This proposition is generally accepted and maintained by Christians in the case of God and the sinner. But in the case of man against man, some Christians entertain curious and illogical notions which virtually subvert the original proposition, that is, they hold and teach that Christians should forgive an impenitent brother. To meet this harmful view the proposition is enlarged.

In every case, whether of trespass against God or man or the church, repentance is indispensable to forgiveness. I cite the law: "If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him" (Luke 17:3-4). The terms of this statute are express and unequivocal: "If he repent, forgive him." Repentance settles the case between individuals. But if he repent not, then the remedy is not forgiveness, but another law, to wit: "And if thy brother sin, go right along, convince him of his sin between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Verily I say unto you, what things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matthew 18:15-18).

Upon this law I remark: To forgive is a legal term, meaning to release or loose from a claim. Its opposite, "to bind," means to retain or hold against one the account as unsettled. "To gain your brother" means that one has so convinced him of the sin against him, that he repents and

confesses and asks for forgiveness.

His repentance is an indispensable condition of forgiveness. If he forgive without his "hearing you" he has no case then to present to the two or three others and none to present to the church, and by his illegal settlement he has not only brought law and order into reproach, but also left his brother "ungained" and stopped the process of gaining, which God, in mercy appointed.

If all personal and joint labors do not bring about "repentance unto the acknowledgment of the truth," then he is not to him a brother, but a Gentile and publican.

The church then binds, not looses.

The law having been followed strictly, in both letter and spirit, by both him and the church, heaven ratifies the binding. He is therefore not forgiven.

In the language of Shakespeare: "Can a man be pardoned and retain the offense?" In case the offense is not merely against an individual but general, that is, against the church or society we have another law, set forth in a noted example (1 Corinthians 5:1-13): "One of you hath his father's wife. And ye are puffed up and did not rather mourn, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as though I were present, judged him that hath so wrought this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus . . . Put away the wicked man from among yourselves."

The conclusion of the case appears in 2 Corinthians 2:4-11 : "Sufficient to such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many; so that contrariwise ye should rather forgive him and comfort him lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you to confirm your love toward him. For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye are obedient in all things. But to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for what I also have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ; that no advantage may be gained over us by Satan."

God thus demands of the church, as well as of the individual, proof of obedience to his law of forgiveness. There must be no forgiveness without repentance. To forgive without it, while possibly easy to us, is ruinous to the transgressor. To gain him – to so labor in love and firmness as to lead him to repentance – this is toil indeed and travail of soul.

But let us look more closely into this matter. If we forgive the trespasser against ourselves, without repentance on his part, we must claim to do so on some Christian principle. But where is our principle? We admit that out of regard for the majesty of the law and justice, God did not forgive us, while we were impenitent, and that God's mercy toward us is the only measure of forgiveness we may extend toward others. "How, then, readest thou?" "And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, EVEN AS God also in Christ forgave you" (Ephesians 4:32). Mark the measure – "even as" – and note that God never forgave us except (a) "in Christ," who satisfied the law claim, and (b) on condition of our repentance.

Again: "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Matthew 6:12): "Release, and ye shall be released" (Luke 6:37).; "Forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive everyone

indebted to us" (Luke 11:4); "And whensoever ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against anyone; that your Father also who is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses" (Mark 11:25); "Forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any; even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye" (Colossians 3:13).

Very clearly these scriptures teach that our measure of duty and model in the exercise of forgiveness toward each other are found in God's mercy toward us. We cannot be more righteous or merciful than God.

Suppose a case: A man who has forgiven a sin against himself without penitence on the part of the offender, begins to pray to God: "Father, forgive my sins against thee as I have forgiven sins against me!" Do look at that prayer! Analyze and interpret it! Here is the analysis and import: (a) The roan offers himself as a model for God. (b) The man forgiving an impenitent offender against himself, asks God, on that account, to forgive him without requiring repentance, (c) The man forgives a debtor owing him one farthing and asks, on that account, that himself be forgiven ten thousand talents – a lucrative transaction! (d) "As I, the model of God, forgive sins against myself without requiring repentance therefore, let all sinners gather from my case, that they may reasonably hope to be forgiven at last, even though living and dying without repentance, for God ought to be as merciful as I am."

The whole case may be summed up thus: Outside of Christ the law demands the uttermost farthing – there is no forgiveness. In Christ there is abundant forgiveness, for he has satisfied law. But there is no access to the forgiveness in Christ without repentance. Therefore there can be no release, no loosing, no remission of sin) in any case, without repentance. In the case of the sinner against God the gospel says, "Repent that your sins may be blotted out." In the case of thy brother against thee: "If he repent, forgive him." In the same case, if he repent not, it being now a case against the church: "Loose" him, if he hear the church and repent – otherwise "bind" him. In the general offense against the church: "Put him away from among you, until in his repentance he is likely to be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow, then forgive him." Such is the divine law.

The reader may easily master the whole subject of man's forgiveness by first considering the Greek terms employed in such cases, all of which in our common version are translated "forgive." These terms are:

Apoluo, to release, employed in Luke 6:37.

Charizornai, to freely forgive, employed in 2 Corinthians 2:7; 2 Corinthians 2:10; 2 Corinthians 12:13; Ephesians 4:32; Colossians 3:13.

Aphiemi, to loose, to remit, employed in Matthew 6:12; Matthew 6:14-15; Matthew 18:21-35; Mark 11:25-26; Luke 11:4; Luke 17:3-4.

Second, by considering our Lord's four lesson connecting our forgiveness of each other with our own prayers for divine forgiveness. These, in the order of time, are: (a) Matthew 6:12-15; (b) Matthew 18:21-35; (c) Luke 11:1-4; (d) Mark 11:25 (Mark 11:26 omitted in revised text as not genuine).

Third, by noting; (a) The law of forgiveness in regard to an offense against an individual so long as it remains an individual matter (Luke 17:3-4) ; the law in the same case when it becomes a church

matter (Matthew 18:15-20) ; the law in general offenses against the church or society (1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 2 Corinthians 2:5-11).

Just here are restated the broad propositions maintained in this discussion: The gospel requires repentance as an indispensable condition of forgiveness in the case of all offenses, whether (a) against God; (b) the church; (c) or an individual. God’s method of mercy toward us, is the standard measure or model toward each other. The only part of either proposition, usually denied by some Christians, is that repentance must be required in individual offenses. They affirm that we must forgive offenses against us, absolutely, without any regard to repentance.

This view seems obnoxious to the following criticisms: (1) It arises from a misconception of the import of forgiveness. Forgiveness must not be confounded with benevolence. Our Heavenly Father causes his sun to shine and sends the rain on the evil as well as the good, but he will not forgive them without repentance. Forgiveness is not simply to be free from malice. Our hearts may be full of love, tenderness, compassion, and solicitude for the offender whom we may not forgive in his impenitence. Forgiveness is not leaving vengeance to God. This we must do, no matter how great the offense against us, nor how impenitent the offender. Withholding forgiveness until the offender repents does not stop us from loving, persistent, prayerful labor to lead him to repentance. Nor does it imply the absence of a forgiving spirit – a readiness and desire to forgive – when it can be done consistent with God’s will and the offender’s good. Whoever cherishes bitter and malicious feelings, thinks vengeful thoughts, cultivates censorious and uncharitable judgments concerning an offender, and withholds in his behalf love, compassion, prayer, and labor, while sheltering under the plea: "I may not forgive him until he repents" misses the mark all along the line, manifests an utterly unchristian spirit and is himself in danger of the judgment. Forgiveness is a law term implying the fair cancellation of the accounts releasing or loosing from what was done, but is now fully satisfied. Hence it is in Christ, who met all law claims, only this abundance of forgiveness is not available or accessible to the impenitent. No man can check on this fund in favor of an impenitent offender.

(2) To forgive without repentance is therefore doing despite to the majesty of the law.

(3) It not only does not "gain thy brother," but it obstructs and stops God’s gracious means for gaining him, thereby doing him a grievous injury.

(4) It works incalculable injury to the one who so forgives seeing it arises from his selfishness, which finds it easier to remit an offense than to labor to restore and gain his offending brother, in God’s appointed but painful and wearisome way.

(5) It feeds sinners with false and fatal hopes, who say, "If these Christians, who are representatives and exponents of the gospel, forgive impenitent offenders against them, surely God, who is infinitely more merciful than they are, will find some way to forgive us at last, even though we live and die without repentance."

We close this discussion with the forceful words of Dr. John A. Broadus. Commenting on the expression in our Lord’s prayer, (Matthew 6:12) "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors," he says: "But like many terms expressive of Christian duty, the word forgive has come to be often used in a weakened sense, and many anxious minds are misled by its ambiguity. If forgive means merely to ’bear no malice’ (Sir 28:7), to abstain from revenge, leaving that to God

(Romans 12:19), then in that sense we ought to forgive every wrongdoer, even though impenitent, and still our enemy. But this is not the Scripture use of the word forgive; and in the full sense of the term it is not our duty, and not even proper, to forgive one who has wronged us, until he confesses the wrong, and this with such unquestioned sincerity and genuine change of feeling and purpose as to show him worthy of being restored to our confidence and regard. Thus our Lord says (Luke 17:3, Revised Version), If thy brother sin, rebuke him: and if he repent, forgive him.' Here again the example of our Heavenly Father illustrates the command to us. He sends rain and sunshine on the evil and the good, but he does not forgive men, restoring them to his confidence and affection, until they sincerely and thoroughly repent. In judging as to the sincerity and trustworthiness of those who profess repentance our Lord inculcated great patience and charitable judgment. If a wrong forgiven is repeated a second or third time, we are apt to lose all patience and refuse to forgive again; but he said, If he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him' (Luke 17:4, Rev. Ver.). Nay, in Matthew 18:21 f, he makes it even 'seventy times seven' – not, of course, as an exact limit, but as a general and very strong injunction of long-suffering and charitable judgment toward human infirmity."

The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance (Romans 2:4). The motives and encouragements to repent, that may be deduced from God's goodness, are necessarily in line with the first motive presented, "The Lord is willing that all men should repent," but deserve separate treatment.

We cite two scriptures: "Despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." (Romans 1:4.) "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; wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction" (2 Peter 3:15-16). On these scriptures, construed together, observe:

(1) The meaning of the terms "goodness, forbearance, and long-suffering." They express, in general, the kindness and benevolence of God in bestowing favors on sinful men, his slowness to take offense and his long-withholding of well merited punishment.

(2) The object of this goodness is the "salvation" of its beneficiaries.

(3) We are not allowed to discredit or set aside this object by our construction of other scriptures, "hard to be understood," which treat of election and predestination. For example, we must not so construe Romans 9:11-23 as to over turn Romans 2:4. We must not "wrest" these hard scriptures to the "destruction" of men, when God requires us to "account his goodness as meaning their salvation."

(4) In this goodness is not merely a vague desire for men's salvation, but an active, positive "leading to repentance" as a step toward salvation.

(5) Through guilty ignorance of the object of this goodness, men despise it and resist its leading.

In awakening and stimulating motives to repentance, this theme affords wonderful opportunity for displaying the impartial benignity of our Heavenly Father, who not only in nature "maketh his sun

to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust," thus "not leaving himself without witness that he did good to men, giving them from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness," but also in the riches of grace has provided abundant salvation for the greatest sinners, "so loving the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have eternal life."

But the capital point – the one calling for special emphasis in treatment – is the active, positive leading of this benignity towards repentance; a leading which can be felt and appealed to; a leading or "drawing of the Father," John 6:44, as though he took a prodigal's band in his, that he might guide him safely over dangerous paths; a leading which is but another word for the Spirit's striving; a leading that softly and lovingly persuades, but will not drive; a leading of attraction emanating from him who said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." And yet a leading that may be resisted. Ah! the sad picture, God's goodness leading and guilty man's resisting! Let the preacher remember that he is dealing with dense ignorance, sinners "not knowing" the direction and object of this leading. "I wot, brethren that through ignorance ye did it," says Peter to the murderers of Jesus. "I did it ignorantly and in unbelief," says Paul of his persecutions. Let the preacher also remember that he represents One "who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way," One who "is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy," who also "knoweth our frame and remembereth that we are dust."

QUESTIONS 1. Repeat in scriptural language the third motive to repentance.

2. What does this exhortation imply?

3. Illustrate the completeness of the "blotting out."

4. Quote the scriptures cited to prove this completeness. (Isaiah 43:25; Isaiah 44:22; Psalms 103:12; Micah 7:19.)

5. State, in clear, strong terms, the relation between repentance and the blotting out of sins as taught in Acts 3:19.

6. Yet what delusion prevails in the world?

7. How alone may teachers and preachers of the gospel dispel this illusion?

8. Quote the three other scriptures cited which show the relation between repentance and remission of sins (Luke 24:46-47; Acts 2:38; Mark 1:4).

9. Do Christian teachers generally concede and teach this relation in the case of God and the sinner?

10. In what case do some of them deny its application?

11. Quote the New Testament law (Luke 17:3-4) showing that repentance is indispensable to forgiveness, even in the case of man's sin against man.

12. Quote the law when this individual offense becomes a sin againstthe church. (Matthew 18:15-18.) 13. State the analysis of this law as embodied in the six remarks on it.

14. Quote the question Shakespeare puts in the mouth of Hamlet's uncle, state the circumstances calling it forth, and show the application to the principle under discussion.

15. State the case and the law as embodied in 1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 2 Corinthians 2:4-11, where the offense is not merely against an individual but general, i.e., against the church and society.

16. Which is easier, to forgive an offense without requiring repentance, or to bring the offender to repentance?

17. On what Christian principle may forgiveness be extended to an offender who will not repent?

18. Quote Ephesians 4:32; Matthew 6:12; Luke 6:37; Luke 11:4; Mark 2:25; Colossians 3:13 and answer: Is the principle here?

19. What measure and model of duty concerning forgiveness do they teach?

20. If a man forgive an offense against himself without requiring repentance of the offender, and then prays, "Father, forgive my sins against thee, as I have forgiven sins against me," analyze the prayer.

21. How may the whole case be summed up?

22. By what three considerations may we master the whole subject of man's forgiveness of man?

23. Restate the two broad propositions maintained in this discussion.

24. To what five criticisms is the view that "we ought to forgive offenses against us without requiring repentance," justly obnoxious?

25. On the other hand, who misses the mark all along the line?

26. What said Dr. Broadus about it in his commentary?

27. Repeat in scriptural language the fourth motive to repentance, as given in this chapter.

28. Quote in full the two scriptures cited as teaching this motive.

29. Give the analysis of their teaching as embodied in the five observations.

30. Can you repeat Cardinal Newman's poem, "Lead, Kindly Light"?

31. In awakening and stimulating repentance, what opportunity does this theme afford?

32. What capital point in the treatment of the theme calla for special emphasis?

33. What also should the preacher remember?

Chapter 47

# 05.20. Motives And Encouragements To Repentance (Concluded)

XVII MOTIVES AND ENCOURAGEMENTS TO REPENTANCE (CONCLUDED)

Joy in heaven – "There shall be Joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons that need no repentance." "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." "It was meet to make merry and be glad; for this thy brother was dead, and is alive; and was lost, and is found" (Luke 15:7; Luke 15:10; Luke 15:32).

First, in deriving motives to repentance from these scriptures, we should note the occasion and object of the three parables – the lost sheep, or one out of a hundred; the lost coin, or one out of ten; the lost son, or one out of two. The occasion was: "Now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him to hear him. And both the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them" (Luke 15:1.) Our Lord's object was to justify his own interest in sinners and to rebuke those who murmured at it.

Second, we must determine whose was the joy; who the sharers of the joy; where the joy was exercised and exhibited, and the reasonableness and propriety of its exercise and exhibition. It is easy to determine whose was the joy. It was the owner of the lost sheep, who, having found it, laid it on his shoulder, rejoicing. Well might he say, "It was my sheep. It was lost. I have found it. I rejoice." It was the owner of the lost coin, who, having found it, said to others, "Rejoice with me. It was my money. It was my loss. Its finding is my gain. The joy is mine." It was the father of the lost boy who, seeing the prodigal coming home, ran to meet him and kissed him much and rejoiced the most. And as the shepherd and woman and father of the parables represent respectively God the Son, who came to seek and to save the lost; God the Spirit, by whose light and sweeping the lost is discovered; God the Heavenly Father, who welcomes the returning prodigal, evidently the joy is the joy of the triune God – Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. So testifies the prophet: "The Lord thy God . . . he will save; he will rejoice over thee with joy; he will rest in his love; he will joy over thee with singing" (Zephaniah 3:17).

It was the prospect of this very joy, set before him as a recompense, which enabled God the Son to endure the cross and despise the shame (Hebrews 12:2), and having endured the one and despised the other, though for a time they made him "a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief," now awaits the fulfilment of another scripture: "God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." "Verily, he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe, in that day." Mark the tense: "There shall be joy." The sharers of the divine joy, represented in the first two parables by "the friends and neighbors," and in the third by "his servants," are evidently the "angels of God" (Hebrews 12:10). "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation" (Hebrews 1:14)? The place of the joy is heaven – God's home – the Father's house of "many mansions." As saith the Scripture: "Sing, O ye heavens; for the Lord hath done it" (Isaiah 44:23). The reasonableness and propriety of the Joy lies in the fact that an owner has recovered vaulable property of which he was wrongfully bereft; a father

recovers his own lost child, yea, finds him alive that had been dead.

Third, we must carefully note (a) that all this joy was over the fact that "one sinner repented," and (b) it was more joy than heaven experiences over all the Pharisees in the world, who murmur at or are indifferent to the salvation of sinners. Having thus determined the occasion and object of the three parables – whose the joy; who its sharers; where the joy and why, and that so great joy is over the salvation of every one penitent – even greater joy than over all the impenitent in the world, we are now prepared to construct a motive to repentance of great power. We may even anticipate the process of thought by which it works its silent, conquering way into the sinner's mind, unsealing his tears, bringing him down on his knees, causing him to smite his wicked heart and cry out: "God be merciful to me, the sinner."

For, beholding the foregoing facts, how can he help reasoning thus: Surely heaven's view of this soul-saving business is widely different from earth's view? And as heaven is higher and better than earth, that must be the just view. And if God and angels are thus concerned over one soul, that soul must be of infinite value – so valuable that there is no exchange for it, no profit in gaining the whole world if I lose it. Hitherto I have made hell glad, but now by pulling this rope of penitence down here, I can set to ringing all the bells of heaven. Surely if Jesus so loves me as to leave heaven to find and save me; if "the love of the Spirit" is a lighted lamp illuminating the darkness where I wander; if the Father is waiting to welcome me, the prodigal, and ready to embrace and kiss me much, giving white robes for my pitiful rags, a royal feast for the husks, fit only for swine, on which hitherto I would fain satisfy my hunger – ah! my soul – then thou hast misunderstood God; and now I change my mind toward God – I repent! I repent!

"For the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 3:2). This phrase, meaning reign or sovereignty of heaven, is peculiar to Matthew's Jewish Gospel. It presupposes a familiarity with both earlier and later prophetic utterances (Isaiah 9:6-7; Isaiah 11:1-10; Micah 4:1-8; Jeremiah 23:5-6; Ezekiel 37:24; Daniel 2:44; Daniel 7:13-14), and an expectation of their fulfilment. The announcement, therefore, that this frequently foretold and long-awaited reign "has drawn near," and the making this nearness a ground for repentance, suggests at once to the mind the character of the motive. The primal idea is prompt and urgent preparation to meet and receive the kingly guest Just at hand, with all readiness of submission to his government. That is, there must be prepared at once a straight, open way to the heart for this King, almost here; room provided in the heart for his abode; a suitable fitting up of the room for his indwelling, which implies the expulsion of all preceding guests, and the removal of all furniture, hitherto used, repugnant to him; a standing ready at the door to welcome him; a recognition in the welcome of his sole sovereignty, with unqualified submission to his rule. We see then that if repentance means preparation to receive God, and if God's visible coming and reign, far off in the prophecies, is now at hand, the motive to repent must connect with and gather force from that nearness, which makes it one of urgency, calling for prompt and exclusive attention. In railroad parlance, John's exhortation, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," is equal to the dispatch announcing: "Through passenger train coming, with full right of way; clear the main track, sidetrack everything, and close against them all the switches connecting with the main line." Yea, in the exhortation, we not only see the distant smoke and hear the faint rumble of the rapidly rolling cars, but we hear the shriek of the whistle and see the glare of the headlight.

The motive is an awakening one, dispelling all drowsiness; a stirring one, exciting all activities; a masterful one, subordinating all other concerns. The "at hand" of the kingdom suggests a secondary but very precious motive to repentance, thus: Repentance is a change of mind toward God concerning a course of sin leading rapidly down to death and eternal ruin. Now, if man be on this road to death, it seeming right to him, I have been cruel, not benevolent to him in dispelling his illusion by a revelation of the certain speedy, irreparable ruin ahead of him; if there be no available way of escape. I only make him die in apprehension before the reality, hastening and multiplying his hell. But if, as a motive to change his mind and turn, I announce the kingdom of heaven, with its forgiveness and salvation, not afar off, but "at hand"; if he be even now on the crumbling verge of hell, almost aflame as a brand exposed to the burning, and I can show him, in the nearness of the kingdom of heaven, salvation, instant, perfect, and eternal (Luke 23:43; Romans 10:6-8), then I do him inestimable good, and not evil at all.

"The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent" (Acts 17:30). This motive arises from the obligations of light, privilege and opportunity. Its strength is measured by the degree of the light. It is supplied from many other scriptures – indeed, from the tenor and trend of all the scriptures. It reveals the justice of God in requiring of men according to what they have, and not according to what they have not. As this is a great principle of the divine justice, the reader would do well to study it in the light of the following scriptures, which will furnish many sermons, and in which this great motive may be defined, illustrated and enforced: Numbers 15:24-31; Psalms 19:12-13; Matthew 11:22-24; Matthew 12:41-42; Luke 23:34; Acts 3:17; 1 Timothy 1:13; Hebrews 10:26-29.

God’s sovereignty in the degree of light given. "For if the mighty works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." This is a marvelous scripture, teaching a solemn lesson, and suggesting an urgent motive to instant repentance. The facts disclosed are: (a) That the people of Tyre and Sidon, as well as the people of Chorazin and Bethsaida, had light enough for repentance, (b) That the latter people had more light than the former people, (c) That neither people repented and both are lost. (d) That if the former had been blessed with as much light as the latter enjoyed, they would have repented, (e) That it shall be more tolerable in the day of judgment for the people who had less light.

The emphatic point in the lesson is that men have no claim on God as to the amount of light, privilege and opportunity; and may not presume that he will increase them until they do repent.

The Ninevites found sufficient light in one sermon of just eight words – a sermon announcing ruin – uttered by a stranger who earnestly desired their overthrow and deprecated their salvation. A preacher, ignorant of God’s sovereignty and man’s extreme peril, once said, "Whenever God cuts off a wicked boy or man by early death, it is proof that he foreknew that the boy or man would not have repented under any circumstances." This statement from the pulpit is a flat and palpable contradiction of our Lord’s own words (Matthew 11:20-24), and was well calculated to encourage sinners to delay repentance, in the delusive hope of greater light some future day.

God’s sovereignty in the space given for repentance. The Scriptures do teach that God graciously allows the wicked space for repentance, during which the death penalty already deserved and pronounced is suspended, while the Spirit strives and Jesus pleads, but they nowhere leave the measure of that space to the sinner, and seldom, though sometimes, disclose its extent. The

space of the Antediluvians was, "while the ark was a preparing" (1 Peter 3:20). In this space, Christ in the Spirit (1 Peter 3:19; Genesis 6:3), through Noah (2 Peter 2:5), preached righteousness. The Ninevites had a space of forty days (Jonah 2:4). Nebuchadnezzar had a space of twelve months after the sentence "hew down the tree" (Daniel 4:14-15; Daniel 4:27; Daniel 4:29). The Jews had their final year, their day of visitation, which they did not know (Luke 13:6-9; Luke 19:42; Mark 11:12-14; Mark 11:21-22). Even the woman Jezebel had her space (Revelation 2:21), as also did Esau (Hebrews 12:16-17).

This motive, like the preceding one, obtains its force from the fact that we have no more power to increase the time which God, in his sovereignty, may allot for repentance than to increase the light, which is given according to his own good pleasure. Hence we should repent now and walk heavenward in the first beam of light, lest there be no tomorrow and lest the light shine no more forever.

Repent ye therefore . . . that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: "whom the heaven must receive until the time of restoration of all things" (Acts 3:19-21). Here are four mighty motives grouped (beside one already discussed), which cannot be fully understood or felt except from a Jewish standpoint. Hence we prefer to discuss them together, (a) The first is suggested by the "therefore" pointing back to their denial and crucifixion of their own Messiah (Acts 3:13-17), while blinded by the veil of ignorance (Acts 3:18; 2 Corinthians 3:14-15). This dark sin calleth for repentance. It is a Jewish sin even till this day. (b) The second points to "the seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," which will never come to the Jewish people and land until they repent and "look on him whom they have pierced" (Zechariah 12:10-14; Zechariah 13:1; Romans 11:1-36). (c) This national repentance and salvation of the Jews must precede the second coming of our Lord. Their delay of repentance delays his coming – their repentance will hasten and herald his coming (Romans 11:20; 2 Peter 3:4-10). Repent ye Jews, that Jesus may come. (d) The restoration of all things (Romans 8:19-24; 2 Peter 3:13; Revelation 21:1) follows our Lord’s coming (Revelation 21:21) which awaits the repentance of the Jews. Repent therefore, ye Jews, that the Father may send our Lord, bringing a restoration of all things. He has promised to come quickly – why comes he not? He is not slack concerning that promise, but is unwilling that Israel should perish, and awaits their life from the dead.

Then, O ye Gentiles, where is your mission to the Jews? Where are your prayers for ancient Israel? How long will you prefer to tread down Jerusalem? Is it nothing to you, as you pass by, that no rain has fallen on Israel for nearly two thousand years?

O the drouth! The drouth! O the desert! The desert! whose wastes are burning sands and whose skies are molten brass! Cannot you, the beneficiaries of Israel’s fall, pray for rain that the Jewish desert may blossom as a rose? Do you want Jesus to come? Then help Israel. Do you long for the good country whose inhabitants are never sick, and never weep, and never die, but ever see the face of God – then HELP ISRAELI "Because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained ; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead" (Acts 17:31). Here looms up the "great white throne" as a motive to repentance. We see the judge coming in flaming fire, with angels and justified spirits (2 Thessalonians 1:7-8; 1 Thessalonians 4:14; Jude 1:14-15) ; the resurrection of

the dead, and transfiguration of the righteous living (1 Corinthians 15:51-52; 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17); the gathering of all the dead before the throne (Revelation 20:11-12) ; the great separation (Matthew 25:31-32); the final destiny (Matthew 25:46; Romans 2:6-11; 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10; Revelation 20:12-15; Revelation 22:4-15). Surely that wicked heart is adamant that gathers no motive to repentance from these certain, rapidly approaching, sublime, dreadful and glorious transactions. And the assurance of that judgment is Christ's resurrection (Acts 17:31).

If the tomb be empty the judgment cometh.

"Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:35). This motive is twofold: (a) "perish;" (b) "likewise," that perish suddenly, unexpectedly, for so perished the Galileans at their altars, and the eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell. The "perishing" has been set forth in the Scriptures under the preceding motive; its suddenness must be considered here. In a thunderstorm we expect to see some tree riven by lightning – in the cyclone some uprooted. These calamities have their forecast and take us not by surprise. But if when the summer sky is bright and the air is deadly still, a giant tree of the field, under which weary laborers rest at noon, falls without wind or warning, that is the unexpected disaster. So perish the impenitent. So it was in the days of Noah; they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage when the flood came, and swept them all suddenly and unabsolved into eternity. So perished Sodom and Gomorrah, now suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. And so it shall be in the day of the Son of Man (Luke 17:26-30). "He that, being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy" (Proverbs 29:1). "Their foot shall slide in due time" (Deuteronomy 32:35). Though for a time "they are not in trouble as other men; though their eyes stand out with fatness; though they set their mouth against the heavens and their tongue walketh through the earth," yet, "surely thou dost set them in slippery places; thou castedst them down into destruction." "How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! They are utterly consumed with terrors" (Psalms 73:5; Psalms 73:7; Psalms 73:9; Psalms 73:18-19). The power of this motive finds an unparalleled illustration in the effect of Jonathan Edwards' great sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God."

And now, in a very imperfect way, far below the transcendent importance of the theme, I have brought to a close my discussions on repentance. I have felt constrained to deal earnestly with so great a subject, because impressed with the shallowness of treatment it usually receives in modern pulpits. O young preachers, remember that the plow is needed, and I exhort you to plow deep when you break up fallow ground!

I may add only that all the relations of repentance have not been considered in these four chapters. Its important relation to baptism and church membership has not been noted. Let it suffice here to state as a vital law that only penitent believers are gospel subjects of baptism and church membership. Nor has opportunity been afforded to discriminate, in important particulars, between the one repentance of the sinner culminating in faith, and the many repentances of the Christian after conversion – a discrimination so wanting in the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, and which confession was borrowed from the Westminster Confession.

QUESTIONS 1. What fifth motive to repentance is given in this chapter?

2. In what book and chapter of the New Testament do we find it?

3. In what kind of teaching is it embodied?

4. Quote the three passages cited which enforce the motive.

5. In deriving a motive to repentance from these scriptures what three things must be done?

6. State then first, the occasion and object of these three parables: Whose is the Joy? Repeat Zephaniah 3:17 and Hebrews 12:2. Who are the sharers of it? What have they to do with men's salvation (Hebrews 1:4)? Where is the joy exercised and exhibited? What is the reasonableness of it? What two other things must be noted?

7. State the probable process of reasoning in the sinner's mind from the foregoing facts, leading up to repentance.

8. State, in scriptural language, the sixth motive cited.

9. What means the phrase, "kingdom of heaven," and to what gospel is it peculiar?

10. With what Old Testament prophecies does it presuppose familiarity and expectation of fulfilment?

11. What fact concerning this kingdom is made the ground of the exhortation to repentance?

12. What then is the primal idea involved?

13. Describe the urgency by a railway illustration.

14. What secondary idea involved suggests an additional motive?

15. State, in scriptural language, the seventh motive.

16. From what obligation does the motive arise?

17. What principle of divine justice rules in the matter?

18. What other scriptures define, illustrate, and enforce this motive?

19. From what proposition is derived the eighth motive?

20. Quote the scripture (Matthew 11:21-24) establishing the truth of the proposition.

21. What five facts does this scripture set forth?

22. What is the emphatic point in the lesson?

23. On what minimum of light did the Ninevites repent?

24. What said a preacher once on this subject?

25. What is the author's criticism on his statement?

26. From what kindred proposition is derived the ninth motive?

27. What do the Scriptures teach about this space?

28. Is the measure of this space left to man?

29. Cite the measure of the Antediluvian space and the scripture bearing on it.

30. How long was the Ninevite space? Nebuchadnezzar’s?

31. What scriptures show the space allotted to the Jews in the time of Jesus?

32. What concerning this space is said of Jezebel? Of Esau?

33. From what fact does this motive derive its force?

34. Recite verbatim revised text of Acts 3:19-21.

35. How many distinct motives are appealed to here?

36. Which one had already been considered?

37. From what standpoint must the remaining four be best understood?

38. How is the first of the four suggested?

39. To what facts calling for repentance does the "therefore" point back?

40. To what hope does the second of these four motives point?

41. What two scriptures, designated from many, bear on the withholding of "refreshings" from the Jews until they repent (Romans 11:1-36; Zechariah 12:10-14; Zechariah 13:1)?

42. To what hope does the third of these motives point?

43. What is the relation of time and order of precedence, according to this text, between the national Jewish repentance and Christ’s second advent?

44. What bearing, according to 1 Peter 3:4-10, has their delay in repentance on the second advent?

45. To what hope does the fourth of these motives point?

46. What scriptures show the nature and extent of this restoration of all things, and that it follows our Lord’s second coming?

47. How should these facts affect the Jew?

48. What duties to the Jews ought the facts to suggest to Gentile Christians?

49. Recite, in scriptural language, the eleventh motive.

50. State what order of stupendous events this motive brings to view citing the scriptures which teach them.

51. In what stupendous fact has God given assurance of this judgment to all men?

52. State in scriptural language the twelfth motive.

53. State the twofold nature of the motive.

54. The first fold having been previously considered, what is the essence of the second fold.

55. Illustrate from trees.

56. Illustrate by the days of Noah – by the case of Sodom and Gomorrah.

57. Quote the pertinent passage from Proverbs; from Deuteronomy from the psalms.

58. What is the relation between repentance and baptism and consequently between repentance and church membership?

# 05.22. An Introduction To A Study Of Paul

XIV AN INTRODUCTION TO A STUDY OF PAUL

We now make a new start in our study of Acts, and I open the discussion with a general bibliography of Paul. Some of the most helpful books on Paul are: (1) The textbook, Goodwin'sHarmony of the Life of Paul;(2) Conybeare and Howson'sLife and Epistles of Paul,which is the greatest that has been published, and no book on this line has ever equaled it; (3) Farrar'sLife and Works of Paul. While Farrar is semi-infidel as to the Old Testament scriptures, and not quite so bad, but bad enough in that respect concerning the New Testament, yet his treatise on the life of Paul is wonderful, and to be highly recommended; (4) Stalker'sLife and Works of Paul;(5) Malcolm McGregor'sDivine Authority of Paul's Writings;(6) Monod'sFive Lectures on Paul;(7)The Epic of Paul,by W. C. Wilkinson, who wrote that fineEpic of Moses,and who is great in these epics; (8) the author's two lectures,Paul, the Greatest Man in History, andThe Fifth Gospel;(9) Ramsay's books on Asia Minor, andPaul's Travels;(10) Hackett on Acts; (11) Lightfoot onGalatians;(12) Luther onGalatians;(13)Smith's Bible Dictionary,article, "Paul"; (14) Paley'sHorae Paulinea.I read that when I was a boy. My father had some books which would now be considered "old," but they beat anything we can get hold of today, and this is one of them. Nothing has ever been published since to equal some articles by Paley.) (16) Various commentators on Acts and Paul's letters; (17) a late but valuable book on Paul is Wilkinson'sPaul and the Revolt Against Him.

The New Testament bibliography of Paul consists of: (1) Acts of the apostles; (2) Paul's letters; (3) 2 Peter 3:15-16, and (4) James 2:14-26. The New Testament passage that goes farthest back in the history of Paul is Acts 9:15 : "He is a chosen vessel unto me, . . ." The next passage going back in Paul's history, is Galatians 1:15.

The following is the chronological data in the history of Paul, and probable conclusions:

1. At the first mention of his name, he is called "a young man" (Acts 7:58), and in his letter to Philemon, written during his first Roman captivity, he calls himself "Paul, the aged."

2. (a) Though a "young man" when first mentioned in the history, yet he was probably a member of the Sanhedrin (Acts 26:10), which necessitated that he must be at least thirty years old. (b) He was probably rabbi of the synagogue mentioned in Acts 6:9, which had the debate with Stephen, and which also called for thirty years of age. (c) The high powers conferred on him by the high priest (Acts 9:2) and the Sanhedrin (Acts 22:5) argues a man of reputation and assured position. (d) Daniel 9:26-27 teaches that the Messiah would confirm the covenant with many Jews for one week, or seven years, but that he himself would be cut off in the middle of the week; so that the confirmation of the covenant with many Jews must extend three and one-half years after the Messiah's death; but this abundant confirmation with many Jews ceased with Paul's persecution and conversion. (e) But Paul was converted when Aretas was king of Damascus (2 Corinthians 11:32), which reign Josephus dates. (f) From all which we may fairly conclude that Saul was about

the age of our Lord.

3. (a) The outside evidence: We learn from 2 Corinthians 11:32 that Aretas was king of Damascus when Paul escaped there from after his return there from Arabia, which was about three years after his conversion; and also the date of his first visit to Jerusalem as a Christian (Galatians 1:18). The Aretas date we get from Josephus. (b) The death of Herod (Acts 12:1-25) coincides with Saul's second visit to Jerusalem (Acts 11:30; Acts 12:23-25), and Josephus gives us the date of Herod's death. (c) Galatians 2:1 fixes his third visit to Jerusalem fourteen years after his conversion, which was the occasion of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1-41), A.D. 50. (d) Paul's two years' imprisonment at Caesarea, the outgoing of Felix and the incoming of Festus (Acts 21:1-40, Acts 22:1-30, Acts 23:1-35, Acts 24:1-27, Acts 25:1-27, Acts 26:1-32) furnishes dates from Josephus and Roman historians (A.D. 61), which, with the length of the voyage to Rome, aid us to know that he reached Rome about A.D. 62 or 63.

The profit and the delight of the study of history is most enhanced when we study the character, life, and labors of a great man in a great period of time. In every such case the thoughtful and candid student discovers that a higher power has prepared the man for the times and the times for the man – a fact less apparent, though no less true, in the case of ordinary men in uneventful times. Alexander the Great scattering the Greek civilization from Macedon to the Nile, the Euphrates, and the Indus; Caesar smiting Gaul, bridging the Rhine, and crossing over to Britain; Marlborough shattering the overweening power of Louis XIV at Blenheim, Oudenarde, Ramillies, and Malplaquet; Frederick the Great triumphing at Rossbach and Leuthen; Napoleon crumbling the monarchies of Europe; Bismarck welding feeble principalities into the Germanic empire, while Von Moltke's strategy culminates at Sedan, Metz, and Paris; Columbus discovering America; the Declaration of American Independence, fruiting at Yorktown; Dewey's victory in Manila Bay, with Schley's triumph off Santiago – All these, as interpreted by the wisest students, manifest God in history as unmistakably, if not so expressly, as the call of Abraham, Moses giving the Law from Mount Sinai, Samuel establishing the School of the Prophets, David sitting on the throne of united Israel, or Ezra restoring Jerusalem and the scripture canon.

Indeed, every broad generalization of history, by its disclosure of God's purpose and man's preparation, snatches the scepter from both the uncertain hand of Chance and the relentless grasp of Fate, to put a diadem on the brow of Providence.

It did not just happen that Hebrew civilization, expressed in one word, "religion," was distributed over the world by the dispersion of the Jews, by their synagogues in every city, and by a propaganda that compassed sea and land to make one proselyte. Nor was it by mere chance that Greek civilization, expressed in one word, "culture," was next diffused throughout all the lands by conquest, colonization, trade, and language. Nor by accident did Roman civilization, expressed in the one word, "government," follow after to bind the whole world into unity. These all, and many other confluent forces, were but constituent and essential elements of that "fulness of time" in which he came, whose accusation was "written in Hebrew and Greek and Latin." Nor was it a fortuitous circumstance that Jesus of Nazareth failed to impart all his gospel to the twelve apostles, unable to receive its fulness and unprepared for its worldwide propagation. Which one of the Galilean fishermen was ever able to interpret, expound, and apply all the significance of earth's greatest tragedy, the crucifixion on Calvary, or to set forth with equal clearness and correlation the

respective parts of all the participants in that tragedy?

God did not intend Christianity to be like the Jordan River, which confines its flow within a narrow channel, but he designed it to become a river of life. Christianity would have been disseminated in its gospel merely to the Jew, but for Paul. But what part had the Jew, through the Sanhedrin and Herod? What part the heathen, through Pilate's court? What part the devil, whose was the power of death and darkness? What part God, the Father? What part the Holy Spirit? What part the Son himself, and what part you and I? Were they fully prepared to answer these other burning questions:

1. Under what law was Jesus condemned – Jewish, Roman, or Divine?

2. Of what offense was he convicted – blasphemy, treason, sedition, or sin?

3. By what court was the operative sentence pronounced – the Sanhedrin, Pilate, or God?

4. What penalty was assessed – separation of soul from the body, or separation of the soul from God, or both?

5. By whom was he executed – the centurion or the Almighty?

6. Who of them could systematize the correlated doctrines deducible from this execution into an inexorable and universal plan of salvation?

7. Will this salvation be all of grace, or all of works, or of grace and works combined?

8. Was this the death of a hero, or martyr, inciting to imitation and saving by example, or was it the death of a unique substitute for sinners, vicarious and expiatory?

9. Was the fountain of salvation, unsealed by this death, to be confined in its flow within the narrow channel of a small Jewish river, losing itself in the Dead Sea, with no outlet, or must it become a river of life, whose healing tide, ever wider, deeper and more irresistible, could neither be dammed up nor turned aside by any barrier of race, color, sex, caste, or condition, until its inflow should heal all dead seas?

10. Was Christianity intended to crystallize into historic form as only one of many Jewish schools or sects, or must it become in development the world's one "image of truth beside which the Jewish remnants are only as the shapeless fragments and powdered dust struck off by the sculptor's chisel from the block of marble in carving the snow-white statue?"

11. Was the service of this new religion to perpetuate the weak and beggarly rudiments of a typical ritual administered by robed priests at obsolete altars, through lifeless liturgies and cumbrous ceremonies, or be rendered in tiny essays on tinted paper, aping some heathen philosophy, charming by its conceit, but powerless to awaken or to save, or must it be proclaimed via voice, by living heralds, face to face with dying men wherever found – in the home, on the street, in the field, or in the forum?

The requirements involved in the complete answers to these and kindred questions called for a new man and an independent apostleship. That man was Saul of Tarsus – a man prepared for his work by nature, culture, and grace. As antecedent probabilities we need not inquire what things

were supposedly requisite to his fitness. We have something more reliable in the actual facts.

Let us rapidly glance at the most salient and significant of these facts which enter into his preparation or constitute his fitness for the apostolic office.

He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews – not a Hellenist – and specially qualified for his great work. A Hellenist was a Jew who had not been living in Palestine, but Paul did not Hellenize. He remained a Hebrew of the Hebrews. The orthodox Palestinian Jews not only retained the sacred speech, but were zealous in the maintenance of strict Hebrew traditions concerning their holy city, their Temple, and their law. On the other hand, most of the Jews of the dispersion had lost their Hebrew speech and manners in acquiring the Greek tongue and its culture. They were not merely liberalized and broadened by the spirit and genius of the Greek cities where they lived, but were loosened in attachment to many holy things of their ancient religion, by travel, trade, and cosmopolitan association with their philosophies and religions. If the Hebrew was too narrow, the Hellenist was too broad. But Saul of Tarsus, though a Hellenist, did not Hellenize. Born in one of the most famous university cities of the Gentile world, expert in the Greek language and literature, familiar from childhood with the trade, movement, culture, philosophies, and religions of foreign lands and nations, he was yet trained diligently in his childhood, according to Mosaic requirements, spent his boyhood in the secluded school of the synagogue, and was graduated from the sacred Jerusalem college. Thus profiting above all his associates in the Jewish religion, having sounded all its depths, climbed all its heights, traversed all its breadths, weighed all its merits, he was peculiarly qualified, in his own experience, to meet, resist, and overcome the deadly Judaizing tendencies that everywhere sought to sink Christianity into a mere Jewish sect.

He was a Roman citizen. This citizenship he did not purchase, but he was free-born. How this exalted privilege, once esteemed the world’s highest honor, came into his family, we may only conjecture. Certainly, not from his being born in Tarsus, which, though a free city in being allowed to retain self-government after subjection to Roman power, was not a Roman colony like Philippi.

Perhaps his father, or grandfather, was one of the Jewish captives led away into slavery by Pompey, and was afterward not only manumitted, but enfranchised by adoption into some noble Roman family. However it came about, the fact is certain, Paul could say, in the sentence immortalized by Cicero, "I am a Roman citizen."

Exemption from chastisement by the lictor’s rod and from other shameful indignities was not the chief value of this citizenship. It conferred access to circles of association from which a mere Jew was forever barred. Thus, unlike the original twelve, he was en rapport with the world’s three great civilizations. As a Hebrew he faced all Jews. As a Hellenist he faced all Greeks. As a Roman citizen he faced the world. He might not only appeal to Caesar, but preach the gospel in Caesar’s household.

There was an advantage and also a disadvantage in his being a Pharisee of the Pharisees. In national spirit, this constituted him a patriot, and not a Herodian. In religious spirit this committed him to a belief in the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the final judgment. The Sadducean spirit could not give birth to an apostle.

Pharisaism also constituted him a legalist. The only way of life it recognized was that of obedience to the law of Moses. This obedience must meet, not only all the requirements of both the moral

and ceremonial law, as written in the sacred books, but all additional requirements and subtleties of tradition imposed by rabbinical comment on the law. His theory of righteousness would be: "I need no regeneration by the Holy Spirit, because I am a child of Abraham. I was never in bondage to original sin. I need no suffering Messiah to vicariously expiate either my birth-corruption, or my actual transgression, seeing I am freeborn, and touching the law, have lived a blameless life. I need no continuous sanctification by the Holy Spirit, seeing that I keep myself without spot or blemish. I may well thank God that I am not as other men. I fast twice a week. I pay tithes of all I possess. I am as white as snow. I stand on my record under the great Mosaic Law: Do and live. I have diligently busied myself to establish my own righteousness, and need not to submit myself to the righteousness of another. If any man might have confidence in his record, and reasonably hope to be acquitted and not condemned in the final judgment, I more, since I have gone beyond all other men in the attainment of self-righteousness."

In other words, since Saul of Tarsus failed of life in this direction, let no other, till the end of time, hope to succeed. He followed that pathway to the mouth of the pit, and under his feet crumbled its last inch of standing ground.

Paul always obeyed the dictates of his conscience in matters of right and wrong. He was a sincere man. He allowed nothing to beguile him into doing what he believed to be wrong, or to restrain him from doing what he honestly believed to be right. He followed his convictions without shirking or faltering, into all their logical consequences. Even in his sins, conscience was king. If he persecuted by invading the sanctity of the home and dragging men and women to prison, judgment, and death, it was only because he verily thought within himself that he was doing God’s service.

Before determining the exact value of this qualification for apostolic office, let us first settle the intrinsic value of a verdict of conscience. Conscience is that inward faculty or monitor, divinely implanted in the very constitution of man, which passes judgment on the rightfulness of its owner’s motives and conduct. Its standard of right is the highest known law. It is, therefore, neither a law-maker nor a law-publisher, but a judge who interprets and applies whatever law is known. If the known law standard be faulty, or if the knowledge of a faultless law standard be imperfect, its mandates may not be expected to quadrate with abstract right. On this account, the decisions of one man’s conscience, and what is adjudged wrong in one country, may be accounted right in another country. Moreover, if the very nature of man become corrupt, his conscience also suffers in the fall, and may itself need to be cleansed in order to normal purity. And, what is equally important to know, if the mandates of any individual conscience be habitually slighted and disregarded, it loses its sensitiveness and becomes callous. Its fine moral perceptions become dim eyed. While conscience, being an original and necessary faculty, is never the creature of education or custom, neither of which has creative power, it may become the slave of either, or of both. All these considerations militate against the infallibility of its verdicts.

But, notwithstanding these necessary disclaimers, conscientiousness is an essential element in all true goodness or greatness. The insincere man can never be either good or great. Moreover, the characteristic of conscientiousness is the most reliable ground of hope for the repentance and conversion of one who is in the wrong. Being right himself, one may hope to gain the most rabid and violent opponent, if only the opponent be sincere in his opposition, but if his opposition be only

a cloak for his covetousness, a mask for his selfishness, or a mere subterfuge behind which he seeks for personal ends, then he will not likely be receptive of truth or amenable to reason. It follows that, until death ends probation, a conscientious man is always salvable.

Mark well that a conscientious man can never commit the unpardonable sin – the sin against the Holy Spirit – and therefore, conscientiousness clearly delimits the scope of possible salvation. It is just at this point that Saul's conscientiousness bears upon his fitness for his great apostleship, and makes his conversion a signboard marking the boundary line of possible salvation. He himself says, "Though I was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; howbeit I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly and in unbelief" (1 Timothy 1:13). That is to say, that if he had committed these sins against spiritual knowledge and spiritual convictions, his sin would have been unpardonable. In yet other words, any man this side of death may be forgiven, who has not rejected Christ after spiritual knowledge, and after having established strong convictions that he is the Christ. The positive side of the doctrine is thus stated in that great dissertation attributed to Paul: "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much surer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" (Hebrews 10:26-29). Thus, the conversion of Saul of Tarsus located one pole of salvation.

Paul was also the chief of sinners. Not counting those guilty of the unpardonable sin, he was the greatest sinner earth has ever known, or ever will know. If we could take all men from Adam to Christ's second advent, and grade them in single file according to the heinousness of their offenses, Saul of Tarsus would be the outside man, farthest from heaven and nearest to hell. The snatching of this man from the very brink of the pit, the plucking of this brand from the burning, to make him not only a Christian, but an apostle, gives ground for hope to all the prisoners of despair, and furnishes a model, beyond which Omnipotence could not go, of the superabounding grace of God. This is just what he says, "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief; howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his long suffering, for an ensample of them that should thereafter believe on him unto life eternal" (1 Timothy 1:15-16). His conversion, therefore, locates the other pole of salvation.

He was a great thinker and profound reasoner. Only John, of the original twelve, is called a theologian, and his theology is of the mystical order, to be understood and appreciated mainly by the man already saved. But Paul's theology is intended to convince the unbeliever and overwhelm the gainsayer. He seems to have studied profoundly all the significance of the tragedy of Calvary, and to have formulated and correlated into a system all the doctrines which enter into the plan of salvation. If eloquence be rightly defined as "so speaking as not merely to convince the judgment, kindle the imagination and move the feelings, but to give a powerful impulse to the will," then Paul was profoundly eloquent. The letter to the Romans must remain to the end of time a monument of argument, towering higher, broader-based and more imperishable than the pyramid of Cheops. One such apostle was needed, that Christianity might commend itself to earth's thinkers, and remain unshaken by the assaults of all opposing philosophies.

Paul was the greatest sufferer. Before the scales of his dazzling call fell from his blinded eyes, the Master said, "I will show him how great things he must suffer for my sake." Somewhat early in his ministry, the catalogue of his sufferings stood "in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, there is that which presseth upon me daily, the anxiety for all the churches" (2 Corinthians 11:23-28).

Our last look at him discovers "such a one as Paul the aged, burdened with fetters, and the last word we hear is, "For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but also to all them that have loved his appearing" (2 Timothy 4:6-8).

Next to his Lord "he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." Chains bound his wrists, while stocks enclosed his ankles. His back was often bared to the Jewish scourge and the lictor's rod. He was more storm-tossed than Aeneas, more wind-driven than Ulysses. If, by the turn of a helm, he shunned the maw of Charybdis, he must feel the grating of his keel on the granite edge of Scylla. While bonds confined him, ocean wrecked him that the viper might bite him. Mobs openly raved to rend him, while conspiracy lurked to assassinate him. Always danger sentineled his sleep, and death confronted his waking. He was tortured more than Tantalus by hunger that might not be appeased, and thirst that might not be quenched. Prometheus, bound on the cold rocks of Mount Caucasus, while vultures fed on his vitals, was not more a living sacrifice than Paul offered in his body, which died daily, and was ever under the sentence of death. He was lonelier in his responsibility than William Pitt, the great secretary, standing solitary against the world, or than Frederick the Great, with his world deluge of enemies pouring in on him from every side. And withal, the care of all the churches was heavier on him than the weight of the world on Atlas. But as the sandalwood tree perfumes the axe which smites it, so his sufferings exhaled the fragrance of intercession for those who smote him. On his lips the song would indeed have been eloquent: Must I be carried to the skies, On flowery beds of ease, Whilst others fought to win the prize, And sailed thru' bloody seas?

Now, at last, his own words of faith are fulfilled to him: "For our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory" (2 Corinthians 4:17). He who can part from country and from kin, And scorn delights, and tread the thorny way, A heavenly crown through toil and pain to win – He who, reviled can tender love repay, And, buffeted, for bitter foes can pray – He who, upspringing at his Captain's call, Fights the good fight, and when at last the day Of fiery trial comes can nobly fall – Such were a saint, or more; and such the holy Paul!

He was the greatest worker. Rarely, indeed, do we find the thinker and the evangelist combined! The man who writes great books or matures profound philosophies is seldom a man of affairs. The mystic will likely be a dreamer, delighting in solitude and meditation. But Paul was no secluded

monk, no Utopian idealist. He mixed with men. He loved the crowded city. Dr. Farrar seems to bewail that, unlike David, he never described the marvelous landscapes and the sea-views of his travels. May it not be that he was too much absorbed in the "manscape" to dwell on the landscape? Whoever traveled so much, preached so much, and labored so much?

Paul never had a vacation. Even in prison he wrote those letters which constitute the world's heritage. Doubtless he rests well now.

Paul was also the weakest man. We are accustomed to associate robust health with great endurance. But Paul was never well. His body was a body of death. Great sickness was the occasion of one of his mightiest ministries. He moved about in weakness and trembling. He was buffeted by a thorn in the flesh so excruciating that three times, as his Lord in Gethsemane, he earnestly besought his Master to remove it, and make him well. The world marveled when the Prince of Orange on the one side, and the Duke of Luxemburg on the other side, both invalids, directed every movement of their opposing armies from litters carried on men's shoulders, being unable to walk or ride. Paul was afflicted, doubtless, with acute and repulsive ophthalmia, and so oft-times must have been led by another. Poor groping man! How pitiable when left alone I With great sprawling letters must he write, when no amanuensis is at hand to receive dictation. Paul was a little man, like Alexander Stephens. He had no imposing presence like Sam Houston, Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnston, and John C. Breckenridge. "His bodily presence was weak." But surely he had the silver tongue and golden mouth of oratory, did he not? Ah! no; "his speech was contemptible," in the judgment of his enemies; or, as he admits, he was "rude in speech." Perhaps he out-stammered Moses. Durer's picture of him, or the ivory German tablets of the eleventh century, is nearer to nature than Raphael's cartoon.

A poor, little, afflicted, blear-eyed, bald-headed, stuttering Jew!

Somebody must always be present to minister unto him, or direct his steps, or write his letters. How can this man travel? How can he endure privation? How can he do a man's work? With no gift or grace of elocution, how can he speak? William L. Yancey, Daniel Webster, Sargent S. Prentiss, Roscoe Conkling, W. J. Bryan – they are orators. But this man who rises in weakness, in fear and much trembling, whose stammering tongue cannot please fastidious ears, and who is estopped by conscience, will not speak with the enticing words of man's wisdom – how can he be an orator? He could not possibly look well. There is not only nothing imposing in his presence, but there is something unpleasant, if not repulsive.

Sir Walter Scott, in Rob Roy, makes Die Vernon say that "if only a woman were blind so as not to see his outward appearance, she would certainly fall in love with Rashleigh Osbaldistone's voice." But Paul had not even a voice. "His speech was contemptible." What on earth had he, then, to make him great?

He had a personality more striking and decisive than any other man of history. He had a Christian experience which he never doubted, and of which, as a fact, he made more than did any other man.

It comes out in every speech and letter. He had humility the lowest, and courage the sublimest. He had faith without wavering, love immeasurable, and hope without a cloud. He had exquisite sympathy for all the lost and the suffering, and the most lively appreciation of every word and deed

of kindness. He had convictions which hell could not shake. He believed something. There was no palsy in his trust. He had a commission from God. He had high conceptions of, and loyal devotion to, duty. His fidelity to a trust could not be beguiled, purchased, nor intimated. The powers of the world to come possessed him at all times. The nearness, certainty, and eternity of heaven and hell he always realized. But more than all, he had the grace of God, which was made so perfect in his weakness that he could glory in his infirmities, and find strength in his very powerlessness. The faith of his converts stood, not in the wisdom or eloquence of man, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and power of God. He had all the internal equipment, but none of the external graces of the great orator.

He was the firmest and yet the most flexible of men. Let classic authors eulogize the combination of the suaviter in nodo, with the fortiter in re. This is the man more courtly than an old-time Virginia gentleman, and more inflexible than Wellington, who illustrates the combination. A vital principle he never surrendered nor compromised. In matters of mere expediency, he would go any length to conciliate and to gain, and, fortunately for mankind, he had the common sense to know a principle when he confronted it. He never could have mistaken stubbornness for firmness, or opinion for principle. He discriminated well between liberty and lawlessness. He was always careful lest his exercise of liberty and privilege should be the occasion of a brother’s stumbling. In great love, he often declined to claim all his rights and dues. He excelled marvelously in adjustment and adaptation. In a perfectly innocent way, he was made all things to all men, if by all means he might save some. He put himself readily on the plane of either Jew or Greek. If one sought, however, to change his gospel into another gospel, he became as rigid as granite and as hot as a volcano. He would have buried an anathema into the face of an angel coming on such an errand. O, but he could stoop to the lowest, soar to the highest, weep with the saddest, rejoice with the gladdest, and pray for the wickedest.

He had a complete and independent gospel. He received it, not mediately, but directly from the glorified Lord. He had never read Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, for they were as yet unwritten. He did not receive a syllable of his gospel nor a shred or his apostolic authority from any of the original twelve. We might as well call Peter the pope of Abraham and Moses as to call him the pope of Paul. The revelation to Paul was more complete than the revelation to Peter. The authority conferred on Paul was both independent and absolute. The pillars of the church at Jerusalem communicated nothing to him, but were constrained to recognize his authority, and to give the hand of fellowship to his independent mission. Peter never had occasion to rebuke Paul, but Paul was constrained to correct Peter. Every contention of Paul was sustained, not only by men, but by the Holy Spirit. And in his last letter Peter reckons Paul’s writings among the scriptures of God. The reformatory power for erring churches and teachers rests in Paul’s writings. There Augustine found it. There Luther found it. There Spurgeon and Whitefield found it. There must we all find the clearest data for determining Christian doctrine, Christian ethics, and church order.

In thus selecting for emphasis a few out of the many characteristics of Paul’s power, we have suffered from the embarrassment of riches. The half a score might as well have been a full score. We find one-half of the books and one fourth of the bulk of our New Testament written by this man. It is also evident that part of Luke’s Gospel was derived from Paul. In discussing such a man, there is danger of ascribing to the servant the glory of the Master. On this point Monod says, "Fear not from, however, a panegyric in which the saint of the day shall usurp the place reserved to his

Master and ours. . . . It would be poorly apprehending the spirit of Saint Paul, to render him that which belongs only to the Lord. Could I forget myself to that extent, I should expect to see his image rush to meet me, crying out to me, as formerly to the inhabitants of Lystra, 'O, men, why do ye do these things? We also are men, subject to like passions with you.' "

Let us look to see what lies behind and before us. We have studied an important part of the Acts of the apostles. The rest of the book will be devoted to a study of Paul, centering on his work. I will add a few notes on books to those already mentioned, as follows: Conybeare and Howson will furnish the background or historical setting of the scriptural picture. Stalker's is the best summary of the subject; the more we study it the more its value appears. Dr. McGregor's has no equal in the matter considered. Farrar's surpasses all others in exegesis, though it contains some things much to be reprobated. Paley's, an old book and favorite of my youth, is devoted to an argument on the evidences of Christianity, based on the undesigned coincidences between the Acts and Paul's epistles. As most of these are by Pedobaptist authors, we may naturally expect some things to which the author may not subscribe.

And now, while none of us may aspire to Paul's place in history, may we each, according to his gifts and God's mercies, see to it that what history we make shall harmonize with his. May we in our day, be faithful to the deposit of truth left us by him and follow him, as he followed Christ.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the general bibliography of Paul?

2. Give the New Testament bibliography of Paul.

3. What New Testament passage goes farthest back about Paul?

4. What is the New Testament passage going back in Paul's history?

5. What is the chronological data in the history, and what the probable conclusions?

6. When is the profit & delight of study of history most enhanced?

7. Illustrate from history.

8. Give a brief generalization of history on this point.

9. Illustrate this generalization by the significance of three words.

10. Did God intend Christianity to be like the Jordan River which confines its flow within a narrow channel?

11. Can you answer all the questions propounded by the author as necessitating a new man and a new apostleship?

12. Was he both a Hebrew of the Hebrews and a Hellenist, and what the qualifications for his great work?

13. Was he Roman citizen? How did he obtain and what its value?

14. What advantage & disadvantage of being Pharisee of Pharisees?

15. In what did his extreme conscientiousness consist?

16. What the intrinsic value of a verdict of conscience?

17. What is the exact value of this qualification for apostolic officer?

18. How does this conscientiousness of Saul of Tarsus locate one pole of salvation?

19. In what way was he the chief of sinners, and how does this locate the other pole of salvation?

20. How was he a great thinker and profound reasoner?

21. How was Paul the greatest sufferer?

22. Show how he was the greatest worker.

23. How was Paul the weakest man?

24. Explain his being the firmest and yet the most flexible of men.

25. Show that he had a complete and independent gospel.

26. In selecting characteristics of Paul's power, from what may one suffer, and what the danger in discussing such a man?

27. What the testimony of Monod on this point?

28. What the best book commended for the background of this study of Paul, what the best as a summary, what the best on the authority of Paul's writings, what the best in exegesis, and what the best on the evidences of Christianity?

# 05.24. A Harmony Of Peter

XXXIII A HARMONY OF PETER

I. BEFORE CONVERSION

1. His father was Jonas (or John) – Matthew 16:17; John 1:42.

2. His brother was Andrew – John 1:40.

3. He was a married man – Matthew 8:14; Mark 1:30; Luke 4:38; 1 Corinthians 9:15.

4. His home was in Capernaum by the Sea of Galilee – Mark 1:21-29.

5. His occupation was that of a fisherman – Matthew 4:18; Mark 1:16.

6. Partners in business were Andrew, his brother, and James and John, sons of Zebedee – Luke 5:10.

7. His circumstances were good. He had a home, a good business, hired servants (Mark 1:20), which is also implied by the sacrifices he made in business to become a preacher – Luke 18:28; Matthew 19:27-29.

8. His education was limited (Acts 4:13), and provincial – Matthew 26:73.

II. BECOMES A DISCIPLE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST, HARMONY, PAGES 18-19.

We find him and his brother Andrew, and John, the son of Zebedee, away from home at the Bethany beyond Jordan as disciples of John the Baptist (John 1:35-41), to which Peter himself refers (Acts 1:21-22). So that he became a Christian through repentance and faith under the preaching of John the Baptist, the first preacher of the gospel. Compare Mark 1:1-4; Luke 3:1-6; Matthew 3:1-3; Luke 1:76-77; Acts 1:21-22; Acts 19:4; Isaiah 40:3-8; Malachi 4:5-6; Matthew 11:14; Luke 7:29-30. In fact, most, if not all, of the original twelve apostles were baptized by John (John 4:1-2; Acts 1:21).

III. FROM HIS FIRST MEETING WITH THE LORD TO THE DEATH OF CHRIST

1. His first meeting with the Lord. – John’s disciples were baptized upon faith in a Messiah soon to appear. As soon as John himself was assured of the person of the Messiah he pointed him out to Andrew and John, a son of Zebedee. Andrew brings his brother Peter to the Lord. When our Lord saw Peter he announced a change of his name: "Thou art Simon – thou shalt be Peter," Simon meaning a hearer, and Peter, or Cephas, meaning a stone, thus indicating the subsequent development of Simon (John 1:19-44).

These are great pulpit themes: (a) From Abram to Abraham; (b) From Jacob, a supplanter, to Israel, a prince having power with God and man; (c) From Simon to Cephas; (d) From Saul to Paul. See a sermon by Spurgeon, and one by the author on the third theme above.

2. His change of occupation from catching fish to catching men, or his call to the ministry (Matthew 4:18-22; Mark 1:16-20; Harmony, p. 28).

Note what it cost Peter to "leave all and follow Christ" as developed later (Matthew 19:27-29); Luke 18:28, and the compensation therefore. So that here we have two great pulpit themes:

(a) Entering the ministry does not mean a loss of natural talents, or past business training, but only a change of object and direction. One trained to catch fish may profitably employ that training in fishing for men. Various methods of approach must be used in catching different kinds of fish. The fisherman must know their habits, the baits most attractive to each kind and whether in different cases he must use the hook and line for the individual fish, or the net for a particular school of fish, or the drag-net for all kinds. So with catching men. This applies to other occupations. An old hunter once said, "Some deer are never killed except in the still-hunt; others in the drive with hounds, horns, horses, and much noise; others again only in the fire hunt by night; and yet others at the salt licks." Hence the proverb: "The deer that goes often to the lick meets the hunter at last."

(b) There is always adequate compensation, even if not in kind, to one who leaves all to become a minister of Jesus Christ.

3. Peter’s first confession: "I am a sinful man." Harmony, page 28, Luke 5:1-11.

(a) Note his profound consciousness of sin in the presence of the Holy Lord (Luke 5:1-11). Compare the case of Job (Job 42:5-6) and of Isaiah (Isaiah 6:5) and note that nearness to God, and increased light, makes sin manifest, and that human claims to sinlessness and perfection argue the claimant’s distance from God, and the darkness in which he walks.

(b) Note the pulpit theme: Increased light and nearness to God deepens the consciousness of sin.

4. Peter entertains his Lord, and the Lord heals his mother-in-law and many others (Harmony, pp. 29-30; Matthew 8:14-17; Mark 1:29-34; Luke 4:38-41). NOTE: Christ in the home heals its sick and makes it a house of salvation to others. What a marvelous guest I

5. Harmony, page 30. Peter, with others, attempts to make a corner on salvation by confining it to Capernaum (Mark 1:35-38; Luke 4:42-43).

6. Harmony, page 37. Peter learns how our Lord could know a fact by the outgoing of his internal power without seeing the beneficiary of his power (Luke 8:45-46). What a fact for psychology and the materialist!

7. Harmony, page 38. Peter, with James and John, selected to witness the raising of the daughter of Jairus (Mark 5:37-43; Luke 8:51-56). We see this illustrious trio twice more similarly honored – at the transfiguration and in Gethsemane.

8. Our Lord appoints twelve men to be with him continually that they might be trained to be apostles. In the list twice given here (Mark 3:13-15; Luke 6:12-16) and twice later (Matthew 10:2-3 and Acts 1:13), Peter’s name is always first, Primus inter pares – Harmony, pp. 44-45, 72, 244; Acts 1:13.

9. Harmony, pages 71-72. After much training Peter and the other apostles, sent out, two by two, to do their first preaching and healing (Matthew 10:1-42; Mark 6:7-13; Luke 9:1-6).

10. Peter’s presumption and little faith on the water (Harmony, p. 80; Matthew 14:28-31). Here, as elsewhere, note that John’s spiritual perception exceeds Peter’s, but Peter’s impulsiveness makes him more ready to act. Indeed, that impulsiveness gets him into much trouble later.

11. Harmony, page 83. Peter’s second confession (John 6:66-69). When hard but necessary doctrine drives away many followers, and our Lord asks if the twelve will also leave him, Peter nobly responds in a great confession: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God." What a great pulpit theme! When the truth concerning our depravity and the necessity of supernatural power in order to our salvation and the spirituality required as an entrance qualification to the kingdom offends our pride and worldliness, it is well to inquire: (1) To whom we must go if we decline to follow Christ? (2) How then shall we obtain eternal life? (3) Who but the Holy One of God is worthy of our faith? (4) How can we know this Holy One? We can know him if we will to follow him.

12. Harmony, pages 89-90. Peter’s third and greatest confession: "Thou, the Son of man, art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16). This incident at Caesarea Philippi is every way momentous:

(1) The remarkable teachings and deeds of Jesus necessarily demand explanation, and awaken popular inquiry as to his person and mission which results in many erroneous conclusions.

(2) Jesus prayed that his twelve apostles, at least, after so much training, might have the true conception of his nature, person and mission (Luke 9:18), for his questions follow the prayer.

(3) Peter’s confession of both his humanity and divinity and of his messiahship, calls forth from the Lord the most remarkable response ever given to a man:

(a) A signal blessing accompanied with the assurance that such faith came not from flesh and blood, but from a revelation of the Father.

(b) An announcement that he had now passed from Simon to Peter.

(c) That on this rock (however we interpret it) he would build his church, against which the gates of hell should not prevail.

(d) His giving to Peter the keys of the kingdom, with authority to bind and loose. It is true that the binding and loosing is also later given to the church (Matthew 18:18) and to the other apostles (John 20:22-23), and still later to Paul, yet the priority of the grant was made to Peter, under such signal circumstances as to distinguish him from the eleven.

13. Harmony, page 91. Our Lord’s sharp rebuke of Peter (Matthew 16:21-23; Mark 8:31-33). Peter’s offense here is every way remarkable:

(a) It follows so soon the high honor and commendation, Task received.

(b) It shows that while Peter believed in the messiahship of Jesus, he did not yet understand that the passion of the Messiah was his crowning glory, and the one means of salvation.

(c) His presumption was very great in rebuking Christ for announcing his vicarious passion.

(d) He is called "Satan" for tempting the Lord to escape that suffering by which alone he could save men, and is reminded that his words savored more of men than of God. The whole incident shows how much Peter has yet to learn concerning himself, the gospel, and in the way of discipline.

14. Peter, with James and John, selected to be a witness of the transfiguration (Harmony pp. 92-93; Matthew 17:1-13; Mark 9:2-13; Luke 9:28-36). Here also the lessons are great:

(a) The outshining glory of his Lord.

(b) The death of Christ, offensive to Peter, interests Moses and Elijah.

(c) The foreshadowing of the final advent in the raising of the dead and transfiguring of living saints.

(d) The teaching of Christ superior to that of Moses and the prophets: "Hear ye him."

(e) Peter's reference to this great event much later in his life (2 Peter 1:16-18).

15. Peter's hasty assumption to decide for the Lord, on the payment of the Temple tribute, and our Lord's miracle to relieve him from embarrassment (Harmony, p. 97; Matthew 17:24-27).

16. Peter learns a lesson on forgiveness: "Seventy times seven" (Harmony, p. 101; Matthew 18:21-22).

17. Peter learns a lesson on applying to himself and other disciples certain teachings of our Lord (Harmony p. 117; Luke 12:41).

18. Peter learns a lesson concerning the compensation for sacrifices made by following Christ (Harmony p. 133; Matthew 19:27-28).

19. Peter, amazed at the sudden withering of the barren fig-tree cursed by our Lord, learns a lesson of faith '(Harmony p. 146; Mark 11:21-24).

20. Peter, with Andrew, James, and John, inquiring privately about the time and signs of the destruction of Jerusalem, and our Lord's final advent, call forth our Lord's great prophecy (Harmony p. 160; Mark 13:3).

21. Peter and John sent to make ready the Passover (Harmony p. 172; Luke 22:8).

22. Peter learns a great lesson on the washing of feet (Harmony p. 174; John 13:6-10).

23. Peter, through John, asks who of the twelve is the traitor (Harmony p. 175; John 13:23-26).

24. When our Lord at the Passover announces his going away where the disciples cannot follow him, and that all the disciples would be offended at him that very night, Peter becomes prominent as follows:

(a) He insists on knowing where the Lord was going, and why he cannot follow him now.

(b) He boldly announces his readiness to lay down his life for the Lord.

(c) He passionately affirms that if everybody else in the world should turn away from the Lord, he himself would stand firm.

(d) Our Lord tells him that this very night, before the time of the second cock-crowing, i.e., just before day, Peter would deny him thrice.

(e) Peter vehemently reaffirmed that he would not deny the Lord.

(f) Whereupon our Lord informs him of the source of the danger, namely, that Satan, by request, had obtained the apostles temporarily that he might sift them as wheat, but that the Lord had prayed for Peter that his faith should not utterly fail, and enjoins upon him that when he was converted, i.e., turned again by repentance for his fall, to confirm other brethren who should be weak in like temptation.

(g) This was the greatest personal lesson of Peter's life. He learned his own weakness, vanity, vain confidence, the power of Satan, and particularly that his salvation did not consist in his weak hold on Christ, but in Christ's strong hold on him. Very humbly and earnestly in his later life he obeyed the solemn injunction to confirm the faith of the weak, and to warn against Satan's power. See 1 Peter 1:3-5; 1 Peter 5:6-10.

25. Peter, with James and John, again selected and honored, this time to enter Gethsemane with the Lord, in order to watch and pray; but they sleep, neither watching nor praying, leaving the Lord alone in his agony (Harmony p. 184; Matthew 26:37-45; Mark 14:33-41).

26. Peter, misunderstanding what our Lord had said (Luke 22:35-38), draws the sword when our Lord is betrayed (Harmony p. 188; Matthew 26:50-54; Mark 14:46-47; Luke 22:49-51; John 18:10-12). This is one of the most important lessons of the New Testament, and generally but little understood. When our Lord first sent out the twelve he assured them that their support and protection was his charge; hence they needed neither sword nor purse. But in the passage cited (Luke 22:35-38), he tells them to prepare both sword and purse, i.e., during the period between his death and resurrection. The sheep would then have no shepherd, and be scattered, and so must look out for their own support and protection. This would not go into effect, however, before he died, nor continue after his resurrection. Peter misunderstood on both points. He drew his sword before Christ died, and later went back to his old occupation for support (John 21:3) after Christ was risen. Moreover, he drew the sword, not to protect himself when Christ was dead, but to protect Christ while he was alive, which contravened all Christ's teachings. See particularly John 18:36.

27. Peter follows Christ afar off, to see the end (Harmony p. 193; Matthew 26:58; Mark 14:54; Luke 22:54).

28. Peter thrice denies his Lord (Harmony pp. 193-195; Matthew 26:58-74; Mark 14:54-71; Luke 22:54-60; John 18:15-27).

29. The cock crows the second time, Christ looks at Peter, Peter remembers, goes out and weeps bitterly (Harmony, p. 195; Matthew 26:74-75; Mark 14:72-72; Luke 22:60-62).

IV. BETWEEN THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

1. The angel at the empty tomb sends word by the woman to Peter (Mark 16:7) that Jesus is risen, and to remind the disciples of the great appointment in Galilee (Harmony p. 219). Which message Mary Magdalene delivers to Peter and John, who hurry to the tomb and find it empty, but they do not understand the scripture about the resurrection and do not believe (Harmony p. 220; John 20:2-10).

2. Jesus appears to Peter himself, the same day (Harmony p. 224; Luke 24:34; 1 Corinthians 15:5).

3. In the evening of the same day he appears again to Peter and nine other apostles, who all are inspired and receive the binding and loosing power conferred on Peter alone at the time of his third great confession (Matthew 16:1-28; Harmony, pp. 224-225).

4. The next Lord's Day he appears a third time to Peter, with the ten other apostles (Harmony p. 226; John 20:26; 1 Corinthians 15:5).

5. He appears a fourth time to Peter, with six others, at the Sea of Galilee, when doubtless they were on their way to the Galilean appointment. This is Peter's recall to the ministry (Harmony p. 226-227; John 21:1-23). This was a great occasion in Peter's life, full of important lessons:

(a) Though Christ was risen, Peter goes back to his old occupation (John 21:3), leading the others with him.

(b) They catch nothing for all their night's work, as preachers often fail when returning to secular employment. The Lord, appears and mildly rebukes with his question: "Children, have you any meat?" i.e., "Is this thing paying you?" Then to show them how they always succeed under his direction, he commands them to cast on the other side of the boat and lo, a multitude they could not drag! Here again John's perception outruns Peter's in recognizing the Lord, and Peter's impulse to action outruns John's. When on the land, lo again, he supplies their food.

(c) After their fast was broken, comes the catechizing of Peter, which rebukes and probes to the bottom: "Lovest thou me more than these?" Here the pronoun "these" may well refer to the nets and fish, i.e., the secular method of support from which Peter had been called to the ministry. If so, the rebuke is for his return to his old business. With this agrees the suggestion that "feeding the sheep, lambs, and little sheep," so solemnly enjoined, was work enough to fill his time and occupy all his talent. With such work, why go back to fishing? And if the Lord could and did supply their breakfast without using any fish caught by them, was he not able to supply all their needs all the time? When preachers go back to secular work, does not the flock hunger and go astray? But if "these" refers to the other disciples, then the rebuke is against his boast that though all else forsook him, he, Peter, would stand firm. With this agrees the seeming reference to his threefold denial by the threefold question. In either event, the probing so deep left a lasting impression on Peter's mind.

(d) The fourth lesson is in the Lord's foretelling the manner of his unwilling death in old age (John 21:18): "Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, another shall gird thee and lead thee whither thou wouldst not," which implies a death by crucifixion – a martyrdom which Peter himself would desire to avoid, which is a rebuke to Peter's boast that he was ready to lay down his life for his Lord. To this death Peter himself refers a long time afterwards: "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my

tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hast showed me." This unwillingness of Peter to suffer martyrdom is preserved in a tradition well stated in the famous book Quo Vadis.

(e) But there is another lesson for Peter. The Lord again repeats the words of Peter's original call to the ministry, "follow me," which originally occurred at this very place, and when they were doing the self-same thing, and was accompanied then as now by a miraculous draft of fishes under the Lord's direction, after they had toiled all night and caught nothing. See Harmony, page 28. The call is renewed: "Follow me; leave these nets and become fishers of men."

So many a despondent preacher, going back to his farm or to his carpenter shop, or to law, or to medicine, for a support, has had his call renewed.

And all this supports the view first expressed above, that the pronoun "these" refers to nets and fishes, or his old secular business.

(f) A final lesson comes to poor Peter. He, having started to follow, turns about and seeing John also following, breaks out, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" to be sharply rebuked: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." Our Lord had already warned against delay in following, on account of the affairs of others (Matthew 8:21-22), and against the danger of turning back (Luke 9:62). Mark Peter's prurient curiosity, his meddlesomeness with the case of others, but especially note his questioning of the Lord's right to single him out with such a preemptory demand to leave all and follow the Master, even to martyrdom, without first explaining what should be the duty and fate of others. It is even yet a very imperfect, but very natural Peter. It is amazing that Romanists find in this incident by the Sea of Galilee, the, to them, decisive proof that signal honor is here conferred on Peter as the chief pastor of all the spiritual Israel, when the whole passage, and in all its parts, is a rebuke to Peter. Peter is indeed distinguished from the others, but by repeated censure. Certainly, he himself never construed the incident as conferring any such signal honor upon himself, and when, in old age, writing of himself, in relation to others, he adopts no such lordly tone. See particularly 1 Peter 5:1-4.

6. He appears the fifth time to Peter and to hundreds of others in the appointed Galilean mountain when the Great Commission is given to the church, discussed elaborately in the chapter on that passage (Harmony p. 228; Matthew 28:16-20; Mark 16:15-18; 1 Corinthians 5:6).

7. He appears the sixth time to Peter, and to the other apostles, giving them illumination to understand the Old Testament Scriptures, as he had previously inspired them to write the New Testament Scriptures, and again commissions them, and promises them the coming and guidance of the Spirit, but enjoins that they tarry at Jerusalem until they received this power from heaven (Harmony p. 229; Luke 24:44-49).

8. He appears to Peter the seventh time with 120 others on the day of his ascension (Acts 1:6-15; Harmony pp. 229-231).

V. AFTER HIS ASCENSION

1. Peter takes the lead in filling the place of Judas (Acts 1:15-26). Query: Was he too previous? Was Matthias lawfully put into the apostolic office? This question is thoroughly discussed in Acts of this INTERPRETATION.

2. Peter takes the lead on the famous Pentecost, when the church is baptized in the Spirit (Acts 2:14-41). Here he uses one of the keys to the kingdom of heaven, and from the inside opens the door to the Jews.

3. Peter, with John, works a great miracle and preaches s second great sermon (Acts 3:1-26).

4. Peter, with John, arrested and imprisoned, makes a great defense before the Sanhedrin, and is released (Acts 4:1-22).

5. Peter, with John, makes report to the church, and joins in an earth-shaking prayer (Acts 4:23-31).

6. Peter leads again, in the detection and exposure of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11).

7. The very shadow of Peter works miracles (Acts 5:15). From Pentecost Peter is flawless, and strides like a Titan.

8. Peter, with all the other apostles, again arrested and imprisoned by the Sanhedrin, but released by the angel of the Lord, they preach boldly in the Temple (Acts 5:17-20).

9. Peter, with other apostles, being again arrested, makes another marvelous defense, is beaten with stripes, but glories in persecution, and continues to preach (Acts 5:21-42).

10. Peter joins the other apostles in the ordination of deacons (Acts 6:1-6).

11. Peter, with John, sent by the other apostles, goes to Samaria to confer the Spirit on Philip’s converts, and exposes Simon Magus (Acts 8:14-25).

12. Peter receives a visit from Paul (Acts 9:26-30; Galatians 1:18).

13. Peter, in a tour to Lydda, heals Eneas, and on invitation goes to Joppa and raises Dorcas (Acts 9:32-43).

14. At Joppa he receives the great vision which eventuates in opening the door to Gentiles at Caesarea with the other key to the kingdom of heaven (Acts 10:1-48). Here again, in his characteristic way, he says, "Not so, Lord," but when fully convinced, obeys the vision.

15. Peter, when questioned by some in the church for this matter, makes a glorious defense (Acts 11:1-18).

16. In the persecution by Herod, Peter is imprisoned, but again released by the angel of the Lord, and goes back to Caesarea (Acts 12:1-19).

17. In a preliminary meeting just before the great consultation in Jerusalem on the question whether Gentiles must become Jews in order to become Christians (Acts 15:1-2), Peter, with John and James, the brothers of the Lord, acknowledges Paul’s independent apostleship, gives him the hand of fellowship in the division of labor, that while they ministered to the circumcision, Paul was commissioned to go to the Gentiles (Galatians 2:1-9). This case alone, set forth in Galatians 1:1-24, Galatians 2:1-21, effectually disproves the papacy of Peter.

18. In the council, Peter defends the acts of Paul in receiving Gentiles without circumcision, by citing his own case with Cornelius (Acts 15:7-11).

19. And yet at Antioch, a little later, Peter, in awe of the followers of James, tears down what he had built up, and is publicly and sharply rebuked by Paul (Galatians 2:11-21).

20. Partisan misuse of Peter's name at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:12; 1 Corinthians 3:22; 1 Corinthians 9:5).

21. Peter goes to Babylon on the Euphrates, and there writes his truly great letters, which are his crowning glory, and bears testimony to Paul's wisdom, and ranks Paul's letters with the Old Testament Scriptures (1 Peter 1:5; 1 Peter 1:13; 2 Peter 3:15-16).

This brief, but connected survey of Peter's life serves several valuable purposes.

(1) It furnishes the richest material in the Bible for noting the developments of a Christian life, showing that the new convert is but a babe in Christ, imperfect in both theology and life, but through training and sanctification, progressing toward higher ideals in both, thus from Simon to Cephas. A good sister once said to the author, "Peter is a great comfort to me; he is so natural, so impulsive, so hasty in speech and deed, so full of faults, so often stumbling, and yet on the whole loving his Lord, frankly confessing his sins and repenting, and every time he falls in the ditch, he manages to climb out on the side toward heaven and resumes his pilgrimage. He is a great comfort to me because I am so much like him, saying and doing foolish things; he keeps me in countenance and hope, but that Paul, who never makes a slip after conversion – he is so perfect he discourages me."

(2) The several great epochs of his life – his conversion, his first meeting with the Lord, his call to the ministry, his three great confessions, his piteous fall, his recall to the ministry at the same place of the first call, and under similar circumstances, his baptism in the Spirit, and from that Pentecost until even his shadow heals the sick (Acts 2:1-47, Acts 3:1-26, Acts 4:1-37, Acts 5:1-42) – what a flawless leader! He is braver than a lion, striding like a Titan, soaring like an eagle, sublimely great. Then his opening the door to the Gentiles, and defense thereof; his superb attitude at the Jerusalem consultation (Acts 15:1-41; Galatians 2:1-21) privately toward Paul and publicly toward the great question of salvation there pending; his subsequent weakness and cowardice at Antioch; his final ripeness and glorious testimony to Paul in his great letters – all these stages are clearly outline. In view of his ups and downs we take off our hats to Peter when we see the culmination of his spirit and charter as evinced in his letters.

(3) It prepares for an examination of the Romanist claims concerning Peter and his alleged successors.

(4) There is a good preparation toward the study of the Acts which follows.

(5) When we come to his letters it will be interesting to gather from them what events recited in this Harmony most impressed Peter's own mind, and what his final statements of great doctrines, and what his crystallized character.

QUESTIONS

1. Who was Peter's father? who his brother? was he single or married? where was his home? what was his occupation? who were his partners in business what was his circumstances and what his education?

2. Under whose preaching did he become a Christian, who was this preacher, and what conditions of salvation did he set forth?

3. Who brought him to Christ, what change of name here, and what three other instances of such change of names in the Bible?

4. What did it cost Peter to "leave all and follow Christ," what the compensation therefore, and what two pulpit themes deduced from this incident?

5. What Peter's first confession, what two Old Testament cases of like kind, and what pulpit theme from this incident?

6. Give an account of Peter's first entertainment of his Lord.

7. How did Peter and others attempt to make a corner on salvation?

8. What triple honor was bestowed upon the illustrious trio – Peter, James, and John?

9. What position has Peter's name in the different lists of the twelve apostles?

10. Where do we first note his presumption and little faith?

11. What his second confession?

12. What his third and greatest confession, and what signal honor here conferred upon him?

13. What is our Lord's sharp rebuke of Peter and in what was Peter's offense very remarkable?

14. On what occasion did Peter assume to decide for our Lord and how did our Lord reprove him?

15. What lesson does he learn from the withering, barren fig tree?

16. How did Peter, James, and John call forth our Lord's great prophecy of his second advent?

17. What was Peter's part in connection with the last supper?

18. What was the greatest personal lesson of Peter's life?

19. At what critical hour did he leave his Lord alone and sleep?

20. What rash act of Peter again showed his impulsiveness and what is the important lesson connected with this incident

21. How does he follow Christ from this time on?

22. What now brings Peter into the depths?

23. What brings him to repentance and bitter weeping?

24. How many times did Jesus appear to Peter on the resurrection day, and what each occasion?

25. When does he next appear to Peter and what the occasion?

26. When and where did he again appear to Peter, and what the important lesson for Peter connected with this incident?

27. Where did he appear to Peter the fifth time? where the sixth time? and what did he give Peter on this occasion in connection with the other ten apostles?

28. When did he appear to Peter the seventh time?

29. Trace this harmony of Peter through the Acts.

30. What purposes are served by this survey of Peter’s life?

# 05.25. The Life Of Peter

THE LIFE OF PETER

XVI This chapter, and the next, will be confined to a glance at the life of Peter, as set forth in the New Testament. The material is as follows: The Four Gospels, as arranged in the Broadus Harmony, the Acts of the Apostles, several chapters of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, two chapters of Galatians, and the letters of Peter himself.

We have in this account the history of one of the most remarkable men that ever lived. He was a poor man, though his partners, James and John, were well-to-do. He was an uneducated man, and later was reproached with the fact that he had never had any learning. He was a married man and had a family to take care of when he was converted, and his only educational training was under the Lord Jesus Christ for three years, and under the Holy Spirit later. This case of Peter illustrates what I have often said: that it is not essential to the ministerial office, or to ministerial success, that a man should be a graduate of a college. I must not, however, be misunderstood. Far be it from me to speak against a college education on the part of those whose circumstances, age, environment, and means enable them to get a college education, and who have the capacity to take it. But I do mean to affirm that Christ and the original twelve apostles were not school men, and yet they have impressed the world.

It oftentimes happens that God calls a man to preach in middle life, after he has a wife and children. It is the folly of some good people that the ministry should be cut down to men who have first obtained a college degree and then a seminary degree. The thought is unscriptural, unbaptistic, unhistorical, and it is incalculably mischievous.

Now we take up Peter's name. His given name was Symeon in Aramaic (see Acts 15:14; 2 Peter 1:1) or Simon in Greek.

We get his surname from Matthew 16:17, i.e., "Bar-Jonah." "Bar" means son; "Simon, son of Jonah" – or the son of John, as some represent it. His cognomen given by Christ was Cephas in Aramaic; or in Greek, Petros; in English, Peter, meaning a stone (John 1:42; Matthew 16:18).

His home was on the border of the Sea of Galilee, Bethsaida first, then Capernaum. He was living at Capernaum in his own house when Christ went there. He not only had a wife, but later on in life when he went out on his apostolic tours, he took his wife along. There are some preachers who, apart from the question of cost, don't particularly care to have their wives go with them. Sometimes it is much better that the wife be along. She will at least see that his clothes are properly brushed, and his neck cloth tied, and she will be sure to point out any wrong mannerism in the pulpit or in mixing with the people. He is apt to fret a little at that. Many preachers are thin-skinned when it comes to criticism, but it is much better for the preacher to remember that his wife does not do that for the pleasure of nagging, but it is because she loves him, and does not like to see him make wrong impressions. Now all of this grows out of the starting point, that Peter took his wife along with him.

In the next place, Peter took care of his mother-in-law, however strange that may seem. Notwithstanding all of the jokes on the subject of mother-in-law, some people have dearly loved their wife's mother, the author for one.

We notice his business. He was a fisherman. The Sea of Galilee has always been famous for its multitude of fishes.

In getting at the character of Peter from his own viewpoint, we must study Mark's Gospel, commonly and rightly called Peter's Gospel, and Peter's letters. We should read Mark through at one sitting, keeping in our mind that this is virtually Peter speaking, and watch for the outcropping of the author's view of himself. In the same way read his letters. In such light Peter shows to much advantage. Then study the other authorities for the view of him from their standpoint. Here again, on the whole, Peter shows to advantage, particularly when we consider our Lord's estimate of him. Jesus knew what was in the man. While rebuking Peter often, he ranked him very high.

It is evident from all these sources of information that he was a plain, straightforward, sincere, impulsive, and withal a very curious man. He was a regular interrogation point. In going over the places in chronological order where Peter's name comes into history, we cannot help noticing that Peter asks more questions than all the rest of the apostles put together. Generally, he asks his question straight out: "Lord, what do you mean by that parable of the blind guides?" "Lord, where are you going?" "Lord) why can't I follow you now?" "Lord, look at the temple and these stones" – and where he cannot ask a question himself, he nudges John to ask it, as in the case of the Lord's Supper when he prompted John to ask Jesus who it was that was going to betray him. David Crocket once said that he had a hound puppy that he set great store by on account of his inquisitive disposition; that he could nose around into more things than any other dog he ever saw; sometimes he got himself into trouble, but if a dog did not have an inquisitive disposition he would never jump a rabbit. A great many people lack knowledge for not asking questions. A wise man never needs to ask the same question twice.

Peter had a streak of weakness in him arising largely from his impulsiveness and overconfidence in himself. We might call it a presumptuous streak; a conceited streak. He had no idea that anybody in the world could hold onto Christ like himself. Everybody else might turn loose, but he would not. He frequently overestimated himself, and underestimated the power of the devil. The element of presumption in him is intimated by his rebukes of the Saviour. Jesus, in a great press of people, says, "Who touched me?" and Peter spoke up at once – he always says something – "Lord, you see this crowd all around here pressing us, and say 'Who touched me?' Who could tell? Why should you say that?" Jesus replied to him: "I know some particular person touched me for a particular object, for virtue went out from me." Now, Peter had not thought of the power of Christ's consciousness to determine outgoing virtue in response to silent appeals. We see that presumption manifested again when he said, "Far be it from thee, Lord, to suffer and die." And again when he said, "Lord> do you wash my feet?" "Lord, you shall never wash my feet." And again, "Wash me all over, head, and hands, and feet." We see him again in the great vision he had at Joppa correcting the Almighty himself: "Not so, Lord."

An element of weakness shows itself in Antioch. He is influenced by certain men who come up from James. Peter had been eating and drinking with the Gentiles, until through fear of their censure he is involved in dissimulation, but like all other impulsive men he is quick to get right and

frank to make full confession of his wrong. His weakness appears particularly in his denial of the Lord, and that too after being warned' beforehand and cautioned the second time, and yet it came on him so suddenly that he turned loose all hold of Christ and denied that he ever knew him, and swore like a trooper. Notwithstanding all this, Peter is one of the most lovable characters in history.

A distinguished lady once said to me, "I cannot stand Paul; he never makes any mistakes. But Peter is a great comfort to me; he is so human in his errors." He had faults with his greatness, and it rather comforted her to think that a great man like Peter would shoot off his mouth so fast sometimes. That is why she said Peter was a comfort to her. Now, there is a distinct development in Peter. We can trace the training; as he gets older he becomes stronger in character and more mellow in spirit. In all literature we do not find a document more humble in spirit, more loyal, and more royal than Peter's first letter. It is a great document – the letter we are now going to study.

Now, while I have before me every New Testament passage which names Peter, and arranged in chronological order, giving the page in the harmony, and the citation from the New Testament books, I will cite only a few incidents which made the greatest impressions on his life. From them we find what things done and said by our Lord, or what impressions from the Holy Spirit, most touched Peter's heart. Just as in the case of David, we might ask, "What things in David's life most impressed him, allowing the Psalms to interpret the impression?" and taking the book of Psalms find out from them what great impressions had been made upon the mind of David by the incidents of his life. Now, by taking Peter's two letters, and adding to them Peter's speeches as reported in Acts, it is an easy thing to determine what experiences impressed Peter more than the others, and in the same way we find from John's Gospel what things particularly fastened themselves upon his mind. But we are dealing with Peter now, and the first instance is his conversion, when he was brought to Christ by his brother Andrew, an account of which is found on page 19 of the Harmony, and recorded in John 1:40-42. Our Lord recognized the power of the man as soon as he saw him, and before Peter could say a word he uses the language that I make a text of in my sermon, found in my first volume of sermon 8: "Thou art Simon; thou shalt be called Cephas, or Peter." (John 1:42). That sermon is called "From Simon to Cephas," and its object was to trace the development in the character of Peter. Simon means a hearer or learner, and Peter means a rock – stability.

It is probable that Peter went with Jesus to the marriage of Cana in Galilee, and went with him to Capernaum, and was also with him on his preaching tour in northern Judea near where John was baptizing in Enon, and was also with him in passing through Samaria to go to Galilee, but not with him when Jesus went to Cana a second time and to Nazareth the first time.

The next great impression on his mind comes from his call to the ministry. That is on pages 27-28 of the Harmony (Mark 1:16-17). Jesus called to the ministry two pairs of brothers: James and John, and Peter and Andrew, at the Sea of Galilee. In close connection with this call comes an incident profoundly impressing Peter's mind, found on the same page of the Harmony, but told in Luke 5. It was the miraculous draught of fishes resulting from casting the net according to Christ's direction. When they went to draw up the net it was filled with such a multitude of fishes that the net broke, and the boat was filled, ready to sink, with the fishes put in it. The miracle profoundly impressed Peter. Here was either a power that could bring the fish to a certain point, or the omniscience that could know where they were in a school and could so give the direction that just letting down the net would take a great multitude, and as the miracle worked in on his mind he

became conscious that he was in the presence of one holier than himself. Sin rose up in him, the conviction of sin, and he knelt down before Jesus and said, "Depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man." I often use that to illustrate the strangeness of conviction of sin.

Most people whose words and actions convict other people of sin are not conscious at the time that they are convicting of sin, and many a preacher studies a sermon and preaches it with a view of conviction of sin, and never convicts a man in the congregation. But there was that conviction of sin forced upon Peter's heart by the consciousness that he was in touch with divinity. In any kind of meeting as soon as God's presence is felt people will be convicted right and left; convicted quickly in the strangest kind of ways.

The next thing that impressed Peter was to have the Lord in his own house. Now, hospitable people might rejoice in having pleasant company or great company, but here was one of the few humble houses of Galilee that sheltered the Lord, and as the Lord came in the fever left the mother-in-law. His power came with him, and Peter's house became a focus of power, and his front yard full of supplicants crying for mercy and healing, and salvation blazed all around Peter's house because the Lord was there.

The next look we have at Peter is the impression made upon his mind by these tremendous miracles of our Lord. His presumption is excited, and so we find on page 30 of the Harmony, as recorded in Mark 1:35 and Luke 4:42, that Peter tries to work a corner on salvation. Christ had gone off to spend the night in prayer. Peter obtruded upon him in his private devotion, with a view to keeping him there at Capernaum, as if he could dam up salvation in a little town and not let it outflow to other places. Our Lord rebuked him and said, "I must go to other towns also; you cannot hold me here; you cannot dam up this stream of life and limit it to one locality.'

Without comment I note the fact that he was one of the three at the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and that he was one of the disciples that plucked grain on the sabbath day and caused a controversy. He was also one of the disciples in the little boat which Jesus had pushed out into the sea away from the multitude in order to teach the people.

On page 49 of the Harmony (Mark 3:14-17) is the ordination of Peter and the other eleven disciples. The call had preceded and they had learned a good many things in being with Jesus. But Jesus, after spending the night in prayer, ordained these men and set them apart to the full work of the ministry, and designated them as apostles to be witnesses for him. That ordination was followed by the great Sermon on the Mount, expanding and expounding the law.

The next impressive thing in his history is on pages 71-76 of the Harmony, as set forth in Matthew 10. The twelve have been ordained and have heard his preaching, and now he is going to send them out, and Mark says, "two by two." Peter knows that he went with one of them wherever he went. I suppose John was with him; more than apt to be with John than with his own brother Andrew. Now, in Matthew 10 we have the elaborate instructions given to these men before they were sent out. This was the first time Peter ever went off from his Lord to do any work, and they went in every direction, two together, with instructions as to what to do and how to do it, and they came back and made a report. There Mark brings in a new fact again, which he gets from Peter, and it was just like Peter to make that kind of a report. When he came back he reported not only what he had done, but what he had taught. There is the defect in our missionary reports today; we

report the miles traveled, sermons preached, houses visited, the Sunday schools, prayer meetings, and churches organized, but we do not say what we have taught. Now Peter came back and reported what he had taught.

We now come to the next important incident in his life, the appearance of Christ walking on the water, which shocked all of them. They thought it was a ghost – an apparition. When they learned that it was the Lord, that impulsive Peter said, "Lord, tell me to come to you; I will come if you say, 'Come.' I don't mind the water. If you tell me to walk on the water, I will do it." The Lord says, "Come," and Peter steps out and walks on the water, and if he had kept his eye on Christ he would have walked all the way, but he got to looking at the waves tumbling around him, and at the wind, and began to sink. But whenever Peter got into trouble he cried out for help, so now he prays: "Lord help me, or I perish." Now, that incident illustrates Peter and his character. The original character of the man, the impulsiveness of the man, the audacity of the man, and then the shrinking of the man from the responsibility which he had brought upon himself.

We next come to a more important event. We find it on page 83 of the Harmony. It is his first confession. Jesus had preached a sermon on hard doctrine, "the Bread of Life," and his main object was to slough off transitory people. He wanted the right kind to stick to him, but he did not want his body of disciples to be filled up with unprepared material, and he preached that sermon with a view to sloughing off and the crowd sloughed off, and it looked like everybody was going to leave him. Upon this many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, "Will you also go away?" Simon Peter answered: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God." Peter is great there. Nobody else spoke, and as usual Peter was all-inclusive, he was ready to speak for others as well as for himself, and he included too many when he spoke for the whole twelve. Jesus corrected it and said, "One of you is a devil. You can speak for yourself, but not for all." That is the first confession of Peter. "Thou hast the words of eternal life. There is no one else to go to. We have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God."

QUESTIONS 1. Where do we find scripture material for the life of Peter?

2. Give an account of Peter: (1) His circumstances. (2) His education and the bearing on an educated ministry. (3) His family relations.

3. What his Aramaic name, his Greek name, his surname, his cognomen in Aramaic, Greek, and English?

4. Where was his home, and what lesson from his taking his wife along with him?

5. What his business?

6. What books may one study in order to get at Peter from his own viewpoint; how does he show up from the viewpoint of other New Testament writers and what was Jesus' estimate of him?

7. What noted characteristic of Peter gave him prominence?

8. What his chief weakness and its cause?

9. Give illustrations of his presumption.

10. What ground for comfort in the life of Peter?

11. What the first event of his life that made a great impression on him?

12. What the second thing that impressed him, the incident that led up to it, and the impression on his mind?

13. What the next event that impressed him?

14. How did Peter try to "corner" salvation?

15. What was Peter’s first missionary work and what in his report unlike our missionary reports?

16. What was Peter’s first great confession, and what the occasion for it?

Chapter 51

# 05.26. The Life Of Peter - (Continued)

XVII THE LIFE OF PETER – (CONTINUED) In the preceding chapter the question was asked: "What incidents in Peter's life most impressed themselves upon his own -life, judging mainly from his literary remains, to wit: His gospel through Mark, his speeches in the Acts, and his letters?" In answering that question, the following, out of many incidents, were cited, in the chronological order in the Broadus Harmony:

1. His first interview with our Lord, and probable conversion (John 1:40-42; Harmony, p. 19).

2. His call to the ministry (Mark 1:16-17; Harmony, p. 28).

3. The revelation of his sinfulness through a realization of Christ's presence and divine power (Luke 5:1-11; Harmony, p. 29).

4. Christ in his home (Mark 1:29-34; Harmony, p. 29).

5. His ordination as an apostle (Mark 3:14-17; Harmony, p. 45).

6. His being sent out to preach away from Christ, the accompanying instructions, the work, and the report of it (Mark 10:1-42; Mark 6:7-30; Harmony, pp. 71-76).

7. His walking on the water (Matthew 14:22-36; Harmony, p. 80).

8. His first great confession (John 6:61-71; Harmony, pp. 82-83).

Out of the many references to Peter in the Gospels, those eight were particularly discussed as bearing upon his character and growth, his own impressions, and the audacity and weakness of his faith.

Now, this chapter resumes the discussion:

9. His greater confession at Caesarea Philippi (Matthew 16:13-20, Harmony, pp. 89-90). The reader will note that on the first interview with Peter our Lord said, "Thou shalt be called Cephas." Now, at the conclusion of Peter's great confession here, that promise was fulfilled. He became Cephas, a stone: "Thou art Peter," and from Peter's own words as to the real foundation of the church and of his relation to that foundation as a living stone, we get a comment in 1 Peter 2:4-8, where he makes it very clear that the foundation of the church is Christ, the rock; he does not understand that the church is built upon him. He was not bothered as a great many modern theologians in interpreting that passage in Matthew 16:1-28, and they would have saved themselves a great deal of trouble if they had allowed Peter, to whom the words were addressed, to give his own inspired understanding of what Christ meant. And it seems always to me that there must be disrespect for the inspiration of Peter when any man says that in Matthew 16:18 the rock upon which the church was built was Peter, and it is disrespect also for Paul, because he is just as clear as Peter: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, Christ Jesus." Peter says that he is a living stone in the Temple, but that Christ is the elect precious stone which constitutes

the foundation, and that is the true conception of it. Peter does not understand from this passage by the promise of the keys, that he was to open the door of the church (that is, to declare its entrance terms) to both Jews and Gentiles.

This appears in the subsequent history; in Acts 2:1-47, Peter, standing up in Christ's completed church and his Spirit-filled church (for the Spirit that day filled it), and under inspiration opened the door, and from the inside, mark you, to the Jews – representative Jews from all over the world, and told them how they could get in. This is evident from Acts 10:1-48. There Peter opened the door to the Gentile world, using these words: "To Christ all the prophets bear witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive forgiveness of sins." And in Acts 15:1-41 he avows that that privilege was conferred on him. In the discussion that took place in Acts 15:1-41 he commences by saying, "Brethren, you remember that how through me, or in me, the Lord made selection from among you about opening the door to the Gentiles." It is also evident from this passage that Peter held the first place among the twelve apostles to the circumcision. As a distinguished Roman Catholic historian puts it, primus inter pares. That means first among equals, and this appears further from the fact that in the four lists of the twelve apostles his name is always first, and from the further fact that in the subsequent history he invariably took the lead. But Peter did not understand that this priority conferred upon him the papal autocratic jurisdiction claimed by the Roman Catholics, and this appears from his subsequent conduct in the following instances: In Acts 2:1-47 the church at Jerusalem holds him to account for going in and eating with the Gentiles, and instead of answering them by authority, he answered them by an explanation, which was accepted. Then, in Galatians 2:1-21 when the question came up of Paul's entirely independent gospel and jurisdiction that occurred at Jerusalem, on that occasion Peter conceded Paul's entire independence and his appointment to be the apostle to the Gentiles, and gave him the right hand of fellowship.

It further appears from this passage in his first letter: "The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed. Feed the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight thereof, not of constraint, but willingly according to the will of God, not for filthy lucre but of a ready mind. Neither as being lords over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves examples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall be manifested from heaven you shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." From this passage we see that while Peter considered himself an elder, an apostle, and a shepherd, he puts himself on a level with other apostles and with other elders and with the Chief Shepherd over all, who is Jesus Christ himself, and that this oversight which he exercises is not an oversight by constraint, nor for money, but as an example. It is impossible for a man to put it any more plainly than Peter does, how he understood the priority conferred upon him on account of his great confession in Matthew 16.

10. His great presumption in tempting Christ to shun the cross and our Lord's severe rebuke (Mark 8:31-9:1; Harmony, p. 91). Though Peter had made a confession that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, he had not up to that time got into his mind the necessity for the death of Christ, as an expiatory sacrifice, and so when our Lord, after that confession, began to lead them into the new idea of the Messiah, that he was to be a vicarious offering, Peter's presumption manifested itself by tempting Christ to shun the cross. Now to show what impression that made on Peter's mind after Christ corrected him, read what he says in 1 Peter 1:18-19. Peter does not shun

the cross now. He has learned better, and he tells the people that they are purchased, not with silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.

11. The next incident that impressed his mind was his witnessing our Lord's transfiguration (Mark 9:2-13; Harmony, pp. 92-93). Peter's witness of that transfiguration showed himself yet to be a learner. He misconstrued the presence of Moses and of Elijah, and said, "Let us build here three tabernacles, one for Moses [we will still hold on to Moses] and one for Elijah, and one for Christ." And he was rebuked by a voice saying, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him!" You can't associate Moses and Elijah with Christ as equal teachers.

Now the true import of that transfiguration Peter did not get in his mind right then, but he got it later as we see from 2 Peter 1:16-18 : "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there was borne such a voice to him by the majestic Glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: and this voice we ourselves heard borne out of the heavens, when we were with him in the holy mount." Now, that transfiguration scene never passed out of Peter's mind. He understood it, at last, to be a miniature representation of the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. In other words, Christ's transfiguration is the way in which he will come in his glory.

In the next place, when he comes in his glory, his power is manifest in two directions: He raises the dead, represented by the appearance of Moses there, and he changes the living, represented by Elijah, who was one of God's Old Testament instances of transfiguration. That will be the power of his second coming, the instantaneous change of the living and the raising of the dead.

Then again Peter understood it to mean that the law led up to Christ. It was a schoolmaster unto Christ. That prophecy foreshadowed Christ as represented by Elijah. Now Peter got the right idea, at last, of the transfiguration. I am citing these cases to show what particular instances in his own life made the deepest impression on his own mind.

12. Now we go to' the next one, the Temple tax (Matthew 14:24-27; Harmony, p. 97). The facts of the case are these: The tax-gatherer came to Peter and said, "Does your Master pay Temple tax?" Now Peter, instead of referring that question to Jesus to be answered by him – he always thinks he is competent to speak for anybody – says, "Yes." They replied, "Well, then, pay it." And he did not have any money. Peter takes the case to the Lord, and the Lord shows him that his answer was an answer of ignorance; that there was no obligation resting upon him to pay that tax, but to get Peter out of his dilemma, he gives him directions to go cast a hook into the sea, take out a fish, and find the money in the fish's mouth to pay for Peter and Jesus. Now that lesson made an impression on Peter's mind, and so when we come to his letters he gives directions in 1 Peter 2:13-16 about honoring the powers that be, and the paying of tribute, and closes by saying substantially, "Even when you waive a right to do it, pay it through expediency, that ye be not evil spoken of." Like Paul, he never would waive duty or principle, but when it was a privilege or right, personal to himself, and by waiving it he could do some good, he would waive it. We may always waive a right, as Paul says, "Meat offered to idols is nothing, nothing to God. I know that everything that God has made is clean, if you receive it with thankfulness." But he says, "If my eating that meat offered to an idol will cause some weak brother to stumble and fall, I will never eat any meat offered to idols as long as I live." "All things are lawful, but not expedient." Now that is

the great lesson Peter got from the Temple tax business.

13. Let us now take up the lesson on how often to forgive a penitent brother (Matthew 18:20-35; Harmony, p. 101). A practical question came up in Peter's life when the Lord said, "If thy brother repent, forgive him." Peter says, "Lord, how often, seven times?" as if he had an idea there ought to be a limit to it. "You can't spend your life forgiving a fellow; now how often – seven times?" Jesus says, "Seventy times seven." That question of Peter's comes up in our lives. I heard a very distinguished deacon once make a snarling speech in a church conference when a certain man came before the church and asked forgiveness, and Dr. Burleson, with his customary suavity and with a strict adherence to Scripture, advised the church to forgive him. This deacon got up and said, "I would like to know what will be the end of that? We have spent a good part of our life as a church in forgiving that man, and I don't want to dig about him any longer." To show you how that thought impresses Peter, when he wrote his letter he says, "Have fervent love towards each other, remembering that love covers a multitude of sins." ''If you love anybody, you can keep forgiving him." A father here on earth will forgive his child for doing wrong, on penitence, a good many times more than he will forgive another one's child. He loves his child more; the relation is dearer. Now, the Lord wanted to teach Peter that when he got deep into the thought of the heart of God's love, there was no limit; that love would be like the two sons of Noah who took a mantle between them and walked backward and covered up the sins of their father. Love covers a multitude of sins.

14. The reward at the earth's regeneration (Matthew 19:27-30; Harmony, pp. 133-134). There Peter puts a question on rewards: "Lord, we have left all to follow thee, what shall we have?" "Now, we have given up everything; we are standing by you while all the world is turning away from you. What shall we have?" Our Lord replied to him that there should be a reward in this life equal to a hundredfold. Not in kind, but in other things. Then he goes on to speak of the true reward that would come at the regeneration – not the regeneration of man, but the regeneration of the earth. "You that have followed me in the regeneration shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. That is the reward ye shall have." But the thing that fastened itself most on Peter's mind was that idea of the regeneration, the restoration of all things, and that the eye of the Christian should be fixed rather upon rewards that followed that than upon anything that takes place here in time. Now to show how that impressed him, in his speech in Acts 3, he refers to it: "Whom the heavens must receive [referring to Jesus, who is gone into heaven] until the time of the restoration of all things." And in 2 Peter 3:7-13, he unfolds the whole doctrine of the regeneration of the earth. He says that the earth once passed through a purgation by the waters of the flood, and shall pass through a purgation by fire, and that there shall be a new heaven and a new earth, and he bases a strong exhortation upon the fact that "The heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll, and the elements shall be melted with fervent heat. Seeing, then, that all of these things shall be dissolved, what manner of men ought ye to be in all holy conversation, and godliness, and walk here in this time."

15. Our Lord's great prophecy (Mark 13:1-37 and Matthew 24:1-51, Matthew 25:1-46). That prophecy is found in Matthew 24:1-51, Matthew 25:1-46, but Peter's connection with it is stated in Mark 13:3 and the whole account of it may be seen in the Harmony, pages 160-168. Peter puts a question that calls forth that great prophecy, covering two whole chapters of Matthew, parts of Mark and of Luke, and made a lasting impression on the mind of Peter. To show something of the impression that it made upon his mind, I will cite an occasion. In 1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 2:5; and 2

Peter 3:1-6, that is, three times he brings out in his letters the reference to our Lord's great prophecy.

16. The lesson of Christ washing his feet. We find the account of that in John 13:7-10; Harmony, page 174. Notice what the points are: According to the Mosaic law, they had at their place of residence, or wherever they were abiding, performed the bodily ablution preceding the Passover, but they had to pass from that to the upper room, where they were to eat the Passover, and in passing from it they got their feet dusty, as they had only sandals on their feet, so that when they got into the house the custom was that at the door the sandals were taken off and their feet were washed and water was always provided for that. So that a man who had complied with the regular ablution prescribed by law, needed only to wash his feet, but as that was not a home where a host would provide for washing the feet of guests, but an upper room in which they were to make their preparations, the question came up: "Who shall do the feet washing?" there being no servant there to do it for them. "What about it?" Peter would say, "I cannot do it, because I am first of the apostles – primus inter pares." And there was a dispute among them while they were going there as to who was the greatest. They wanted to make some one small enough to wash feet.

Christ knew about their contention; it was a little thing on so great an occasion to cause a disturbance. So they concluded they would go in and recline at the table and eat the Passover without washing, whereupon Jesus arose and girded himself, taking a towel and a basin. They were reclining on their left elbow with their feet stretched out behind them. Christ walked around -the horseshoe table and began to wash their feet. Nobody said a word until he got to Peter. Peter said, "Lord, do you wash my feet?" "Yes." "Lord, you shall never wash my feet." Jesus said, "Well, if I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." "Then, Lord, wash me all over." The lesson there needed was the lesson of humility, service, and hospitality. That was what was needed and they were too proud to do it, whereupon Jesus, their Lord and Master, took the lowly part upon himself. Peter never forgot that. In his letter there is an evident reference to it) 1 Peter 5:5, where he exhorts against strife, and that we should gird ourselves with humility to serve one another.

17. This incident perhaps made more impression on Peter's mind than anything, and that was Christ's warning against Satan's sifting of Peter and the other apostles, and of Peter's failing, and his promising to pray for Peter that his faith fail not, and his direction to Peter that when he was converted from the error that he held that he would strengthen his brethren. That lesson appears in Luke 22:31-33; in Mark 14:29-31, and we must consider in connection with it the three denials of Peter that took place afterward. Those denials appear in Matthew 26:1-75; Mark 14:1-72; Luke 22:1-71; John 18:1-40, and the whole matter is set forth in the Harmony, pages 176-177; 193-195.

That transaction, that trial of Peter's faith, that sifting of Peter by Satan, that intercession of Christ which kept his faith from failing, the awful bitterness with which he regrets his fall – we see how it impressed him in the following passages. There is a reminder of it in the scene described in John 21:1-17. As Peter had denied Christ three times, Christ asked him the same question three times over. But we get Peter's own words in 1 Peter 1:6-7. He says, "The trial of man's faith is more precious than the trial of gold by fire." In 1 Peter 1:3-5 he strengthens the brethren as Christ commanded him to do. His error was that he could hold onto Christ himself, hence he says, "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." Before that he thought he was keeping himself. We see the thought again brought out in 1 Peter 5:5-10. He believes in a devil now, and

he warns them that "their adversary, the devil, goeth about as a roaring lion." He warns them against overconfidence: "God resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble." Just as if he had repeated the old proverb: "Pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall," and urges them to watch themselves.

18. Christ's resurrection and appearance to Peter. We find the account of it in Luke 24:33-35, and 1 Corinthians 15:5, and in the Harmony, page 224. If we read Peter's speech, recorded in Acts 2:22-36, and his great speech in Acts 3:11-16, and his great speech, in Acts 10:38-43, we see what a tremendous impression was made upon Peter's mind by the resurrection of Christ and his appearance to him.

19. Christ's words to Thomas, which Peter heard (John 20:24-29; Harmony, pages 225-226): "Thomas, you believe because you have seen. Blessed are those who, not seeing, believed." Peter quoted that very thing in his first letter (John 1:8). This shows what an impression it made on him.

20. The solemn lessons at the Sea of Galilee; Christ's questions and Peter's answers (John 21:1-17; Harmony, pp. 226-227). First, Peter had gone back to his secular business. Second, Christ meant him to be a fisher of men, and not of fish, and a shepherd of spiritual flocks. Third, Christ wanted proof of his faith in him, trusting him to take care of him and his love for him. That great lesson received a reflection in 1 Peter 5:2-4.

21. The prediction of the manner of his death (John 21:18-19; Harmony, p. 227, reflected in 2 Peter 1:14). In that letter he tells that the Lord made known unto him how he was to die.

22. The twenty-second incident is his baptism in the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:1-18), and the reflection of that in full in 1 Peter 1:12.

23. A class of incidents: Peter's suffering for Christ. He was arrested five times (Acts 4:3; Acts 3:18; Acts 5:26; Acts 12:3; John 21:18). He was in prison four times (Acts 4:3; Acts 5:18; Acts 12:3; John 21:18). He was beaten with stripes one time (Acts 5:40). He was crucified (John 21:19). Those were Peter's individual sufferings. To see how those sufferings impressed his mind, all we have to do is to read 1 Peter 1:6-7 and particularly 1 Peter 4:12-19.

24. A class of incidents: His contact with Paul. These contacts were Acts 9:26-30 construed with Galatians 1:18; Acts 15:1-29, construed with Galatians 2:1-10; Galatians 2:11-21. To see how these contacts with Paul impressed Peter, let us read 2 Peter 3:15-16.

25. His vision at Joppa. Several times in his letters he refers to what God has cleansed.

QUESTIONS 1. What Peter's second or greater confession?

2. What promise fulfilled here?

3. What Peter's understanding of the foundation of the church, and his relation to it? Proof?

4. What did be understand by "the keys of the kingdom"?

5. On what two occasions did he use these keys?

6. What place did he hold among the apostles to the circumcision? Proof?

7. Did he understand that his priority conferred upon him the papal jurisdiction as claimed by the Catholics? Give proof.

8. For what did Jesus severely rebuke Peter, and how does he show the impression it made on his mind?

9. How did Peter understand the transfiguration at first? Later?

10. What great lesson did Peter get out of the incident of the Temple tax?

11. How does Peter express his impression of Christ's teachings on forgiveness?

12. Give Peter's elaboration of Christ's teaching on the regeneration of the earth, and rewards.

13. What reference in his letter to the incident of foot washing?

14. What event probably impressed him most, and what references to it in his letter?

15. Describe his sufferings for Christ by answering the following questions: (1) How many times arrested? (2) How many times imprisoned? (3) How many times beaten with stripes? (4) How did he die? (5) What impressions made on his mind by these sufferings, and where do we find them?

16. What the contacts with Paul, and what their impressions on him?

# 05.28. Analysis Of Hebrews And Our Lord's Sonships

XXIII ANALYSIS OF HEBREWS AND OUR LORD’S SONSHIPS

Before commencing the exposition of this remarkable letter, I wish to refer briefly to commentaries suitable to English students. I commend heartily Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown, brief but critical and trustworthy, though dissenting from it, however, in the persons to whom the letter is addressed. I commend very heartily "The Speaker’s Commentary." Its introduction is superb, indeed, the best I have seen, though I differ from this commentary as to the persons addressed in the letter. I commend, with some reservation, "The Pulpit Commentary," particularly its homiletical part. Farrar, in "The Cambridge Bible," is as usual sharp and erratic. Of course, as a radical critic, he dissents from authorship by Paul. Edwards, in "The Expositor’s Bible," is weak. In "The American Commentary," Kendrick follows the radical critics in his introduction, and gives an easy flowing translation of Hebrews. I have never regarded Kendrick as occupying the first rank on the matter of soundness of judgment in interpretation.

ANALYSIS OF HEBREWS 1. INTRODUCTION, answering the questions:

1. Who wrote it?

2. In what language?

3. Where written?

4. What the circumstances of the writer?

5. When written?

6. To whom?

7. The occasion, or circumstances of those addressed.

8. Of what group of letters is it a part, and what its place in the group?

9. What its character and style?

10. What its theme?

II. THE MEDIATOR OF THE NEW COVENANT IS THE SON OF GOD (Hebrews 1:1-9).

1. By eternal subsistence. In his pre-existence: (1) "The effulgence of God’s glory and very image of his substance." (2) "Through whom also he made the worlds." (3) "Upholding all things by the word of his power."

2. In his incarnation (1) "The Firstborn." "Made purification of sins."

3. In his resurrection (1) "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." "When be again bringeth his firstborn into the world." (2) "Sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high." "Thy

throne, O God, is forever and ever." (3) "Anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows."

III. SUPERIOR TO THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE (Hebrews 1:10-12)

1. He created and upholds it.

2. He is changeless; it changes.

3. He dissolves it by fire at his final coming (Hebrews 1:11-12, and 2 Peter 3:4-12), and recreates it (Revelation 21:1).

IV. SUPERIOR TO ALL OLD TESTAMENT PROPHETS AS REVEALER

1. Their revelation fragmentary, diverse, incomplete.

2. His revelation complete, and closes the canon of Scriptures.

3. It is a gospel of salvation – theirs a promise.

V. SUPERIOR TO ANGELS – GOOD AND BAD

1. To good angels: (1) In his threefold sonship he is the object of their worship. (2) In his expiation of sin. (3) In his inheritance. (4) In his enthronement. (5) In his anointing with the oil of gladness. (6) In their subordination of service. (7) In his confirmation of them for their fidelity in ministering to the heirs of salvation. (8) In his gospel as compared with the law disposed by them. (9) In the higher penal sanctions of his gospel over the penal sanctions of the law. (10) In the gospel's better accrediting than the law. (11) In his sympathetic priesthood. (12) In his becoming a brother to them whom they only serve.

2. To bad angels: (1) In his successful resistance to Satan's temptation, both in the desert and in Gethsemane. (2) In his complete victory over Satan and all his demons on the cross. (3) In delivering Satan's victims. (4) In his final judgment of them.

VI. GREATER THAN MOSES, MEDIATOR OF THE OLD COVENANT

1. The builder of the house greater than the house.

2. The Son in the house greater than the servant.

3. The house built by the Son greater than the house built by the servant.

4. Neither Moses nor the people led out of bondage by him ever reached the earthly Promised Land, but Jesus enters the heavenly promised land, saying, "Here am I and the children thou hast given me."

VII. GREATER THAN JOSHUA, THE CAPTAIN GENERAL OF ISRAELThe rest into which Joshua led his generation was imperfect and temporary, but Jesus entered the true rest or redemption.

VIII. THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH

Commemorating the rest after creation (Genesis 2:2-3), and commemorating the temporal deliverance from Egypt (Deuteronomy 5:4-15), and of the imperfect rest of Joshua (Hebrews 4:8), was nailed to the cross of Christ and blotted out (Colossians 2:14; Colossians 2:16-17), and

forever superseded by another day – the Christian’s sabbath – "sabbath-keeping" (Sabbatis mos) that remaineth to the people of God, commemorating the resurrection rest of Christ’s finished work of redemption (Hebrews 4:8-10).

IX. GREATER THAN AARON THE HIGH PRIEST

1. In descent from Judah, not Levi.

2. After the order of Melchizedek.

3. Sinless, whereas Aaron was a sinner.

4. Aaron died, but he ever liveth to intercede, and therefore is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God through him.

5. In sympathetic touch with his people.

X. THE GENERAL SUPERIORITY OF THE NEW COVENANT OVER THE OLD COVENANT (Heb. 8:5-10:18)

1. In its better promises.

2. In its better surety.

3. It is the substance of which the other was the shadow.

4. Written on the heart instead of tablets of stone.

5. In the dignity and intrinsic merit of its one great expiatory sacrifice, offered once for all.

6. This one expiation blots out sin and its remembrance; the multitude of the others, oft repeated, only passed sin over till this one came.

7. In the personal and experimental knowledge of God possessed by all members of the new.

8. All the members of the new are priests unto God, having a superior festival and better nonexpiating sacrifices (Hebrews 13:10-13; Hebrews 13:15-16).

9. The old broken repeatedly by one of the parties to it, and disregarded by the other.

10. The old in its city, its tabernacle, and all its appointments and sacrifices and priesthood and ritual and ordinances forever taken away. The new abideth forever, thoroughly kept by its surety, and so provides for all its members that they, when fully saved, will forever keep it.

XI. ALL THE WORTHIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TIMES

Won their victories by faith – the great first principle of the new covenant (Hebrews 11:1-40).

XII. THE ENCOURAGEMENTS TO A SUCCESSFUL RACE

Under the new far exceed those of the old (Hebrews 12:1-17).

XIII. THE OUTCOME OF THE NEW

Far better and more glorious (Hebrews 12:1-24).. The covenant argument has its climax in Hebrews 12:1-29 and closes at Hebrews 13:16. The Mediator argument finds its climax in Hebrews 13:8.

XIV. CLOSING WORDS (Hebrews 13:17-25). The one theme of this book is: Christian Jews should hold fast to the profession of their faith in Jesus Christ, steadily going forward to maturity, and not relapse into Judaism, because the new covenant, mediated by our Lord, forever supersedes, and on all points is infinitely superior to the old covenant given through the disposition of angels and mediated by Moses.

The argument and exhortation rest on the nature, person, and office of our Lord in relation to salvation, and on the excellencies of the new covenant mediated by him. So resting, the argument naturally commences with the dignity and worth of the Mediator as contrasted with all other intelligencies, and then develops the excellencies of his covenant. Jesus the Messiah is the one hero of the book from start to finish. The arguments, each followed by appropriate exhortation, commence with verse I, reach the climax as to the covenant in Hebrews 12:1-29, and close with the priesthood of all Christians and the superiority of their festivals and of their nonexpiatory sacrifices, at Hebrews 13:10; Hebrews 13:15-16. The climax on the Mediator is reached at Hebrews 13:8.

The Mediator of the new covenant is first presented to view in his threefold sonship to the Father:

1. The sonship of his pre-existence; i.e., prior to time and creation of the universe. He was the Son of God by eternal subsistence, or, as this book expresses it, "being the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance." The activities of this substance are thus expressed: "Through whom he also made the worlds," and his providence after their creation, "upholding all things by the word of his power." Eternity of being, creation, providence, set forth his essential deity and overthrow the false conceptions of the Gnostic philosophy concerning eons, which at this very time is one of the active causes tending to apostasy. On this point, as on others, the book fits into the pre-ceding letters of the first Roman imprisonment, rounding up their argument, and prepares for the interfitting of subsequent New Testament books. We cannot, except by violence to the system of correlated revelation, disrupt it from this connection. But it is the evident purpose of the book to connect his first sonship with the second and third sonships, reaching the climax of the argument as to Mediator in Hebrews 13:8 of the last chapter: Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and today, yea, and forever."

2. Son of God by procreation of the virgin Mary – his "firstborn." Compare Luke 1:35 and 2 Samuel 7:14. This chapter expresses the work of this sonship in four distinct offices.

(1) Prophet: "Hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son" (Hebrews 1:2).

(2) Both priest and

(3) expiating sacrifice: "When he had made purification of sins" (Hebrews 1:3). Other parts of the letter give elaborate details of his priesthood and vicarious sacrifice, which will be considered later.

(4) King: "I will be to him a Father and he will be to me a Son" (latter clause of Hebrews 1:5). This is a quotation from 2 Samuel 7:1-29. The verses immediately before it are: "When thy days are fufilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, that shall proceed out

of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever" (2 Samuel 7:12-13).

It is this promise to David which influenced him more than all other words of God to him, and evoked the matchless Psalms 72:1-20; occasioned the kingdom prophecies of Daniel Zechariah, and Micah, and the testimonies so elaborately set forth in the Gospel of Matthew, on the King and kingdom. But so far, the allusions are to the King and his birth, and in the setting up of his kingdom, and the constitution of his church before his death. It is the King building and establishing and not his reigning after his exaltation. The word, "firstborn," belongs to the second sonship, i.e., so far as it relates to his first coming into this world, and not "the bringing in again."

3. The Son of God by his resurrection: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." "And when he again bringeth in his firstborn into the world." The first passage, (Hebrews 1:5) first clause, is a quotation from Psalms 2:1-12, and by Paul himself, is expounded as applying to his resurrection at Acts 13:33. The other passage: "When he again bringeth in his firstborn into the world," needs careful consideration. It means that as he brought him first into the world by his incarnation – his birth of the virgin Mary – so he brought him into the world the second time at his resurrection. It means that when he died on the cross he left the world and his spirit ascended to the Father, as in Luke 23:46 – "And Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' and having said this he gave up the spirit."

Here arises a series of crucial questions: Where did the spirit of Jesus go when separated from his body, why did it go there, and how long did it stay there, and leaving there, where did it next go, and for what purpose, and how long did he remain at this second place, and for what purpose, and then where did he next go and why, and where is he now, and what doing, and how long will he remain, and then where will he go, and for what?

The answers are: His spirit went to heaven; he went there as High Priest to sprinkle on the mercy seat the blood shed on the cross and make atonement for sins. He remained there in the interval between his death and resurrection; he then returned to the earth for his glorified resurrection body, and remained on earth comforting and instructing his disciples for forty days, and then he again ascended to heaven, soul and body, and sat down at the right hand of God; was crowned King of kings and Lord of lords, and there he reigns as King and makes intercession as High Priest until his third and final advent to raise the dead and Judge the world and then turn over the kingdom to the Father.

Let us note very carefully the following points:

1. At his first advent he assumed the body of his humiliation to become the sacrifice for sin. At his second advent he assumed the body of his glory for reigning and interceding in heaven. At his final advent he will assume his mystical body, the church, for its glorification forever.

2. When his body died, his soul, negatively, (1) did not descend into (Gehenna) hell. His descent into hell on the cross, soul and body, during the three hours of darkness; (2) His soul did not go into hades considered as a place, in order to preach a gospel unto the wicked dead, nor to deliver Old Testament saints from a half-way prison, but, positively, according to Leviticus 16:1-34, entered heaven to make atonement in the holy of holies for offering and pleading the merit of his expiating blood. On that great day of atonement (Leviticus 16:1-34) there was continuous action.

Immediately after the death of the vicarious sacrifice, the high priest, with the warm blood, parted the veil which hid the holy of holies. This blood of the typical vicarious sacrifice cleanses the typical sanctuary and makes atonement. There is no halt in the proceedings; the action is continuous. So this letter will tell us how Jesus passes through the veil – that is, by the death of his body – and enters into the most holy place beyond the veil and cleanses with his own nobler blood the true sanctuary and makes atonement.

To make this clear, let us repeat: One of the greatest questions of New Testament theology is: How was the soul of our Lord employed in the interval between his death and resurrection? Some make hades an intermediate place between heaven and hell (Gehenna), divided into two compartments – paradise for the good, and Tartarus for the wicked. This they call "the middle life." They contend that all Old Testament saints are sidetracked in paradise, and that all the lost of Old Testament times are sidetracked in Tartarus until the final judgment and that the same disposition is now made of the souls of good and bad. See J. R. Graves'Middle Life,Bishop McTyiere's sermon inMethodist Pulpit,South, afterward regretted, as I am informed, and Bishop Hobart's (Episcopal) funeral sermon on a brother bishop, and the interpretation of the creed: He descended into hell (hades).

On this theory some contend, by a misinterpretation of 1 Peter 3:19-20; 1 Peter 4:6, that the disembodied soul of Christ, between his death and resurrection, was employed in preaching a saving gospel in Tartarus to those who perished in the flood. Others, citing apocryphal books, contend he entered into paradise and announced to the souls of the saints resting there the finishing of his work for their salvation, and that he took out with him, when he left, the souls of Abraham and other Old Testament saints. On similar lines is based the Romanist theory of purgatory. When we come to interpret 1 Peter 3:19-20; 1 Peter 4:6, all these theories will be examined in a special chapter. Just now our concern is to establish positively where he was and how employed in the interval between his death and resurrection.

The answer is suggested by his own words on the cross: "It is finished. Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." And he gave up the spirit, intensified by the recorded prodigy: "The veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom" (Luke 23:45) with this comment in our letter:

Which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is within the veil; whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. – Hebrews 6:19-20.

But into the second the high priest alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself and for the errors of the people: The Holy Spirit thus signifying that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest while the first tabernacle is yet standing. . . . But Christ having 'become a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. . . . For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us. – Hebrews 9:7-8; Hebrews 9:11-12; Hebrews 9:24.

Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus. – Hebrews 10:18-19.

Here it is evident that the veil which hid the holy of holies typified Christ's body. When his body died that veil was forever rent. Through this rent body he entered the heavenly holy of holies and there offered his own expiating blood an offering through the eternal Spirit, hence in Hebrews 12:22-24, the last glorious thing the Christian comes to is "the blood of sprinkling," not on his heart as applied by the Holy Spirit in regeneration, but that blood sprinkled on the mercy seat in the heavenly sanctuary.

It has been objected to this view that Jesus said to Mary after his resurrection: "I have not yet ascended to my Father," but that refers to his ascension in his glorified body, and not in his disembodied spirit. His body could not be raised until his spirit had made atonement in heaven, hence it said: "Now the God of peace who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus."

I once heard a preacher say that Jesus never sprinkled that blood on the mercy seat in heaven until his ascension in his risen body forty days after his resurrection as described in Acts 1:10. I asked him two questions:

1. "If the high priest in Leviticus 16:1-34 waited forty days after the sacrificial goat was slain to take the blood into the sanctuary?"

2. "How the body of Jesus could be raised until the blood of the covenant was on the mercy seat?"

It was through his rent body, not his risen body that our Forerunner reached that sanctuary. When he expiated sin on the cross it was necessary that he offer the blood in the sanctuary for atonement. So long as the blood remained at the cross it could not be made efficacious. It must be accepted to become a propitiation. The mercy seat was the place of propitiation. There-fore when his body died, his soul immediately passing through the veil – a rent body – entered into the heavenly sanctuary to make his expiation effective in that salvation of men. It was the culmination of the whole process of the work of his second sonship.

His third sonship starts at the resurrection. He was brought to life through the blood of the everlasting covenant accepted in heaven. This makes clear the passage which Milton misunderstood: "And when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world he saith: 'And let all the angels of God worship him.'" His soul was out of the world and in heaven. He must be brought into the world again to obtain and inhabit his risen and glorified body, which is his second advent) as our souls must come from heaven with him at his third and final advent, to obtain and inhabit our glorified bodies ( 1 Thessalonians 4:14). And as the angels had worshiped him in his third sonship – his risen and glorified humanity – God says, "Let all the angels of God worship him." You may rest assured that all of Psalms 2:1-12 and Psalms 110:1-7 apply to this third sonship as expressed in this first chapter and affirmed in Acts 4:23-28, and in many other New Testament passages.

I once had a friendly private controversy with a Campbellite who affirmed that there could be no law of pardon till Jesus became the Son of God, which took place at his resurrection, and therefore Acts 2:38 was the first law of pardon under the new covenant, and so all gospel cases of pardon must not be considered. I told him that his fallacy consisted in ignoring the second sonship, and

that in all his sonships sinners were pardoned, and that the plan of salvation was one plan from Abel to the final judgment, Hebrews 11:1-40 of this book abundantly shows. It is to this third sonship that his heirship and his anointing with gladness, and his session at God's right hand, all belong. He was appointed heir because of the reconciliation he accomplished in his second sonship, so our lesson declares (Hebrews 1:4), and the great passage in Php 2:6-11. So testify also Psalms 2:1-12 and Psalms 110:1-7. Equally clear also his anointing with gladness Hebrews 1:9; Hebrews 12:2, which will be considered more particularly in another connection.

3. Superior to the universe (Hebrews 1:10-12). We must note that in all the first two chapters the arguments connect with Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians in a demonstration against the Gnostic heresy concerning creation and eons. Here our Lord's pre-eminence over the universe appears from:

(1) He created it. (2) His providence upholds it. (3) His eternity and immutability. (4) He dissolves it at his will.

On this last point the reader will recall the process by which the chaotic matter of the earth was reduced to order (Genesis 1:6-10) by the creation of the atmosphere separating the waters above from the waters below, and then separating the waters below from the land, and how this process was reversed in bringing about the flood (Genesis 7:11; Genesis 7:17-24), and then renewed in restoring the old condition after the flood (Genesis 8:2-3). That was a memorable mutation, and showed God's control over the ordinary course of nature. He will recall his covenant with Noah, pledging continuity of the order of nature, and safeguarding against another water dissolution while the earth remaineth (Genesis 8:22; Genesis 9:8-17).

But here in our lesson is predicted a more remarkable mutation – a dissolution by fire (Hebrews 1:11-12). And no reliance on what is called "the settled course of nature" will avail against this dissolution. Soon after this letter Peter wrote to the same people his great argument on the same line, (2 Peter 3:1-13), and reminded the Christian Jews of Asia Minor of this very letter of Paul (2 Peter 3:14-16). Jesus is sovereign over nature's course, which he established, and in it brings mutation at his will.

4. Greater as a revelator than all the Old Testament prophets (Hebrews 1:1-2):

(1) In all his sonships he is a revelator of the Father – the visible of the invisible God. The effulgence and image in his first sonship, so in his second sonship (John 14:8-9), and so in his third sonship.

(2) In the teaching of his prophetic office. Their revelation was fragmentary, infrequent, diverse, incomplete (Hebrews 1:1-2), and often beyond their own understanding (1 Peter 1:10-12).

(3) His revelation illumines theirs, dispels its mysteries, and completes the canon of the Scriptures.

(4) It unfolds in panorama the events of all time touching the kingdom of God, until the great culmination. (See Revelation 1:1, and throughout the book.)

QUESTIONS 1. What commentaries named on this book, and how commended?

2. Give the main points of the author's analysis.

3. What is the theme of this book?

4. On what does the argument and exhortation rest?

5. How does the argument naturally commence, what does it develop, who the hero of the book, and what the terminals of the several arguments?

6. What is the threefold sonship of Jesus Christ, the Mediator of the new covenant?

7. What is his work in the first sonship, and how expressed?

8. Against what heresy are the first two chapters especially directed, with what preceding letters does this argument connect, and into what subsequent New Testament books by other writers does it fit?

9. What arthe activities of our Lord in his second sonship?

10. What are the activities of our Lord in his third sonship?

11. How many advents of our Lord into the world, and what the purpose of each?

12. What was Jesus doing between his death and resurrection?

13. What heresies concerning the place where our Lord's soul went, and his work between his death and resurrection, and what the scriptural and other grounds relied on to support them?

14. What distinguished advocates of these theories?

15. State at length the author's argument as to what Jesus was doing between his death and resurrection?

16. In what particulars is our Lord superior to the material universe?

17. On what ground do men of science reject miracles?

18. Show from Genesis the process of the established order of things, and in one remarkable instance this reverse of this process, and its restoration.

19. What is the second mutation, according to this letter, awaits the heavens and the earth, and what the means of its accomplishment?

20. Prove from Peter in a letter subsequent to this how men's reliance on the continuity of the order of nature will be swept away by this second mutation.

21. Show how in this letter of Peter to the same people addressed in Hebrews, he identifies this letter as Paul's.

22. In what particulars is our Lord superior to Old Testament prophets?

# 06.00. STUDIES IN ROMANS

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935

I. INTRODUCTION I. HOW WAS CHRISTIANITY ESTABLISHED IN THE CITY OF ROME?

Doubtless many Jews from Rome attended the annual feasts in the time of our LORD and became, to some extent, acquainted with the issue between our LORD's kingdom and the rulers in Jerusalem. It is certain that among the great number of Jews gathered together from various nations, Roman-Jews and proselytes heard Peter's great sermon on the Day of Pentecost, some of whom doubtless were converted on that day. Through these converts, on their return, the Gospel may have been carried to Rome.

It is much more probably that Stephen's ministry may have sent converts to Rome, particularly after the dispersion following Saul's persecution. We, at least, note in the salutation of this letter certain kindred of Paul who were in CHRIST before him. This very fact may account for the bitterness and madness of Paul's persecution of the church, since under Stephen's mighty power a breach had been made into his family circle. The kindred, we know, were in Rome at the time this letter was written.

How did Paul come to know so many people in Rome? Paul's acquaintance and friendship with Aquila and Priscilla, banished from Rome by Claudius, could increase his knowledge of the personnel of Roman Christians. Moreover, his great meetings held in Syria, Cilicia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia necessarily brought many Romans, both Jews and Gentiles, under the influence of his ministry. Hence, we note in this letter salutations to his converts in Asia. The travel and traffic to and from Rome along the lines of the great Roman roads, extending to the boundaries of the empire, would continually enlarge Paul's knowledge of the Christians at Rome whether Jews or Gentiles. In this natural way we account for the intimate personal salutations at the close of this letter.

II. NO CHURCH, BUT CHURCHES

There was no central church at Rome. They had no common meeting-place, but there were several churches meeting in private houses; at least three, we may gather from this letter, particularly the one in the house of Aquila and Pricilla. Hence, the letter is not addressed to the church at Rome, but to all the faithful in Rome. In accounting for the establishing of Christianity here we must not lose sight of the labors of Christian women, whom Paul calls fellow workers, so manifest in the salutation.

III. PETER NOT THE FOUNDER It is a false tradition that makes Peter the founder of Christianity at Rome and the first bishop of the church there. As we see from this letter, there was no central church and there was only a possibility of Peter's indirect influence through his Pentecostal

sermon. Stephen's influence in this direction is more to be credited than Peter's and Paul's much more than either of them. Aquila and Priscilla should have the credit of establishing the first church there, and the noble Christian women saluted by Paul share the honors with them. The Romanists indeed contend that Peter went to Rome immediately after the events recorded in Acts 12:1-18, and remained twenty years. But this contention contradicts the Scriptures, for we find him soon thereafter at the council, Acts 15:1-41, and still further afterwards at Antioch, Galatians 2:11, and it may be inferred from 1 Corinthians 9:5 that Peter was at that time traveling as an apostle to the circumcision. And as late as his first letter we find him in Babylon where were many Jews. That he was not at Rome when Paul wrote this letter is evident from the absence of any salutation to him among so many; nor was he there when Paul arrived more than two years later as a prisoner. There is no reference to him as being in Rome in the letters of either the first or last imprisonment there of Paul.

It has also been contended that the household churches cited by Paul in this letter were only worshiping and not organized bodies, but this is contrary to the meaning of the word "church," and also to the uniform apostolic method of ordaining elders in every congregation and otherwise fitting them up for housekeeping. They were not like cattle men on the range marking, branding and letting loose.

IV. THE AUTHOR, THE DATE, THE PLACE

Paul's authorship has never been seriously questioned by the scholarship of Christendom. The letter avows it in the beginning, and every internal evidence and all its relations to Galatians and Corinthians support it. The date is largely determined by its relation to Corinthians and Galatians. In II Corinthians and Galatians he replies to a challenge of his apostolic authority with the internal evidence overwhelmingly in favor of Romans following Galatians, Romans being developed from Galatians. As Ephesians, the more general discussion, follows Colossians, so Galatians, being an off-hand, fiery, impulsive letter, is followed by Romans, a calm, deliberative enlargement. The parallels between the two letters are very striking and abundant. The reader may find in Lightfoot a discussion of these remarkable parallels.

So, we may say that Paul wrote this letter from the house of Gaius at Corinth about 58 A.D. Doctor Robertson's argument for this date in his Student's Chronological New Testament is very fine. Lightfoot's argument from internal evidence of the relative order of Corinthians, Galatians and Romans is extraordinarily strong.

V. OCCASION AND PURPOSE The occasion is evident from the letter itself. He is the guest of Gaius in the City of Corinth. He has concluded his labors in those parts, and is about to make his final visit to Jerusalem, carrying the alms for the poor saints which he has gathered in the great collection in Macedonia, Achaia and Asia minor. After this Jerusalem visit he purposes a tour into Spain via Rome. To prepare the way for this forthcoming visit to Rome, he wrote this letter, having an opportunity of sending it by Phoebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, the eastern Corinthian seaport. But the purpose of the letter goes far beyond the occasion. The attack on his apostolic authority, and the very heart of his Gospel, by the Judaizing Christians whom he has been resisting locally and in a somewhat off-hand manner in his letters to the Corinthians and Galatians, he now realizes to be not only more than a local matter, more than a personal attack on his authority, but an incorrigible far-reaching, fundamental assault on the whole plan of salvation

by grace. Impulsive, off-hand and local replies do not meet the exigencies of the situation. There must be a calm, dispassionate and elaborate exposition of the whole plan of salvation sufficient for every emergency and for all time to come. Such a discussion would likely accomplish the greater good and attain the wider circulation if addressed to the saints at the imperial capital, for which as a center radiated influences to all the circumference of the world. Moreover, this very discussion, forwarded at once to Rome, might anticipate and forestall the Judaizing tendency steadily moving westward from Jerusalem. Hence, there is nothing local in his argument.

VI. THE NATURE AND CONTENT The concluding part, with its personal salutations, might well be left out of copies sent abroad, as we actually find to be the case in some manuscripts. Hence, while it is a letter, it is much more than a letter -- it is a doctrinal treatise, a veritable body of systematic theology. While Ephesians, developed from the more local letter to the Colossians, is of the nature of a general circular, and in this respect somewhat resembling this letter, and while Hebrews bears resemblance in that it is an elaborate discussion of the two covenants, yet addressed to Christian Jews only, this letter is unlike anything else in the New Testament.

It is the most fundamental, vital, logical, profound and systematic discussion of the whole plan of salvation in all the literature of the world. It touches all men; it is universal in its application; it roots, not only in man’s creation and fall, but also in the timeless purposes and decrees of GOD before the world was, and fruits in the eternity after this world’s purgation. It considers man as man and not as Jew or Greek.

It considers law, not as expressed in statute on Mt. Sinai, but as antedating it and inherent in the divine purpose when man was created in the image of GOD.

It considers sin, not as ceremonial defilement, nor as an overt act, but as lawlessness of spirit and nature. It considers condemnation, not as personal to an individual offender because of many overt acts, but as a race-result from one offense of the one head of the race. Consequently, It considers justification, the opposite of condemnation, not as an impossible acquittal of a fallen sinner on account of his many acts of righteousness but as acting on ONE act of righteousness, through the Second HEAD of the race.

It considers, not an impossible morality coming from a corrupt and depraved nature, but a morality arising from regeneration, sanctification, resurrection and glorification. It considers, not the divine government and providence as here and there looking in on particular men, in special times and given localities, but as an all-comprehensive sweep from eternity to eternity reaching with microscopical minuteness every detail of the nature of man, and universal in its control of all forces, and all subsidiary to the original divine purpose. The GOD of this letter is GOD INDEED -- not a partial, local deity, not blind chance, not cold inexorable fate, but a purposeful, omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, infinitely holy and infinitely loving GOD.

I must not close this introductory chapter without calling attention to the connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament as shown by the great number of Old Testament quotations in the book. Genesis is quoted five times, Exodus four, Leviticus twice, Deuteronomy five times, I Kings twice, Psalms fifteen times, Proverbs twice, Isaiah nineteen times, Ezekiel once, Hosea twice, Joel once, Nahum once. Habakkuk once, Malachi once; and there are others more indirectly used. It is also notable that Paul sometimes quotes from the Hebrew, at other times from

the Septuagint, and sometimes follows the spiritual impulse in giving the true sense in his own words.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1.How was Christianity established in the City of Rome?

2. Why was not the letter addressed to the church at Rome? How was it addressed?

3. Who probably led in the establishment of the first church in Rome? What of Peter, Stephen and Paul in this connection?

4. Were the household churches cited by Paul in this letter organized bodies? Why?

5. Tell of the author, date and place of the letter.

6. What was the occasion of the letter?

7. What of the purpose of the letter?

8. In what sense was this letter "more than a letter"?

9. How must this letter rank among other letters of the New Testament?

10. Tell something of the scope of the discussion in the letter.

11. What of Old Testament influence on the Epistle?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. How Christianity Was Established in Rome II. No Church, but Churches III. Peter Was Not the Founder IV. The Author, the Date, the Place V. The Occasion and the Purpose VI. The Nature and Content ~ end of chapter 1 ~

Chapter 54

# 06.01. Paul's Salutation, Thanksgiving, Prayer (1:1-17)

II. PAUL'S SALUTATION, THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER

Romans 1:1-17 The theme of this letter is found in Paul's own words: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith." This theme condensed is, The Gospel Plan of Salvation. But some one asks, "Why not 'Righteousness of God' the theme?" Because this righteousness is only the means to the great end -- "salvation."

I. THE SALUTATION (Romans 1:1-7) We gather from the salutation the following things:

1. The writer: "Paul."

2. Those addressed: "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints"; that is, Christians.

3.The salutation itself: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." The writer is particularly described, (1) in his status as a "servant of Jesus Christ," (2) in his office, as "called to be an apostle," (3) in his ordination, as "separated unto the gospel of God," (4) in the direct object of his work, as "for obedience to the faith among all nations," including the Romans themselves: "Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ," (5) in the ultimate reason for his work, as "for his name." His "gospel of God" is described, (1) as "promised afore by his prophets," (2) as recorded "in the holy scriptures," (3) as "concerning his Son." That Son is described thus: (1) "made of the seed of David according to the flesh," (2) "And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," (3) as our MESSIAH and LORD, (4) as the author of "grace and apostleship."

II. THE THANKSGIVING (Romans 1:8) The ground of thanksgiving is thus expressed: "That your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world." This universal proclamation of the faith of the Roman Christians may be easily accounted for. Rome was the world's capital and center of governmental unity. To it and from it, over the great military roads and ship lines, were constant tides of travel and traffic, so that a whisper there reached the boundaries of the empire. To Paul, at least, working along these roads or sailing over these sea-courses there came continual news of the progress of the Gospel there. There were his kindred, his converts, his acquaintances from many lands, with whom he had constant communication.

III. THE PRAYER AND ITS REASon (Romans 1:9-15) This prayer is thus expressed: ". . . if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God to come unto you." It is described:

1. As sincere: "God is my witness,"

2. As unceasing: "without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers," and so forth.

3. The reasons for this prayer are: (1) to impart some spiritual gift looking to their establishment, (2) for mutual comfort in each other's faith, (3) that he might have some fruit in them as in other Gentiles, (4) because he was a debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians, wise and foolish, (5) because he was ready to preach at Rome as well as elsewhere, (6) he had been hindered in his purposes to visit them hitherto: "For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming unto you" (Romans 15:22), (7) he was not ashamed of the Gospel in any crowd.

4. The following conclusions may be drawn from this prayer: (1) That he counted Rome in the sphere allotted to him. (2) That on account of its central and political position as the world's metropolis, its strategical importance as a radiating mission base surpassed all others. (3) That the arch enemy of the Gospel understood this importance as well as Paul and, so far, had barred him out of the field. Hence, the necessity for this prayer. Twice in this letter he refers to this hindering of his purpose to come to them (Romans 1:13 and Romans 15:22) and in 1 Thessalonians 2:18 we find that Satan is the hinderer: "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us." (4) We learn from Acts 23:11 that it was the LORD's will for him to visit Rome according to this prayer, which says, "By the will of God": "And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." Thus we see Satan and his emissaries opposing Paul's approach to Rome, while Paul was longing and praying to get there; GOD's will over-ruling Satan's will in answer to the prayer. And he prayed "if by any means," leaving that also to GOD, and we learn that he went in bonds: "And when it was determined that we should sail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners unto one named Julius, a centurion of Augustus' band" (Acts 27:1) and "For this cause therefore have I called for you, to see you, and to speak with you: because that for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain" (Acts 28:20). (5) This prayer with its reasons opens the way to a statement of the great theme of the letter.

IV. THE THEME OF THE LETTER (Romans 1:16-17) This theme involves the answer to these questions:

What is the Gospel, to whom addressed and on what terms, what its power, and what the salvation into which it leads; how is it a power to this end, what the righteousness revealed, what the meaning of "from faith to faith," and what the varied use of the quotation from Habakkuk. The Gospel is the whole story of CHRIST's mediatorial work as PROPHET, SACRIFICE, PRIEST, KING, LEADER, and JUDGE, addressed to the whole human race, whatever the nationality, sex or social condition, on the terms of simple faith in JESUS as He is offered in the Gospel, the power of which is GOD Himself; that is, GOD the HOLY SPIRIT. The salvation unto which it leads consists generally in what it does for us, what it does in us, what it leads us unto.

1. Salvation -- What It Does for Us It provides for us justification, redemption and adoption.

(1) Justification is the declaration of a competent court that one tried before it is acquitted. In a word it is the acquittal of a man at the bar of GOD. In this part of the letter Paul uses salvation in the sense of justification. Man is saved when he is justified. Later we will find the word "saved" used in a larger and completer sense. When I am justified before GOD, that delivers me from the wrath to come. It delivers from the guilt of sin.

(2) Redemption is the buying back of what has been sold. Paul tells us in this letter about the redemption of the soul, the buying back of the soul; later he tells about the redemption of this earth on which man lives.

(3) Adoption, like the two words already used, is a legal term. We are not naturally children of GOD; we get into the family of GOD by adoption. He adopts us into his family. Adoption is that legal process by which one, not naturally a member of the family, becomes legally so. It confers all the rights and blessings of actual sonship.

2. Salvation -- What It Does in Us Let us look at salvation as done in us.

(1) As to the soul -- What are the processes? They are regeneration and sanctification. What is regeneration? Regeneration is giving a holy disposition to the mind. The carnal mind is enmity against GOD, not subject to His law, neither can be made subject to His law. Man in his natural state hates GOD, hates truth, hates light. It is not sufficient that a man be redeemed from the curse of the law, or the wrath of the law, and be acquitted. It is necessary that he have a mind in harmony with GOD. That occurs in us; GOD begins a good work in us, and continues it to the day of JESUS CHRIST. And that good work in us is expressed by regeneration and sanctification. Regeneration gives us a holy disposition, but the remnants of the flesh are still with us. Then sanctification commences and more and more conforms us to the image of JESUS CHRIST, as we go on from strength to strength, from glory to glory, from faith to faith. That is what it does in us; it regenerates and sanctifies us. The salvation in us, referring to the soul, is consummated just as soon as the soul gets through its discipline and is freed from the body. On the other side we see the spirits of the just made perfect. That is the end of the salvation as far as the soul is concerned.

(2) As to the body -- But salvation takes hold of the other part of the man -- his body that lies mouldering in the ground. GOD provided in the Garden of Eden for the immortality of the body. When sin expelled the man and he had no longer access to that tree, his body, of course, began to die. Salvation must save that body. That comes in the resurrection which he discusses in this letter. In the resurrection these things take place:

First, the body is made alive, quickened. Second, it is raised. Third, it is glorified. And glorification means what? What these words say, "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." That is the entire man, is it not? I said it was the complete and everlasting deliverance of the entire man, soul and body. Then fourth, we must bring those two saved parts together. So CHRIST brings the spirits with Him. He raises the dead, and the spirits go back into the old house, now renovated and glorified. We have not yet come to the end. That is what is done for us, and what is done in us, but it is not the deliverance unto that inheritance that is reserved in Heaven. That is Paul’s idea of salvation as it is presented in this letter, and it is never less than that.

3. Salvation -- What It Is Unto

It is unto something as well as from something. We have seen what GOD does for us: He justifies, He redeems, He adopts. We have seen what GOD does in us: He regenerates and sanctifies the soul and He raises the body in glory. Beyond this, He delivers us unto that inheritance that is

reserved in Heaven that the heart of man never conceived of -- the precious things that GOD has in store for those that love Him. Salvation cannot mean less than that. We cannot say that it is all of salvation, for the soul to be justified when the body is not saved; we cannot say the body is saved until it is raised from the dead and glorified. We cannot say that we are saved unto our inheritance until we get to it and enter into it. Our salvation, therefore, may be spoken of as already accomplished: we have been saved: "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved)" (Ephesians 2:5). It may be viewed as in process: we are being saved: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God" (1 Corinthians 1:18). It may be thought of as future: we shall be saved: "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him" (Romans 5:9). So salvation is a big thing. Let us define it.

Salvation is the final, complete and everlasting deliverance of the sinner’s entire soul and body from the guilt of sin, from the bondage of Satan, and the deliverance of man’s habitat -- this old world -- from the curse upon it.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1.What is the theme of this letter in Paul’s own words?

2. What is the condensed theme?

3. What do we gather from the salutation?

4. How is his "gospel of God" described?

5. How is the Son described?

6. What is the ground of thanksgiving?

7. How may we account for the universal proclamation of the faith of the Roman Christians?

8. What is Paul’s prayer here?

9. Why this prayer?

10. What the conclusions from this prayer?

11. Analyze the theme of this letter?

12. What then is the Gospel?

13. To whom addressed?

14. On what terms?

15. What the power of the gospel?

16. Of what does the salvation unto which it leads consist?

17. Define this salvation, and explain fully each of the aspects of salvation, defining also the terms used.

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER Theme, The Gospel Plan of Salvation I. THE SALUTATION (Romans 1:1-7) 1.The writer, "Paul"

2.Those addressed -- all Christians in Rome 3.The salutation itself II. THE THANKSGIVING (Romans 1:8) III THE PRAYER AND ITS REASon (Romans 1:9-15) 1.Sincere 2.Unceasing 3.Reasons for it 4.Conclusions from it IV. THE THEME OF THE LETTER (Romans 1:16-17) 1. Salvation -- What it does for us (1) Provides justification (2) Offers redemption (3) Secures adoption 2. Salvation -- What it does in us (1) As to the soul a. Regenerates b. Sanctifies (2) As to the body a. Raises b. Glorifies 3. What it is unto An inheritance, which is undefiled and that fadeth not away ~ end of chapter 2 ~

***

Chapter 55

# 06.02. Universal Necessity of Salvation (1:18-2:16)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 III. THE UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION (As Shown in the Case of the Gentiles) Romans 1:18-32, Romans 2:1-16

Having considered in the preceding chapter the nature and meaning of salvation, we follow in the next two chapters the Apostle’s argument in showing the universal necessity of salvation. The argument applies to the whole human race, to man as man. In this chapter we have the case of the Gentiles.

I. SIN IS UNIVERSAL All men are guilty before GOD. They are all ungodly.

1. They are sinful in their nature -- They are unlike GOD and are therefore an offense to GOD in their nature.

Originally man was made in GOD’s image and likeness: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" (Genesis 1:26). This original state of man shows his likeness, his dominion and his commission. Men lost this image and likeness through sin; they are out of harmony with the CREATOR. They need salvation, or deliverance.

2. They are sinful in their deeds -- Their deeds are evil, proceeding from the evil nature within. Their sin of deeds consists of both omission and commission. They have failed by way of omission to exercise their dominion and to execute their commission. Not only have they thus failed, they have actively done contrary to both. The wrath of GOD has been revealed from Heaven against their sin of nature and of deed. This wrath is the assessed penalty of violated law.

3. Sin is lawlessness -- What is law?

We can never understand sin until we comprehend law. We cannot show that sin is universal without developing an understanding of the law which sin violates. What then is law? In its last analysis law is the intent or purpose of the CREATOR in bringing a being into existence. GOD’s intent in bringing man into existence is set forth in Genesis 1:26-31 :

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth

upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so. And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

It is written indelibly in our nature. It inheres in the very constitution of our being. As a principle it antedates any particular formal statute. Law does not become law through enactment or legislation. Rather, law is expressed in enactments and statutes. Indeed, all statutes are but expressions of antecedent, inherent, constitutional law. The multitude of statutes are but expressions of the law principles in the constitution of nations and states.

Sin therefore is lawlessness, or any lack of conformity with law, whether in nature or in omission or commission of deed. An omission of duty and a commission of sin are but symptoms or expressions of a sinful nature. As our LORD said: "But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies" (Matthew 15:18-19). As he again said: "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" (Matthew 7:16-18). "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by his fruit" (Matthew 12:33). That preacher therefore had no adequate conception of sin who defined it as, "The wilful transgression of a known law." The greatest of all sin is a sin of nature. It is not dependent in obligation on our knowledge.

4. Law Binds in Spite of Ignorance.

Paul says, "For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified." Both natural and spiritual laws bind and have penalty notwithstanding our ignorance. The ignorance itself is sin, or may be a result of sin. And transgression is only one overt act of sin. It is equally sin to fall short of law or go beyond it, or to deflect from it. Righteousness is exact conformity with law. With this conception of law, and of sin, the Apostle speaks of its penalty, the wrath of GOD -- a wrath that is antecedent to its revelation. And yet this wrath is revealed.

II. GOD HAS GIVEN SUFFICIENT LIGHT GOD did not leave men ignorant of sin and sin’s penalty.

1. There are two books of this revelation: the book of nature in them, and the book of nature outside them.

(1) GOD has planted knowledge in them -- "The spirit of man is the candle of the LORD, searching all the inward parts of the belly" (Proverbs 20:27). As the natural eye is the lamp of the body, so the spirit is JEHOVAH’s lamp. "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" (Matthew 6:23). Man, therefore, by the very constitution of his being, has a knowledge of GOD, law, sin, and penalty.

(2) GOD has revealed law and penalty, outside of man, in nature -- But the Apostle argues a revelation of wrath outside of us and in the broad book of Nature. He says, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are

made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Romans 1:20). His deity and His everlasting power are "clearly seen" in the universe which is the work of His hands.

Yea, not only Nature, but Providence in Nature, as was said to Noah: "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease" (Genesis 8:22). And reaffirmed by this Apostle: "Nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from Heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14:17). Thus all nature in us or external to us, and GOD's marvelous providence, proclaim the knowledge of Him.

2. By way of summary, we show how the revelation of law is made both in us and in nature outside of us -- (a) In the very constitution of our being, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord."

(b) In the operation of the conscience, either accusing or excusing.

(c) In the order of the material universe which discloses the deity and power of the CREATOR.

(d) In GOD's continual government of the universe by His providence evident in the recurring seasons.

(e) In the appeal of all men to GOD's judgment for unrighted wrongs, and the invocation of His wrath upon the wrong-doer.

(f) In the social order of men established everywhere, whatever the form of government, through which men define and punish wrong.

(g) In the worship of all men everywhere in which by sacrifice in some form they seek to placate the offended Deity and appease His wrath.

(h) In their very idolatries, by which they seek to lower the Deity to their own level and even beneath their level, and in their veiling their pollutions under the cover of worship, they yet bear testimony to His Deity and their amenability to His judgment.

3. This natural light is sufficient, but not efficient -- This internal light which GOD gives is not a faint spark, but a great light. With every man in the world there is an internal sense of right and wrong. Men may differ among themselves as to what particular thing is right or wrong, but all have the sense of right and wrong. They are keenly alive to their rights and keenly sensitive to their wrongs. But there can be no right and wrong without some law to prescribe the right and prescribe the wrong. And there can be no law without a law-maker. And there can be no law without penal sanctions; otherwise, it would be no more than advice. And there can be no penalty without a judgment to declare it and a power to execute it. But every man knows that even an exact justice is not meted out in this world -- that many times the innocent suffer and the guilty triumph. Therefore, the conclusion comes like a conqueror, that there must be a judgment to come and a wrath to come.

It is this knowledge or consciousness of future judgment and wrath that makes death frightful to the evildoer. And it is this consciousness of amenability to GOD's future infallible judgment and inexorable wrath that restrains crime more than the dread of all human law and judgment. So it is demonstrated that there is in us a revelation of wrath against sin. But men's lives showed that

nature’s light, whether external, internal or providential, has no power to regenerate or sanctify, and no power to propitiate or justify. It could warn, alarm and condemn, but it could not save. It was a sufficient, but it was not efficient.

4. Hence, a plan is needed which will have power unto salvation -- Here I want to show the contrast between the light of nature and the light of the Gospel. Both are brilliant, but one of them is sufficient and the other is efficient. In Psalm 19 we have this language:

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork.

Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge." This is an abundance of light, and a sufficiency of light, but notice the contrast:

"The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul; The testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple."

(Nature’s light cannot help the fool).

Here it is the design of the Psalmist to put in contrast the light of nature and the light of GOD’s Word. In one of them the knowledge is sufficient; in the other the light is both sufficient and efficient.

Romans 1:32 affirms that there was sufficient knowledge so that GOD’s ordinance made such deeds as were enumerated worthy of death, and yet it declares that they themselves willfully disobeyed and consented to disobedience in others. I ask the reader to note particularly that it is very far from the Apostle’s thought to belittle the light of nature. He boldly avows its sufficiency, but in that it lacks efficiency there is necessity for another light which is "the power of God unto salvation." This revelation was sufficient to leave them without excuse because when they thus knew Him as GOD they were guilty of these sins:

(a) They glorified Him not as GOD.

(b) Neither were thankful.

(c) Became vain in their reasonings (imaginations).

(d) Darkened their senseless (foolish) hearts.

(e) Professing to be wise, they became fools.

(f) Became idolators, changing the glory of the uncorruptible GOD into an image made like corruptible man, birds, beasts, and creeping things.

III. MEN ARE "INEXCUSABLE"

Paul’s discussion continues the argument as to the universality of sin, and the necessity for the new and efficient revelation of Gospel light as follows: Having this sufficient natural light, sinners are "inexcusable" because they, as individuals and as society, pass judgment on others, not excusing them, and therein condemning themselves in all wrong-doing.

1. He starts out with the declaration in Romans 2:1 that whenever the individual man passes judgment on a fellow man for alleged wrong-doing, and whenever organized society passes

judgment on a member of society, that proves that they are inexcusable if they do wrong, since by their judgment they have established the principle of judgment. And in Romans 2:2 he advances to a new thought: "But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things." What is that judgment of GOD that we know so confidently? How do we know it? What is the knowledge? The knowledge there is the knowledge that comes from nature. His argument demands that from the light of nature in us and outside of us we know that GOD's judgment on such things as are enumerated in the first chapter is according to truth -- that the things there enumerated are wrong, and that when GOD punishes them the punishment is just.

2. In Romans 2:3 he asks this question: "And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" On what kind of reasoning shall a man who lives entirely apart from the Bible, and yet does claim light enough to pass judgment on the wrong-doer, escape the judgment of GOD? If the wrong is done to him by organized society, whether tribe or clan or nation or republic or a limited monarchy, no matter what the government is, that government holds some things to be wrong and assesses punishment worthy of death. "Now," he says, "do you suppose that you will escape the judgment of GOD? You certainly cannot." We have no hope from such light as is in nature, because in nature every violation of law receives a just recompense of reward -- every one, whether we know the law of nature or not. If a man puts his hand into the fire, it will burn him. If he takes poison, it will kill him. Confining our judgment to the law of nature, any hope that we may indulge and with which we may solace ourselves, is foolish, since we cannot escape the judgment of GOD.

3. He advances in the argument: "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" The thought here is that GOD doesn't punish every week -- that in the moral government of the world a long time sometimes elapses between the commission of a crime and its exposure, and in multitudes of cases exact justice is never rendered in this world. Paul asks that question because of GOD's method of delay in His final punishment. What is the reason of the delay? He says that it is from "the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering." GOD is good; GOD is patient; GOD bears a long time before He strikes. "Now are you going to despise that?" As the Apostle says "Not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance."

There you get at the real reason of GOD's delay in punishing in his moral government. There was no delay in the case of Adam. When he sinned, GOD made the inquisition. He called him to His bar at once. Since that time why does He not do that? Because that very day grace intervened, and man was put upon a grace probation, and the Gospel was preached that day in that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. And the throne of grace was set up that day. On the east side of the Garden dwelt GOD with the cherubim to keep open the way to the tree of life. This delay comes from His goodness, His forbearance, and His longsuffering and the reason for that goodness, forbearance, and longsuffering was to give man, though guilty and worthy of instant death, the opportunity to repent, not through anything in him, but through grace.

IV. GOD IN MERCY DELAYS PUNISHMENT The original penalty due to Adam's sin was suspended by the intervention of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST under a probation of grace. From that day all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, have been freed from the immediate execution of that divine wrath. There have been earthly judgments on wicked men, and chastisements on Christian

men, but the full penalty of the wrath of GOD has never yet been visited upon man. When a wicked man dies, he goes at once to hell, but if that were counted full execution of the divine penalty, that man would not have to leave hell to come and stand before the judgment of GOD. And if a Christian when he dies goes immediately to Heaven, that is not to be considered the full salvation of that man. The reason is that the body is not involved either in the case of the good man or the wicked man. When this final wrath of GOD is visited upon man, it is visited upon both soul and body.

1. The first reason for the suspension of the penalty under a covenant of grace, is that this gives space for repentance -- Peter and Paul both discuss that proposition. Paul discusses it here in the chapter where he says, "Not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Peter discusses it in his second letter where he says that we must construe the longsuffering of GOD toward sinners to mean salvation.

2. The second reason is that neither a good man nor a bad man can thoroughly understand until the Judgment Day the reasonableness of GOD’s government and be constrained, whether condemned or saved, to admit the righteousness of the sentence pronounced -- no man will realize the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the exceeding richness of GOD’s forbearance, nor the fulness of GOD’s grace in fixing the final decision until that day.

We know now only in part, but then we shall know as we are known. The wicked, as quick as a flash of lightning, will see the exceeding sinfulness of all their past sins. In the case of every man before his conversion he realizes that the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it? "I, the Lord." He is the only one. It is the easiest thing in the world for a man, when he looks at his good qualities, to take a telescope and look through the little end of it and see them more in number and larger in bulk than they really are. But he reverses that telescope to look at his faults, and sees them infinitesimally few and small, and by the same strange power by which he sees double in the first group, he sees his faults blend and become fewer in number. He sees one star with the naked eye where there are two, and just a splash in the milky way where there are ten thousand distinct worlds. By a kind of "hocus pocus" he takes up his little handful of evil deeds and begins to apologize for them, and finally stands off and says, with complacency, "Now, LORD, see my record. You can see how my good preponderates over the evil." Right at that time comes the flashing of the supernal light of infinite holiness upon the scales and presto! What a change! These good deeds that look so mountainous and multitudinous begin to diminish in size and number and shrink and pulverize until they become like fine dust. One breath of wrath blows them away like powder. On the other side, that little infinitesimal group of evil begins to multiply and magnify and swell and tower and blacken until it is a great mountain range, peak after peak, oozing with the putrid poison of that abominable thing which GOD hates -- SIN. So in a sense never before, all will then admit that by the deeds of the law no man can be justified.

3. I want to add a third reason -- No man is competent to take account of the evil of his deeds or the good of his deeds until he sees the end of their influence. It is impossible for a man to do anything that terminates in himself, but it will surely touch everybody connected with him -- Father, mother, brother, sister, friend. Not only so, but after it has cast its gloom over all the circle of those that are nearest to him, by ties of blood, there is that awful power of action and reaction that

carries it on till the judgment day.

If we drop a little pebble into a placid lake -- a stone no larger than the end of the finger -- by the power of action and reaction the tiny ripples begin to radiate until they strike the utmost shores of that lake. So time is the ocean into which our deeds are dropped, and the influence of our deeds in their radiating wavelets in every direction never stops until it strikes the shores of eternity. How then can any judgment inflicted now make that man see? Those that are in hell today do not see it. Those in Heaven today do not see it.

It will take the light of the Judgment Day to bring out the full realization, and when that time comes there will be one instantaneous and universal dropping upon the knees. Every knee shall bow, all together -- all the lost in hell and all the saved in Heaven, and every tongue shall confess. When a man is just about to turn around under the "depart" of GOD's final condemnation of soul and body and go into hell forever, before he goes he will say, "LORD GOD, in my condemnation thou art just."

Judgment of man here upon this earth is based upon uncertain proof. How many times the most notorious criminal is acquitted simply from the lack of legal evidence! There is moral conviction in the minds of the judge and the jury that he is guilty, but the proof does not show it in a legal way. In that day all evidence will be in hand, and the law construed and vindicated with even and exact justice. There can be no suborning of testimony, no blindfolding the eyes of the judge with a bribe, no reticence on the part of witnesses as to what they saw or heard. The evidence will be complete, not only to GOD, but, as I have said, to man. If ever any Christian allows himself to indulge in feelings of pride and thinks that in the partnership between him and GOD his "I" is a capital letter and GOD is spelled with a small "g," it will not be that way up there.

He will know that his salvation is not of works, but from its incipiency in GOD's election to its consummation in the glorification of his body, that athwart the whole long-extended golden chain of salvation shall be written in the ineffaceable letters of eternal fire, "SALVATION IS OF GRACE," and across the whole dark descending stairway to eternal hell, over every step of it, in letters of fire, "MAN'S DAMNATION IS OF HIMSELF!"

V. "ACCORDING TO MY GOSPEL"

Now comes another strange thought -- that judgment in the last day will be, says Paul, "according to my Gospel." The judgment of the heathen will be according to this gospel, and it will be well for him, even if a lost soul, that he be judged according to this Gospel. There cannot be a case of a lost man in which it should be better for him to be judged by somebody else than JESUS. Here is a little baby that has never personally committed any sin. It dies one hour from its birth without ever lisping its mother's name. It has inherited sinfulness of nature. It died, in the sense of condemnation, when Adam sinned. To put it as an extreme case, let us call it a heathen baby. Suppose he was not judged by the gospel. He would be forever lost. But the Gospel points to another HEAD, JESUS CHRIST the Second ADAM. The death of JESUS CHRIST avails for the salvation of that one whose condemnation is only on account of Adam's sin and only on account of inherited depravity. If it were not for the Gospel, that child would perish throughout eternity, because the law could not save him.

All the heathen children who die before they reach the years of personal accountability are saved. Take the adult heathen. Even if he be lost, it is better for him that he be judged according to the Gospel than merely according to the law of nature. There is never any mercy in the law of nature. In the light of grace Paul, speaking of the heathen, says: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent." In CHRIST He bears with the sins of the heathen in a way that the law could not bear. Let a baby and a man stick their hands into the fire. The fire burns the baby who is ignorant the worst because it is most tender. But when JESUS judges the heathen, He judges them more kindly, because they lacked knowledge, and though the man be lost forever, there are degrees in hell. Not all men who go to hell will have the same extent to suffering. It is not like running all the sentences into one mold so that they will all come out alike, as candles, in length and thickness; but according to light and opportunity JESUS will judge. The servant that knows not his master’s will and does it not, shall be punished with few stripes. If there is one principle of the final judgment of JESUS CHRIST that is transcendently above any other principle, it is this principle: that the judgment will be rendered according to the light, the privilege, the opportunity.

Here the words of JESUS, "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city." Why? Because these had great light; those little light. That is why it is a benefit to a lost man to be judged by JESUS CHRIST. That is one of the sweetest thoughts that ever creeps into my mind -- that JESUS shall be my judge. No wonder David, when GOD put the alternative before him, "Would you rather fall into the hands of your enemies or into the hands of the living GOD," said, "LORD GOD, let me fall into thy hands. Do not leave my chastisement to be assessed by men." I never think of GOD’s judgment except with satisfaction. Even when I am thinking about things I have done that are wrong, I am glad that GOD is to be the JUDGE.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1. How does the argument for the universal necessity of salvation apply to the whole human race?

2. What are the four arguments applied to the Gentiles?

3. What is ungodliness?

4. What is unrighteousness?

5. What is the consequent wrath of GOD?

6. What is law?

7. What other use of the term "law" in this letter?

8. What then is sin?

9. What is penalty?

10. How is the wrath of GOD revealed?

11. What must follow the fact of right and wrong?

12. When and why a judgment of wrath?

13. Why were the Gentiles left without excuse, and of what sins were they guilty?

14. What the consequences?

15. By way of review what have we found: (1) As to the theme of this letter? (2) As to the ground of salvation? (3) As to the necessity for this salvation? (4) As to how this revelation of wrath is made in us and out of us?

16. Having this light, why are sinners inexcusable? Explain, "But we are sure," and so forth, Romans 2:2.

17. What is GOD's method of punishment, Romans 2:4?

18. What is the reason for the delay?

19. According to what?

20. What is each case?

21. What the extent of punishment?

22. What part does the light a man has play?

23. Why a judgment at the end of the world?

24. How is judgment to be by the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST? Illustrate.

25. What the transcendent principle of the judgment?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. SIN IS UNIVERSAL 1. All are sinful in nature 2. All are sinful in deeds.

3. Sin is lawlessness 4. Law binds in spite of ignorance II. GOD HAS GIVEN SUFFICIENT LIGHT 1. Two books of revelation

(1) Within us

(2) Without us 2. How this revelation is made 3. This natural light is sufficient, but not efficient 4. Hence a plan with power is needed III. MEN ARE "INEXCUSABLE"

1. By judging, men have established a principle of judgment 2. Cannot escape judgment of men, much less of GOD 3. Or, despisest thou GOD's goodness IV. GOD IN MERCY DELAYS PUNISHMENT 1. Gives space for repentance 2. Man cannot understand until the Judgment Day 3. Must see the end of our deeds V. "ACCORDING TO MY GOSPEL."

~ end of chapter 3 ~ ***

Chapter 56

# 06.03. Necessity of Salvation pt.2 (2:17-4:25)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 IV. THE UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION (Concluded) (As shown in Case of Jews) Romans 2:17-29, Romans 3:1-31, Romans 4:1-25

Another point in Romans 2:1-29 is that under the law, being a Jew outwardly could not save a man. The real Jew is one inwardly, and his circumcision is of the heart. He must be regenerated, and the publication of the grace plan ran side by side with that law plan, even in the Old Testament.

I. GOD HAD BUT ONE PLAN OF SALVATION FROM THE BEGINNING 1. That leads to some questions:

(1) What advantage has the Jew? -- If, being naturally a Jew, and circumcised according to the Jewish law, and keeping externally the ritual law, did not save him, as Romans 3:1-31 opens -- what advantage then hath the Jew? The answer to that is that to the Jews were committed the oracles of GOD, and they had a better chance of getting acquainted with the true plan of salvation.

(2) Then what if some of these Jews were without faith? -- That does not destroy the advantage; they had the privilege and some availed themselves of it.

(3) Does that not make the grace of GOD of none effect? -- In other words, if GOD is glorified by the condemnation of unbelievers, how then shall the man be held responsible? His answer is, "God forbid," for if that were true, how could GOD judge the world? That supposition destroys the character of GOD in His judgment capacity. If GOD were the author of sin and constrained men by an extraneous power to sin, He could not be a judge. All who hold the Calvinistic interpretation of grace must give fair weight to that statement. Whenever GOD does judge a man, His judgment will be absolutely fair.

A party of preachers were discussing election and predestination. I asked the question, "Do you believe in election and predestination?" The answer was, "Yes." "Are you ever hindered by what you believe about election in preaching a universal Gospel? If you have any embarrassment there, it shows that you have in some way a wrong view of the doctrine of election and predestination." A young preacher of my county went to the wall on that thing. It made him practically quit preaching, because he said that he had no Gospel except for the sheep. I showed him how, in emphasizing one truth according to his construction of that truth, he was emphatically denying another truth of GOD.

(4) That brings up another question: If the loss of the sinner accrues to the glory of GOD, why should he be judged as a sinner? -- A supposition is made. Under that view, would it not be well to say, "Let us do evil, that good may come"? There were some slanderous reports that such was Paul’s teaching. He utterly disavows such teaching or that any fair construction of what he

preached tended that way.

2. We come now to his conclusion of the necessity of the Gospel plan of salvation -- He bases it upon the fact that under the law of nature, providence and conscience, under the law of Sinai, under any form of law, the whole world is guilty.

There is none righteous, no, not one;

There is none that understandeth, There is none that seeketh after God;

They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable. So apart from the Gospel plan of salvation there is universal condemnation.

3. We come to his next conclusion, Romans 3:13-18, that man's depravity is total -- "Total" refers to all the parts, and not to degrees. He enumerates the parts to show the totality. that does not mean that every man is as wicked in degree as he can be, but that every part is so depraved that without the Gospel plan of salvation he cannot be saved: Their throat is an open sepulchre; With their tongues they have used deceit: The poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: Their feet are swift to shed blood;

Destruction and misery are in their ways; And the way of peace have they not known:

There is no fear of GOD before their eyes.

4. With mankind universally guilty, and every member totally depraved, we get another conclusion -- that whatever things the law says, it says to those under the law -- No matter whether the law of conscience, the law of nature, or the moral law of Moses, those under the law must be judged by the law. That being so, he sums up his conclusion thus: "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

II. THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION That brings us to consider the Gospel plan of salvation which extends from verse 21 of this chapter to the end of chapter 8, and covers four points -- justification, regeneration, sanctification, and glorification. For the present we will discuss that part called justification.

1. It is of faith, not of merit -- He commences by stating that while there is no righteousness by the law, there is a righteousness apart from the law; and this way of salvation apart from the law is witnessed by the law itself and by the prophets. He further says that this righteousness is presented to both Jew and Gentile without any distinction, and that this always has been the way from the beginning of the world to the present time. If GOD has seemed to discriminate in favor of the Jews, He looked toward the Gentiles through the Jews, and if He now seems partial to the Gentiles against the Jews, He is looking toward the restoration of the Jews. This righteousness is presented to all men on the same condition, faith, and this righteousness presented by faith is of grace. Man does not merit it, either Jew or Gentile -- it is free.

It is the hardest thing in the world to convince a sinner that salvation comes from no merit of his, and that faith is simply the hand that receives. Throughout all the length of the great chain of salvation it is presented without discrimination as to merit or race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude.

2. We come now to the ground of it -- That ground is redemption through CHRIST. To redeem means to buy back, as we have already seen. It implies that one was sold and lost. It must be a buying back, and it would not be of grace if we did the buying back. It is a redemption through JESUS CHRIST. He is the REDEEMER -- the one who buys back. The meritorious ground consists in His expiation reaching us through His mediation. He stands between the sinner and GOD and touches both. The first part of His mediation is the payment of the purchase price. He could not, in paying the purchase price, stand for GOD unless GOD set Him forth as a propitiation. He could not touch man unless He Himself, in one sense, was a man, and voluntarily took the position. The effectiveness of the propitiation depends upon the faith of the one to receive JESUS. That covers all past sins. When we accept JESUS we are acquitted forever, never again coming into condemnation. I said that that "covers past sins." We must understand this. But CHRIST's death avails meritoriously once for all for all the sins of a man, past, present and future. In the methods of grace there is a difference in application between sins before justification and sins after justification. The ground is one, before and after. But the HOLY SPIRIT applies differently. When we accept JESUS by faith as He is offered in the Gospel, we at once and forever enter into justification, redemption of soul and adoption into GOD's family, and are regenerated. We are no longer aliens and enemies, but children and friends of GOD. GOD's grace, therefore, deals with us as children. Our sins, therefore, are the sins of children. We reach forgiveness of them through the intercessions of our HIGH PRIEST and the pleadings of our ADVOCATE (see Hebrews 9:15-26; Hebrews 7:25; 1 John 2:1). We may be conscious of complete peace when justified (Romans 5:1), but our consciences condemn us for sins after justification, and peace comes for these offenses through confession, through faith, through intercession, through the application of the same cleansing blood by the HOLY SPIRIT.

3. "From Faith to Faith" So in us regeneration is once for all, but this good work commenced in us is continued through sanctification with its continual application of the merits of CHRIST's death. Therefore, our theme says, "From faith to faith." Not only justified by faith, but living by faith after justification through every step of sanctification. We do not introduce any new meritorious ground. That is sufficient for all, but it is applied differently. Justification takes place in Heaven. It is GOD that justifies. The ground of the justification is the expiation of CHRIST. The means by which we receive the justification is the HOLY SPIRIT's part in regeneration which is called "cleansing." Regeneration consists of two elements, at least -- cleansing and renewing. But the very moment that one believes in CHRIST, the HOLY SPIRIT applies the blood of CHRIST to his heart and he is cleansed from the defilement of sin. At the same time the HOLY SPIRIT does another thing. He renews the mind. He changes that carnal mind which is enmity toward GOD. Few preachers ever explain thoroughly that passage in Ezekiel: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean... I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." There is the cleansing and the renewing. JESUS says, "Born of water and of the Spirit." There are no articles in the Greek. It is one birth. In Titus we find the same idea: He saved us "by the washing of regeneration," the first idea, and the "renewing of the Holy Ghost," the second idea.

4. This method of justification enables GOD to remain just in justifying a guilty man -- If we could not find a plan by which GOD's justice would remain, then we could find no plan of justification. How do we understand that to be done upon this principle of substitution? J.M. Pendleton, in his discussion of this subject based upon a passage in the letter to Philemon, explains it. Paul says, "If

he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account." Now Philemon can be just in the remission of the debt of Onesimus, because he has provided for the payment of that debt through Paul; so CHRIST promised to come and pay our debt and the payment is reckoned to the man that accepts CHRIST, thus showing how remission of sins in the case of Old Testament saints precedes the actual payment, or expiation, by CHRIST. GOD charged Abraham's debts to CHRIST, and CHRIST promised to pay them when He should come into the world. Abraham was acquitted right then. So far as GOD was concerned, the debt was not expiated until CHRIST actually came and died. In our case, expiation precedes the faith in it. He expiated my sins on the cross before I was born. There came a time when the plan of salvation by that expiation was presented to me, and I received it, and then remission took place.

5. This plan of salvation by faith not only justifies GOD, but absolutely excludes any boasting upon the part of the man -- If the man had paid the debt himself, he could claim to be the cause of this justification. But since he did not contribute one iota to the payment of the debt, there is no possible ground for him to boast. This plan brings out GOD's impartial relation both to Jew and Gentile, since both are admitted upon equal terms. This brings us to an objection that has been raised. If GOD acquits the man without his having paid the penalty of the law, does not that make the law void? His answer is an emphatic denial. It not only does not make the law void, but it establishes the law. How? The law is honored in that the Substitute obeys it and dies in suffering its penalties. Further, by the fact that this plan takes this man saved by grace and gives him, through regeneration, a mind to obey the law, through it may be done imperfectly, and then through sanctification enables him to obey the law perfectly. It fulfils all of its penal sanctions through the One who redeems and through the HOLY SPIRIT's work in the one that is redeemed. When I get to Heaven I will be a perfect keeper of the law in mind and in act. We can easily see the distinction between a mere pardon of human courts, which may be really contrary to law, and a pardon which magnifies and makes the law honorable. So we see that GOD can be just and the justifier of the ungodly.

III. FINAL PROOF THAT GOD'S PLAN OF SALVATION HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE SAME In his argument to prove that GOD's plan of salvation has always been the same, Paul illustrates it by striking Old Testament cases that would appeal to the Jewish mind.

1. One of these is Abraham's conversion which is recorded in Genesis 15:1-21 -- Up to that time Abraham was not a saved man, though he was a called man and had some general belief in GOD. At that time he was justified, and he was justified by faith, and righteousness was imputed to him; it was not his own. That was before he was circumcised, and it deprived him of all merit, and made him the Father of all who should come after him in the spiritual line. He proves this by the promise to Abraham and his seed, and shows that that seed refers, not to his carnal descendants, but to the spiritual descendant, JESUS CHRIST. Then he goes on to show that as Isaac, through whom the descent flowed, was born, not in a natural manner, but after a supernatural manner, so we are born after a supernatural manner. He then takes up the further idea that that was the only way in the world to make the promises sure to all the seed.

2. The other illustration is the witness of David -- David was their favorite king. His songs constituted their ritual in the temple of worship. He testifies precisely the same thing: "Blessed is he whose... sin is covered;" that is, through propitiation. Blessed is the man to whom GOD

imputeth no transgression. He takes these two witnesses, Abraham and David, and establishes his case. He shows that the results of justification are present peace, joy and glory; "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God."

Take the thief on the cross. He had no time to get down and reform his life. He was a dying sinner, and some plan of salvation was needed which would be as quick as lightning in its operation. Suppose a man is on a plank in the deep and about to be washed away into the watery depths. He cannot go back and correct the evils that he has done and justify himself by restitution. If salvation is to be sure to him, it must work in a minute. That is a great characteristic of it.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1. What judgment is referred to in Romans 2:6, and what the proof?

2. What advantage had the Jew?

3. Did all Jews avail themselves of this advantage?

4. Does that not make the grace of GOD of none effect? Why?

5. Does the doctrine of election hinder the preaching of a universal Gospel? Why?

6. If the loss of the sinner accrues to the glory of GOD, why should he be judged as a sinner?

7. What is Paul’s conclusion as to the necessity of the Gospel plan of salvation? Upon what does he base it?

8. What is Paul’s conclusion as to man’s depravity? What is the meaning of total depravity? How is it set forth in this passage?

9. What then is his summary of the whole matter?

10. What is the theme of Romans 3:21 to 8:39? What four phases of the subject are thus treated?

11. Is there a righteousness by the law? What is the relation of the law to righteousness? To whom is this righteousness offered?

12. How do you explain GOD’s partiality toward the Jews first and then toward the Gentiles?

13. What are the terms of this righteousness? What its source?

14. What is redemption? What does it imply?

15. What is the meritorious ground of our justification? Upon what does the effectiveness of it depend?

16. What is the difference in the application to sins before justification and to sins after justification?

17. How does this method of justification by faith enable GOD to remain just and at the same time justify a guilty man?

18. How does this plan of salvation exclude boasting?

19. What objection is raised to this method of justification? What the answer to it?

20. What is the distinction between a mere pardon of human courts and this method of pardon?

21. How does Paul prove that the plan of salvation has always been the same?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. GOD HAD BUT ONE PLAN OF SALVATION FROM THE BEGINNING 1. That leads to some questions:

(1) What advantage had the Jew?

(2) What if some Jews disbelieved?

(3) Is not the grace of GOD thus made of none effect?

(4) Why should the sinner be judged as one?

2. The necessity of the Gospel plan 3. Man’s depravity is total 4. The law speaks to those under the law II. THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION 1. It is of faith, not merit 2. We consider the ground of it 3. "From faith to faith"

4. Enables GOD to remain just in justifying the guilty 5. Excludes boasting III. FINAL PROOF THAT GOD’S PLAN HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE SAME 1. Illustrated in Abraham 2. Re-enforced by David ~ end of chapter 4 ~

***

# 06.04. Gospel Plan of Salvation (5:1-21)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 V. THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION

Romans 5:1-21 The first paragraph, Romans 5:1-11, of this chapter is but an elaboration, or conclusion, of the line of argument in Romans 3:1-31 and Romans 4:1-25. There are two leading thoughts in this paragraph: (1) GOD’s method of induction into the grace of salvation. (2) The happy estate of the justified.

I. METHOD OF INDUCTION This method is expressed thus: "Therefore being justified by faith . . . though our Lord Jesus Christ; By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." A vital question is here answered -- "How do we get into CHRIST, in whom are all the blessings of salvation, each in its order?" The corresponding doctrine to our getting into CHRIST is getting CHRIST into us to complete the union with Him as expressed by Himself: "I in you . . . ye abide in me" (John 15:4). The names of these two doctrines are -- (1) Justification through faith, or we into CHRIST (2) Regeneration through faith, or CHRIST in us.

Elsewhere the doctrine of "Christ in us" through regeneration is presented thus: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the Epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God: not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart" (2 Corinthians 3:3). "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Corinthians 4:6). "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Colossians 1:27). The proof that the method of this induction is also by faith is given by CHRIST. When Nicodemus asked as to the method of regeneration, CHRIST answered, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:14-15). "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him" (1 John 5:1).

"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:12-13). "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:26).

II. THE HAPPY ESTATE OF THE JUSTIFIED

1.The justified truly have peace legally in GOD’s eyes as soon as they are justified. So one may be justified in fact sometime before he realizes the peace to which justification entitles, as the experience of many Christians shows. It is GOD’s purpose that we should realize it, and the sooner the better. To affirm that our subjective perception of an external act is necessarily

simultaneous with the act is to limit the existence of things to our knowledge of things. So we may express the understanding of the text by saying that it is both an affirmation: "We have peace"; that is, justification now entitles to peace, but we need to lay hold of it. The fallacy of the affirmation consists of confounding justification, which is GOD's act, with subjective peace, which is our experience. Objective peace, legal peace, necessarily accompanies justification, but it may not be subjective. The battle of New Orleans was fought after the treaty of peace was signed, because Sir Edward Packenham and General Jackson did not know a treaty of peace had been agreed upon.

2. I will name in order all the elements of the happy estate of the justified:

(1) Peace with GOD.

(2) Joy in hope of the glory of GOD (3) Joy in tribulation, because of the fruits which follow.

(4) The gift of the HOLY SPIRIT (5) The love of GOD shed abroad in our hearts, by that given SPIRIT (6) The assurance that the justified shall be saved from the wrath to come, because:

(a) If reconciled, when enemies, much more will He continue salvation to friends.

(b) If reconciled through His death, much more will He alive deliver us from future wrath.

(7) Joy in GOD the Father, through whose Son we receive the reconciliation.

III. THE JUSTIFIED ARE SURE OF SALVATION By a new line of argument the Apostle conveys assurance of salvation to the justified.

1. An argument based on our seminal relations to the two Adams -- This great doctrine is expressed thus: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Romans 5:12). "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Romans 5:18-19). If we combine the several thoughts into one great text we have this: By one offense of one man, condemnation came upon all men. So by one act of righteousness of one Man, justification unto eternal life comes upon all men who by one exercise of faith lay hold on him who wrought the one act of righteousness.

2. This text startlingly offends and confounds the reasonings of the carnal mind which says:

(1) One may not be justly condemned for the offense of somebody else, but only for his own offense; nor justified by the righteousness of somebody else, but by his own righteousness.

(2) Condemnation must come from all offenses, not just one; and justification must be based on all acts of righteousness, not just one.

(3) To base a man's condemnation or justification on the act of another destroys personal responsibility.

(4) The doctrine of imputing one man's guilt to a Substitute tends to demoralization, in that the real sinner will sin the more, not being personally amenable to penalty.

(5) The doctrine of pardoning a guilty man because another is righteous turns loose a criminal on society.

(6) The whole of it violates that ancient law of the Bible itself: Thou shalt justify the innocent and condemn the guilty.

If the Gospel plan of salvation, fairly interpreted, does destroy personal responsibility, does tend to demoralize society, does encourage to sin the more, does turn criminals loose on society, does not tend to make its subjects personally better, it is then the doctrine of the devil and should be hated and resisted by all who respect justice and deprecate iniquity. But the seminal idea of condemnation and justification grows out of relations to two respective heads, and it results from varieties in creation, thus:

(a) GOD created a definite number of angels, just so many at the start, never any more or less, a company, not a family, incapable of propagation, being sexless, without ancestry or posterity, without brother or sister or other ties of consanguinity, each complete in himself, and hence no angel could be condemned or justified for another's act. The act of every angel terminates in himself. Therefore, there can be no salvation for a sinning angel. And hence our Saviour "took not on him the nature of angels."

(b) But GOD also created a different order of beings, at the start just one man, having potentially in himself an entire race -- a countless multitude to be developed from him. And in propagating the race he transmitted his own nature, and through heredity his children inherited that nature. No act of any human being arises altogether from himself or can possibly terminate in himself. In considering heredity, Oliver Wendell Holmes has said, "Man is an omnibus in which all his ancestors ride." Moreover, man was created to be a social being, from which fact arises the necessity of human government whether in legislative, judicial or executive power. The mind can conceive of only one human being whose act would terminate in himself, and under the following conditions alone: He must be without ancestry, without capacity of posterity, without kindred in any degree, without relation to society, living alone on an island surrounded by an ocean whose waves touched no other shore from which society might come. How much more the head in whom potentially and legally was the race could not do an act that would terminate in himself!

(c) The creature cannot deny GOD's sovereign right to create this variety of moral beings, angels and man.

(d) Nature does not exempt children from the penalty of heredity.

(e) Human law neither exempts children from legal responsibility of parents nor acquits criminals because of hereditary predispositions. The context bases the condemnation of all men on the ground that all sinned in Adam, the head, and so having sinned in him they all died in him. The context, "And so death passed upon all men" (even those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression) is the distinct proof of our proposition. Only one person ever sinned the sin of Adam and that was Adam himself, the head of the race. Now as proof that his posterity sinned after the similitude of his sin; that is, they sinned not as the head of a race, but from depravity -- an inherited depravity. Adam did not have that inherited depravity. GOD made him upright.

Whenever I commit a sin, I do not commit that sin from the standpoint of Adam, but I commit it on account of an evil nature inherited from Adam, and that sin is not after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Moreover, if I commit a sin, the race is not held responsible for my sin, because I am not the head of the race. The race does not stand or fall in me. Thus there are two particulars in which sins which we commit are not after the similitude of Adam's sin, and yet, says the Apostle, with his inexorable logic, ". . . even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." The law was executed on every one of them; they died. Sin condemns on the ground of the solidarity of the law, the unity of the law. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (James 2:10).

Human law in this respect conforms to divine law. If a man be law-abiding fifty years and then commits one capital offense, his previous righteousness avails him nothing. Nor does it avail that he was innocent of all other offenses. If a man were before a court charged with murder, he would derive no benefit by proving that he had not been guilty of theft. If he were guilty on the score of murder, his life is forfeited. That is on account of the solidarity of the law. Nor does it avail a man anything in a human court that he was tempted from without. So Adam vainly pleaded, "The woman... gave me of the tree, and I did eat."

IV. THE SEMINAL IDEA OF SALVATION (Romans 5:12-21)

1. The one offense committed by the first Adam was his violation of that test, or prohibition, "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Genesis 2:17). Adam was told that he was not to eat of the tree of death, nor was he to experimentally know the difference between good and evil. In other words, he was an anti-prohibitionist. The law commenced with an absolute prohibition, and it did not avail Adam a thing to plead personal liberty. Race responsibility rested on Adam alone. It could not possibly have rested on Eve, because she was a descendant of Adam, just as much as we are. GOD created just one man, and in that man was the whole human race, including Eve. Later he took a part of the man and made a woman, and the meaning of the word "woman" is "derived from man." When Adam saw her, he said, "Isshah," woman, which literally means derived from man. As she got both her soul and body from the man, being his descendant, it was impossible that the race responsibility should rest on her.

If Eve alone had sinned, the race would not have perished. She would have perished, but not the race. The race was in Adam. GOD could have derived another woman from him like that one. He had the potentiality in him of all women as well as all men. Some error has arisen from holding Eve responsible, such as the error of pointing the finger at the woman and saying, "You did it!" The text says, "By one man's offense" and not by one offense of one woman. That Eve sinned there is no doubt; she was in the transgression. To the contrary, history shows that GOD connects salvation with the woman, and not damnation. He said that the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. There we have the promise of grace. And he could not have said the seed of the man, for, if one be the seed of a man, he inherits the man's fallen nature.

2. This fact has a mighty bearing on the Second Adam -- When the Second Adam came, the first and virtually essential proof was that a woman was his mother, but no man was His Father -- GOD was His Father. If a man had been His Father, He would Himself have been under condemnation through a depraved nature. Mary could not understand the announcement that she should

become the mother of a Saviour who would be the "Son of God," since she had not yet married, until the angel exclaimed: "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). Hence, whoever denies our LORD's birth of a virgin and that he was sired by the MOST HIGH denies the whole plan of salvation and is both the arch liar of the world and anti-Christ. The essential deity of our LORD and His incarnation constitute the bed-rock of salvation. It is the first, most vital, most fundamental truth. No man who rejects it can be a Christian or should be received as a Christian for one moment. (See John 1:1, John 1:14; 1 John 4:1-3; Php 2:6-8; 1 Timothy 3:16) But this question comes up, "Did not JESUS derive his human nature, through heredity, from his mother; since she was a descendant of fallen Adam, how could her Son escape a depraved nature?" This is a pertinent question and a very old one. It so baffled Romanist theologians that they invented and issued under papal infallibility the decree of "The Immaculate Conception," meaning not only that JESUS was born sinless, but that Mary herself was born sinless, which of course only pushes back the difficulty one degree. Their invention was purely gratuitous. There is nothing in the case to call for a sinless mother. Depravity resides in the soul. The soul comes, not from the one who conceives, but from the one who begets. This is the very essence of the teaching in the passage cited from Luke. The sinlessness of the nature of JESUS is expressly ascribed to the Sire: "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." And it is the very heat of Paul's entire biological, or seminal, idea of salvation; that is, life from a seed. The seed is in the sire. The first Adam's seed is unholy; the Second Adam's seed is holy. Hence, the necessity of the SPIRIT birth. So is our LORD's teaching in John 3:36; John 8:44; and 1 John 3:9, and the parable of the Tares with its explanation, Matthew 13:24-30, Matthew 13:36-43, and especially 1 Peter 1:23 : "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." The propriety of salvation by the Second Adam lies in the fact that we were lost through the first Adam. All the criticism against substitutionary, or vicarious, salvation comes from a disregard of this truth.

1. 3. CHRIST met all the law requirements as follows:

(1) By holiness of nature -- starting holy.

(2) By obeying all its precepts.

(3) By fulfilling its types.

(4) By paying its penalty. The value of the first three items is that they qualified Him to do the fourth. If He had been either unholy in nature or defective in obedience, He would have been amenable to the penalty for Himself. But having holiness in His own nature and His perfect obedience exempting Him from penalty on His own account, He could be the sinner's Substitute in death and judgment: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin: that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Corinthians 5:21). ". . . ye were... redeemed . . . with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Peter 1:18-19). If He answered not to the types, He could not be the MESSIAH.

CHRIST's one act of righteousness, which is the sole ground of our justification, is His vicarious death on the cross. No one ought to preach at all -- having no Gospel message -- if he does not

comprehend this with absolute definiteness. If we attribute our justification to CHRIST's holiness, or to His perceptive obedience, or to His Sermon on the Mount, or to His miracles, or to His Kingly or Priestly reign in Heaven, where He is now, or if we locate that one act of righteousness anywhere in the world except in one place and in one particular deed, we ought not to preach. The one act of righteousness -- the sole meritorious ground of justification -- is our LORD's vicarious death on the cross, suffering the death penalty of divine law against sin. This death was a real sacrifice and propitiation Godward, so satisfying the law's penal sanctions in our behalf as to make it just for GOD to justify the ungodly. Our LORD's incarnation, with all His work antecedent to the cross, was but preparatory to it, and all His succeeding work consequential. His exaltation to the throne in Heaven, His priestly intercession, and His coming judgment flowing from His obedience "unto death, even the death of the cross" (Philippians 2:8-9).

V. THE PARTICULAR PROOF OF THIS ONE ACT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS FROM BOTH TESTAMENTS IS AS FOLLOWS 1. Proof from the Old Testament

(1) The establishment of the throne of grace, immediately after man's expulsion from paradise, where GOD dwelt between the cherubim, east of the Garden of Eden, as a Shechinah, or Swordflame, to keep open the way to the tree of life (Genesis 3:24) and was there acceptably approached only through the blood of an innocent and substitutionary sacrifice (Genesis 4:3-4; compare Revelation 7:14; Revelation 22:14), which mercy-seat between the cherubim was to be approached through sacrificial blood, just as described in that part of the Mosaic Law prescribing the way of the sinner's approach to GOD (Exodus 25:17-22).

(2) In the four most marvelous types: a. The Passover-lamb whose blood availed when JEHOVAH saw it (Exodus 12:13, Exodus 12:23) showing that the blood propitiated GOD-ward. (See 1 Corinthians 5:7). b. In the kid on the great Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:1-34) which shows that the expiatory blood must be sprinkled on the mercy-seat between the cherubim as the basis of atonement. c. In the red heifer, burned without the camp, and whose ashes, liquefied with water, became a portable means of purification (Numbers 19:2-6, Numbers 19:9, Numbers 19:17-18 with Hebrews 9:13), representing that first and cleansing element of regeneration in which the HOLY SPIRIT applies CHRIST's blood. (See Psalms 51:2, Psalms 51:7; Ezekiel 36:25; John 3:5 [born of water and SPIRIT]; Ephesians 5:26; Titus 3:5.) d. The brazen serpent, fused in fire and then elevated to be seen, which shows that the expiatory passion, a fiery suffering, must be lifted up in preaching, as the object of faith and means of healing, Numbers 21:9, explained in John 3:14-16; John 12:23-33; Galatians 3:1.

(3) In such striking passages as Isaiah 53:4-11 -- Compare the Messianic prayer: "Deliver my soul from the sword" (Psalms 22:20), with the divine response, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts" (Zechariah 13:7 a), and hear the sufferer's outcry: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Psalms 22:1 and Matthew 27:45-46). When these passages are compared with Isaiah 53:5-10, Romans 3:25; 2 Corinthians 5:21 and 1 Peter 2:24, it cannot be reasonably questioned that He died under the sentence of GOD's law against sin, and that this death was propitiatory toward GOD and vicarious toward man, and is the one act of righteousness through which our justification comes.

2. Proof from the New Testament Some of the New Testament passages, including several already given, our LORD's own words in instituting the Memorial Service: "This is my body which

is given for you . . . This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you . . . which is shed for many" (Luke 22:19-20; Mark 14:24). (We need to add only Romans 3:25; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 1 Corinthians 5:7; 1 Peter 1:18-19; 1 Peter 2:24 and Hebrews 10:4-14). The combined text, "One exercise of faith," means that unlike sanctification, justification is not progressive, but is one instantaneous act; GOD justifies, and our laying hold of it is a simple definite transaction. One moment we are not justified; in the next moment we are justified. One look at the brazen serpent brought healing. Zacchaeus went up the tree lost, and came down saved. The dying thief at one moment was lost, and the next heard the words: "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." At midnight the lost jailer was trembling; just after that he was rejoicing, believing in GOD with all his house. There is no appreciable time element in the transition from condemnation to justification.

Considering CHRIST as a gift, how long does it take to receive Him?

Considering Him as a promise, how long to trust?

Considering CHRIST as the custodian of an imperilled soul, how long to commit it to Him?

Considering the union between CHRIST and the sinner as an espousal (2 Corinthians 11:2), how long to say: "I take Him?" As a marriage between man and woman is a definite transaction, consummated when he says, "I take her to be my lawful wife," and when she says, "I take him to be my lawful husband," so by one exercise of faith we take CHRIST as our LORD. But as sanctification is progressive, we go on in that from faith to faith. But justification through faith in a Substitute does not turn loose a criminal on society. If it be meant a criminal in deed, it is not true, because to the last farthing the law claim has been met in the payment of the surety. In other words, the law has been fully satisfied. If it be meant in spirit, it is not true, for every justified man is regenerated. A new heart to love GOD and man has been given, a holy disposition imparted, loving righteousness and hating iniquity. A spirit of obedience, new and right motives of gratitude and love are at work, and motive determines very largely the moral quality of action. In other words, the justified man is also a new creature.

It secures in the new creature the only basis of true morality.

Morality is conformity with moral law. Immorality is non-conformity with moral law. The first and great commandment of moral law is supreme love toward GOD, and the second is love to thy neighbor as thyself. No unregenerate man can make a step in either direction any more than a bad tree can produce good fruit, for "the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." The unregenerate is self-centered; the regenerate, Christ-centered. The justified man, being regenerate, will be necessarily a better man personally and practically than he was before in every relation of life -- better in the family, better in society and better in the state. A claim to justification without improvement in these directions is necessarily a false claim. The writer in Romans 2:17 has already introduced the word "law" in a special sense when discussing the case of the Jew as contradistinguished from other nations. And this is the sense of his word "law" when he says, "For until the law sin was in the world." Law, to a Jew, meant the Sinaitic law. But the Apostle is proving that law did not originate at Sinai, in any sense except for one nation, as was evident from sin and death anterior to it. First, there was primal law inherent in GOD’s intent in creating moral beings, and in the very constitution of their being, and in all their relations. And this law, even to Adam in innocence, found statutory

expression in the law of labor, the law of marriage and in the law of the Sabbath, as well as in the particular prohibition concerning the tree of death.

VI. THE INTERVENTION OF THE GRACE COVENANT

Immediately after Adam's fall and expulsion from Paradise came the intervention of the grace covenant with its law of sacrifices, symbolically showing the way of a sinner's approach to GOD through vicarious expiation. There were preachers and prophets of grace before the Flood, as well as the convicting and regenerating SPIRIT. All these expressions of law passed over the Flood with Noah, with several express additions to the statutory law both civil and criminal. Death proved sin, and sin proved law, before we come to Sinai. Adam was under law. Adam sinned and death reigned over him. Adam's descendants down to Moses died. Therefore, they had sinned, and therefore were under the law. But their sin was not like Adam's in several particulars: (1) They did not sin as the head of a race. (2) They did not sin from a standpoint of innocence and holiness, but from an inherited depravity. (3) They sinned under a grace covenant which Adam had not in Paradise. This last particular is here emphasized, where grace in justification is contrasted with the condemnation through Adam's one offense.

If then the Sinaitic code did not originate law, what was its purpose? "Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound" (Romans 5:20). This purpose of the law will be considered more elaborately later. Just here it is sufficient to say that the Sinaitic code under three great departments, or heads, is the most marvelous and elaborate expression of law known to history. Its three heads or constituent elements, as we learn in the Old Testament are - 1. The Decalogue, or moral law, or GOD and the normal man.

2. The law of the altar, or GOD and the sinner, or the sinner's symbolic way of approach to GOD, including a place to find Him, a means of propitiating Him, times to approach Him, and an elaborate ritual of service.

3. The judgments, or GOD and the State, in every variety of municipal, civil and criminal law. So broad, so deep, so high, so minute, so comprehensive is this code, so bright is its light, that every trespass in thought, word and deed is not only made manifest, but is made to abound, in order that where sin abounded, grace would abound exceedingly.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW

1. What part of Romans 5:1-21 is but an elaboration, or conclusion, of the line of argument started in Romans 3:1-31 and Romans 4:1-25 2. What vital question is here answered?

3. What is the corresponding doctrine to our getting into CHRIST?

4. What are the names of these two doctrines?

5. How elsewhere is the doctrine of "CHRIST in us" through regeneration presented?

6. What is the proof that the method of this induction is also by faith?

7. What is the fallacy of affirming that subjective peace is simultaneous with justification? Illustrate.

8. What, in order, are the elements of the happy estate of the justified?

9. By what new line of argument in Romans 5:12-21 does the Apostle convey assurance of salvation to the justified?

10. How does this text startlingly offend and confound the reasonings of the carnal mind?

11. On what ground does the context base the condemnation of all men?

12. What is the meaning of the context, "and so death passed upon all men," and so forth?

13. On what ground does sin condemn, and what the proof?

14. How does human law in this respect conform to divine law?

15. What was the one offense committed by the first Adam?

16. On whom did race responsibility rest -- Adam or Eve, or both, and why?

17. If only Eve sinned, what would have been the result?

18. What error has since arisen from holding Eve responsible?

19. What bearing has this fact on the Second Adam?

20. How could JESUS, being born of a depraved woman, escape depraved nature?

21. What is CHRIST's one act of righteousness, which is the ground of our justification?

22. What particular proof of this one act of righteousness from both Testaments?

23. How is it that justification through faith in a Substitute does not turn loose a criminal on society?

24. Explain the parenthetic statement in Romans 5:13-17.

25. What are the three constituent elements of the Sinaitic law?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. METHOD OF INDUCTION 1. Justification through faith, or we into CHRIST.

2. Regeneration through faith, or CHRIST into us.

II. THE HAPPY ESTATE OF THE JUSTIFIED 1. "We have," "Let us have"

2. Some things included in this happy estate III. THE JUSTIFIED ARE SURE OF SALVATION 1. Argument based on relations to the two Adams 2. Offends the carnal mind IV. THE SEMINAL IDEA OF SALVATION 1. Sin came through Adam 2. This has bearing on the Second Adam 3. How CHRIST met all requirements V. THE PROOF FROM BOTH TESTAMENTS 1. From the Old Testament 2. From the New Testament VI. THE INTERVENTION OF THE GRACE COVENANT 1. The Decalogue 2. The law of the altar 3. The judgments ~ end of chapter 5 ~ ***

Chapter 58

# 06.05. Salvation in Us (6:1-8:39)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 VI. SALVATION IN US WHAT SALVATION DOES FOR OUR SOULS AND OUR BODIES Romans 6:1-23, Romans 7:1-25, Romans 8:1-39

We have considered hitherto in this letter what salvation has done for us in redemption, justification and adoption. We have now before us in Romans 6:1-23, Romans 7:1-25, Romans 8:1-39 what salvation does in us in regeneration and glorification of our bodies.

Two questions properly introduce this section. In Romans 3:21 he says, "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets." In view of this, in Romans 6:1 he asks, "What shall we say then?"

I. SHALL WE CONTINUE IN SIN, THAT GRACE MAY ABOUND?

1. The Question Fully Stated The meaning is this: Does salvation by grace through faith in a debt-paying Substitute encourage to more sin because the sinner does not himself pay the penalty, and thus by more sin give greater scope to superabounding grace? Or, does imputation of the penalty of sin in a Substitute make void the law to the sinner personally? Or does GOD's justification of the sinner, through faith, instead of his personal obedience, turn loose a defiled criminal on society eager to commit more crime because his future offenses, like his past offences, will be charged to the Substitute? These are pertinent questions of practical importance and if, indeed, this be the legitimate result of the Gospel plan of salvation, it is worthy of rejection by all who love justice.

While we have already considered this matter somewhat, let us restate a reply embodying the substance of this section. The reply is briefly as follows:

2. Whom GOD justifies them He also regenerates and sanctifies in soul and raises and glorifies in body.

(1) In the first element of regeneration -- the application of the blood of CHRIST by the HOLY SPIRIT. The sinner is cleansed from the defilement of sin. (See Psalms 51:2, Psalms 51:7; Ezekiel 36:25; Titus 3:5, first clause, "the washing of regeneration"; "born of water" (John 3:5). See also Revelation 7:14 and Revelation 22:14. So that the justified man is not turned loose a defiled criminal on society.

(2) In the second element of regeneration the justified sinner is delivered from the love of sin by his renewed nature, Psalms 51:10; Ezekiel 36:26; John 3:3, John 3:5-6 "born again... born... of the Spirit"; Titus 3:5, second clause, "and renewing of the Holy Ghost." So that the regenerate man has the spirit of obedience (Ezekiel 36:27; Titus 2:11-14; Titus 3:8). And while the obedience of the regenerate is imperfect, yet through sanctification, when it is consummated, the regenerate in soul

is qualified to perfect obedience (Php 1:6; Php 3:12-14; 2 Corinthians 3:17-18). And when the body is raised and glorified, then this justified sinner has become personally, in soul and body, as holy and obedient as JESUS Himself (1 John 3:2; Psalms 17:15), all of which is pictorially set forth in our baptism (Romans 6:4-5; Colossians 2:12). So that faith not only does not make void the law to us personally, but is the only way by which we shall be made able to keep the law personally, and not only does not encourage to sin, but furnishes the only motives by which practically we cease from sin.

3. The doctrine of baptism as bearing upon this point set forth in Romans 6:1-11 is this: A justified and regenerate man is commanded to be baptized.

Baptism symbolizes the burial of a dead man -- dead to his old life -- his cleansing from the sins of the old life, and his resurrection to a new life.

CHRIST died on the cross for our sins once for all. Being dead, he was buried, raised to a new life and exalted to a royal and priestly throne. All this, in the beginning of his public ministry, was prefigured in his own baptism. As he died for our sins, paying the law penalty, so we in regeneration become dead to law claims because we died to sin in his death. Being dead to the old life, we should be buried. This is represented in our baptism: "Buried... in baptism." But in regeneration we are not only slain, but made alive, or quickened. The living should not abide in the grave; therefore, in our baptism there is also a symbol of our resurrection. Regeneration not only slays and makes alive, but cleanses; therefore, in our baptism we are symbolically cleansed from sin, as was said to Paul. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." So that not only both elements of regeneration, cleansing and renewal of soul are set forth pictorially in our baptism, but also the coming resurrection and glorification of our bodies.

4. In Romans 6:7 we have this language: "For he that is dead is freed from sin." That means that there are two ways in which one can satisfy the law and meet all of its claims. He can either do it by perfectly obeying the law, or he can do it by meeting the penalty of the law. Therefore, it says, "for he that is dead is freed from sin." It is just like an ordinary debt. If one pays the debt, he is justified from the claim. If a man commits an offense and the law’s decision is that he suffer the penalty of two years in the penitentiary, and he serves the two years in the penitentiary, he is justified in the eyes of the law. The law cannot take him up and try him again. While the disobedience of the law is not justified in obedience, he has paid the full penalty. Now to make the application of that: CHRIST died for our sins; we died in His death, just as we died in Adam and came under condemnation for it. Now when we die with CHRIST, that death on the cross justifies us from sin. That is what it means. The next point is the argument from the meaning of the declaration that he that is dead is justified from sin. That argument is presented in Romans 6:12-13, and the reason for it is given in Romans 6:14. Let us look at those verses. If we be dead to sin, we should not let sin reign in our mortal body that we should obey the lusts thereof. Neither present our members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness, but present ourselves unto GOD as alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto GOD. The reason assigned is, "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace." In other words, "It is true that you did not pay that law claim, but your Substitute paid it, and that puts you from under the law of condemnation. Now if you set out to pay, you set out to pay unto grace. The spirit of obedience in you is not of fear, but of love to Him that died for you."

That is what is called being under grace in a matter of obedience and not under law.

5. What is the force of the question, "Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace?" In other words, "Because my obedience is not a condition of my salvation, shall I therefore sin?" That is the thought, and his argument against that is this: "God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" If a man presents himself unto grace as the principle of obedience, then it is not a life and death matter, but it is a matter of love and gratitude. It is on a different principle entirely. And in a very elaborate way he continues the argument down to Romans 6:23 : "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Let us now explain the contrast in Romans 6:23 and give the argument. Here he contrasts two things, (1) the wages; this is a matter of law -- wages; (2) over against that stands gift -- free gift. That is not a matter of wages. The wages of sin is death -- that is the penalty -- but now the free gift is eternal life. It is impossible to put his meaning any plainer than these words put it: "Are you expecting to be saved on the ground of earning your salvation as wages, or are you expecting to be saved through the free gift of GOD unto eternal life?" That is the thought.

6. Let us see the force of the illustration in Romans 7:2 : "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man." The force of that as an illustration of the married life is: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." The obligation of a wife to a husband, and their fidelity to each other, is a matter of law growing out of the relation that holds them together. So long as a husband lives and a wife lives, neither one of them can be free to marry except in a certain case, and that exception is discussed elsewhere. He is just discussing the general principles here. Now apply that illustration: "The law holds you to absolute fidelity in obedience just as the law holds the woman bound to her husband, and the husband to his wife. If you died with CHRIST, you are dead to that law, and therefore you can enter into another relation. You are espoused to CHRIST. The law that binds you now is the law of that espousal to CHRIST, and that is the law of freedom; not like the other, it is a matter of grace." That is the force of that statement.

II. IS THE LAW SIN? (Romans 7:12)

Then in Romans 7:7, "Is the law sin?" That is an important question and he answers it. Some things in connection with it have already been answered, and in answering it particularly I will take the following position.

1. The law is not sin -- It is holy, it is just, it is good. What, then, is the relation of the law to sin? He says here that it gives the knowledge of sin: "I had not known sin, but by the law." If people were living according to different standards, every man being a judge in his own case, what A would think to be right B would think to be wrong, and vice verse. People would think conflicting things, and as long as a man held himself to be judge of what was right and what was wrong he would not feel that he was a sinner. So the real standard, not a sliding scale, is put down among all the varying ideas of right and wrong. What is the object? It is to reveal the lack of conformity to the law: "I had not known sin, but by the law."

2. The law provokes to sin -- He says, "But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead." If children were forbidden to climb telephone poles, they would all desire to climb them, and they might never think of it if they were not forbidden. So the law was designed to show just what inherent nature will bring out. A snake is very pretty at certain times, and one may think that the enmity between him and the human race is hardly justifiable, but let him give a snake the opportunity to develop just what is in him, and then he will have a different opinion. Who would have supposed that it was in human nature to do the things done in the French Revolution? Man is a good sort of creature; he would not impale a body on a bayonet; he would not burn a woman at the stake; he would not put her fingers in a thumb-screw; he would not put a man on the rack and torture him; but nobody knows the evil that is in human nature until it has a chance to show what is in it. The law brings all that out.

3. Hence, the object of the law is to make sin appear to sin, and to be exceeding sinful -- to make it seem what it is, and not just a peccadillo, or a misdemeanor, but an exceedingly vile, ghastly and hateful thing.

4. Then the object of the law is to work death: "Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." The death there referred to is the death in one's own mind. It means conviction that one is lost -- that is the death he is talking about. For he explains immediately, where he says, "I was alive without the law once"; that is, he felt like he was all right, but when the commandment came he saw that he was a dead man -- under condemnation of death. And that is one of the works of the HOLY SPIRIT bringing about conviction, making a man see that he is a sinner, making him feel that he is a sinner, that he is exceeding sinful. And we may distrust any kind of preaching that is dry-eyed, that has no godly sorrow, that has no repentance. If one thinks that he is a very little sinner, then a very little Saviour is needed. We depreciate our Saviour just to the extent that we extenuate our sin.

III. THE CONFLICT OF THE TWO NATURES (Romans 7:15-25) The next passage is also of real importance (Romans 7:15-25). There is only one important question on it: "Is the experience there related the experience of a converted man, or of an unconverted man?" If one wants to see how men dissent on it, let him read his commentaries.

1. The Conflict Stated. Let us see some of the points: "For that which I do I allow not (the word "allow" is used in the sense of "approve"): for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. ... For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." The point is this: If the mind of the flesh -- the carnal mind -- is enmity against GOD, if it is not subject to the law of GOD, and neither indeed can be, then how can that mind "delight in the law of God after the inward man?" How can he approve that which is good? From Romans 7:16-25, he discusses a certain imperfection attending the regenerate state.

2. The experience of every regenerate man will corroborate this: "I know a certain thing is right; I am ashamed to say I did not do it; I know a certain thing is wrong, and I approve the law that makes it wrong, and I am ashamed to say I have done that very thing." And if there is one thing

that disturbs the Christian and troubles him, it is to find a law in his members warring against the law of his mind. That is expressed here: "O Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" That expression of Paul's has been (and I think rightly) supposed to refer to an ancient penalty inflicted on a man that had committed a certain offense. He was chained to a dead body, and he had to carry that dead body with him everywhere he went. He alive, that body dead, he would want a pure atmosphere to inhale, and that body would be exhaling the stench of corruption. It was a miserable condition: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

3. One of the great French preachers preached on that subject before Louis XIV -- We find a reference to it in Strong's "Systematic Theology." He was talking about the two "I's"; "For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not: but what I hate, that do I." The French preacher was pointing out the two men in a man, and how they fought against each other, and the king interrupted him in his sermon and said, "Ah, I know those two men." The preacher pointed at him and said, "Sire, it is somewhat to know them, but, your majesty, one or the other of them must die." It isn't enough just to know them; one or the other of them is going to ultimately triumph. What is the meaning of Romans 8:4 : "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Here is the fulfillment in us. It is not imputed righteousness that is being discussed here; that is, justification. But it is the object of regeneration and sanctification to make a personal righteousness. The object of regeneration and sanctification is that in us the law might be fulfilled as well as for us in the death of CHRIST. That is the meaning of the passage, and it is one of the profoundest gratifications to me that my salvation does not stop at justification. I am glad to think that the law has no claims on me, but I could not be happy, being only justified and loving sin. I not only want to be delivered from sin but from the love of sin in regeneration, and the dominion of sin in sanctification.

4. The Apostle describes the two minds in Romans 8:5-8 : "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh." Here "flesh" does not mean the body. The flesh does not mean the tissues and the blood. That would constitute only a physical man. What he means by the flesh is the carnal mind. Now he is discussing the two. He continues: "but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." There are the two minds: "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." It is just like trying to wash away the soul's sins in water.

We might take the sinner up and hold him under Niagara Falls and let it pour on him for ten thousand years and we could never wash away the soul's sins. It was impossible for the blood of bullocks to take away sin. It is impossible for the water of baptism to take away sin. This carnal mind cannot be made into a Christian. We can whitewash it, and there are many preachers that do that sort of business. It may be outwardly beautiful, like a tomb, but inwardly it is full of rottenness and dead men's bones.

IV. SALVATION THORUGH REGENERATION AND ADOPTION

We now continue the discussion of salvation through regeneration and adoption. Regeneration is a change of mind. The carnal mind cannot be made into a Christian, hence there must be a change. Is the change simply using the old mind, but modifying it, or is it a change like this: A woman puts her baby in the cradle at night and the next morning there was another baby in the

cradle which she called the changeling? That was not any imitation of the baby that was in there before. Just so we waste our time if we try to make a Christian out of the carnal mind. We cannot do it. That is why regeneration is called a creation, which is to make something out of nothing -- not out of a material having already existed.

What Paul is expressing here is that we may take the fallen nature of man which he has inherited from Adam and commence an educational process in the cradle, and continue it up to the adult stage and get a very respectable church member, but not a saved person.

Education has no creative power at all. A man may be very proper in his behavior; he may pay the preacher; he may go to Sunday school; he may do everything in the world that will enable him to appear to be a Christian, and yet not be a Christian. There must be a breaking up of the fallow ground. As JESUS said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

1. Regeneration Is a Change Wrought by the HOLY SPIRIT The conclusion reached by the Apostle in this argument is in Romans 8:11 : "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Now the question, Who shall deliver me from the body of this death, this evil mind, this evil body? It comes through CHRIST, but it is CHRIST working through the SPIRIT. It is the HOLY SPIRIT that made CHRIST's body alive; it is the HOLY SPIRIT that will make our bodies alive at the Resurrection; it is the HOLY SPIRIT that will glorify these bodies, and when they come out they will be spiritual bodies and not carnal bodies.

There is a test presented in Romans 8:14 : "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Who are GOD's children? Those that have the SPIRIT -- those that are led by the SPIRIT. We are regenerated by the SPIRIT, and under the guidance of that SPIRIT we turn away from sin. If we fall we try to fall toward Heaven, and get up and try again. There is a sense of wanting to get nearer and nearer to GOD. We want to know whether we are Christians. Here is the test: We are led by the SPIRIT of GOD.

2. Regeneration Is Accompanied by Adoption That brings us to the word, "adoption." What is adoption? Etymologically it is that legal process by which one, not a member of a family naturally, is legally made a member of it and an heir.

(1) There are three kinds of adoption which the Apostle discusses in this letter: a. National adoption, Romans 9:3 b, Romans 9:4 a: "My kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption." Many times in the Old Testament, Israel is called GOD's son, the nation as a nation being His particular people. b. The adoption of the soul of the justified man, Romans 8:15 : ". . . ye have received the Spirit of adoption." c. The adoption of our bodies when they are redeemed from the grave and glorified, Romans 8:23 : "Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

(2) The fact of our adoption is certified to us in Romans 8:15-16 : "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." That is a matter of our subjective experience. As in the case of justification there must be a difference of time between the fact of our justification and our realization of its privileges, so there must be and

indeed often is a difference in time between the fact of our adoption and our realization in experience that we are adopted. The cry, "Abba, Father," means that in our experience a filial feeling toward GOD comes into the heart. Antecedent to this when we thought of GOD, he seemed to us to be distant and dreadful, but when through the HOLY SPIRIT given unto us came this conscious realization that GOD is a Father, it drove out all fear.

We do not feel ourselves under bondage to law, but we have the sense in our hearts of being GOD's children, and as a little child readily approaches a parent in expectation of either help or comfort, we have this feeling toward our Heavenly Father. It is one of the sweetest experiences of the Christian life. There is no distinction of meaning between the Spirit of adoption and the SPIRIT's bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of GOD, or if there is a distinction it is not appreciable in our consciousness, since it is the SPIRIT that bestows that filial feeling.

3. Adoption Includes the Earth as Well as Man In a vivid way the Apostle represents the earth, man's habitat, as entering sympathetically into man's longing for his complete restoration to GOD's favor through adoption, Romans 8:20-23 : "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered form the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body," The meaning of which is that this earth was made for man; to him was given dominion over it, but when he sinned the earth was cursed. In the language of the Scriptures, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." In Isaiah 55:12-13 we have this vivid imagery following conversion: " . . . the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the LORD for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." In other words, the joy that is in the heart of the Christian constitutes a medium of rose-color through which all creation seems to him more beautiful than it was before. The birds sing sweeter, the flowers exhale a sweeter perfume, the stars shine brighter, all of which is a sign, or forecast, of the redemption of the earth from the curse when man's redemption is complete. This curse as originally pronounced upon the earth was not through any fault of creation, as our text says: ". . . subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." And very impressive and vivid is the imagery that the groaning of the earth is as travail, waiting to be redeemed from the defilement and scars and crimson stains that have been put upon it through man's inhumanity to man on account of sin.

Other Scriptures very clearly show that this redemption of the earth accompanies the redemption of man. As the earth was cleansed from defilement of sin practiced by the antediluvians through the Flood, so at the coming of our LORD and the resurrection of our bodies it will be purged by fire. The language of the Apostle Peter upon this subject is very impressive: "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto

fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwell righteousness." (2 Peter 3:5-7; 2 Peter 3:10-13). In John's apocalypse, referring to the restitution of all things after the judgment, he says, "And I saw a new Heaven and a new earth: for the first Heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea" (Revelation 21:1).

V. SALVATION THROUGH THE PARACLETE In continuation of the theme of this section the Apostle further shows the power of the work of salvation in us through the HOLY SPIRIT -- the Paraclete. But the word, "Paraclete," needs to be defined. While our LORD was on the earth He was the Paraclete, to whom as the Paraclete the disciples said, "Lord, teach us to pray," and in many examples of His own praying and in many special lessons on prayer He taught the disciples, and they were sad at heart when at the Last Supper He announced His speedy going away from them, but comforted them with the assurance that He would pray the Father to send them another Paraclete, the HOLY SPIRIT, who would teach them to pray acceptably. Prayers not according to the will of GOD are not answered. We may ask for things, being in doubt as to whether it is GOD's will that such things should be granted, but the HOLY SPIRIT is not in doubt. He knows what is according to the will of GOD, and hence when He moves us intensely to offer prayers, those prayers will always be according to GOD's will, and so will be answered.

It is on account of the SPIRIT's intercession in us that backsliders are ever reclaimed. As we wander away from GOD we lose the spirit of prayer, and while we go through the forms of prayer we are conscious that our prayers do not rise, do not take hold of the throne of GOD; but when the SPIRIT comes upon the backslider then his hard heart is melted, the fountain of his tears is unsealed, the spirit of grace and supplication comes upon him, and he is conscious that he is taking hold of the throne of mercy in his prayers. As an illustration, some have experienced the hardships of a long-continued draught, when the heavens seem to be brass and the earth seems to be iron. When vegetation dies, when dust chokes the traveler on the thoroughfare, and thirst consumes him, suddenly he comes to a well and in it is an old-fashioned pump, but in moving its handle he causes only a dry rattle. The reason is, that through long disuse and heat the valves of the pump have shrunk and hence cannot make suction to draw up the water. In such case water must be poured down the pump until the valves are swollen, and then as the pump handle is worked, suction draws the water as freely as at first. As that pouring the water from above down the dry pump is to its efficacy in bringing water up, so is the SPIRIT's intercession in us, causing us to pray successfully and according to the will of GOD. In that way the two elements of the Gospel plan of salvation cooperate to the everlasting security of the believer. At the Heaven end of the line JESUS, the first Advocate, or Paraclete, makes intercession for us as HIGH PRIEST, pleading what His expiation has done for us, while the HOLY SPIRIT, the second Advocate, or Paraclete, works in us an intercession for us here on earth; so that both ends of the line are secure in Heaven above and on earth beneath. No backslider has ever been able to work himself into the

true spirit of prayerfulness any more than a dry pump can be made to bring up water by working the handle. Whenever he does pray prevailingly, it is when the SPIRIT works in him the grace of supplication.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1. What has been considered in this letter hitherto?

2. What is now before us in Romans 6:1-23, Romans 7:1-25, Romans 8:1-39?

3. What two questions properly introduce this section, and what is their meaning?

4. What of the significance of these questions?

5. What is the doctrine of baptism bearing upon this point set forth in Romans 6:1-11?

6. What is the meaning of Romans 6:7 : "For he that is dead is freed from sin"?

7. What is the force of the question, "Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace?" (Romans 6:15) 8. What is the contrast and argument in Romans 6:23?

9. What is the illustration in Romans 7:2, and what the force of it?

10. Is the law sin? If not, what is its relation to sin?

11. Expound the passage, Romans 7:15-25 12. What is the meaning and application of Romans 8:4?

13. How does the Apostle describe the two minds, and what is the teaching?

14. What is regeneration, negatively and positively?

15. What is the real import of what Paul says about it?

16. What is the conclusion reached by Paul in this argument?

17. What is the test presented in Romans 8:14?

18. What is adoption?

19. What are the three kinds of adoption which the Apostle discusses in this letter?

20. What is the meaning of the soul’s cry, "Abba, Father"?

21. In what vivid way does Paul represent the earth, man’s habitat, as entering sympathetically into man’s longing for his complete restoration to GOD’s favor through adoption?

22. In continuation of the theme of this section, how does the Apostle further show the power of the work of salvation in us?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER What Salvation Does for Our Souls and for Our Bodies I. SHALL WE CONTINUE IN SIN THAT GRACE MAY ABOUND?

1. The question fully stated.

2. Whom GOD justifies he regenerates and sanctifies.

(1) Removes the defilement of sin (2) Removes the love of sin 3. Baptism signifies death and resurrection 4. Having died to sin, we are delivered from sin (Romans 6:7) 5. Shall we sin because we are not under law?

6. Illustration in Romans 7:2 II. IS THE LAW SIN? (Romans 7:2) 1. The law is not sin 2. The law provokes to sin 3. Makes sin appear to be sin

4. Works death III. THE CONFLICT OF THE TWO NATURES (Romans 7:15-25) 1. The conflict stated 2. Every regenerate man corroborates 3. The French preacher stated it 4. Paul describes the two minds in Romans 8:5-8 IV. SALVATION THROUGH REGENERATION AND ADOPTION 1. Regeneration is a change wrought by the HOLY SPIRIT 2. Regeneration is accompanied by adoption (1) Three kinds of adoption (2) Adoption is certified, Romans 8:15-16 3. Adoption includes the earth as well as man V. SALVATION THROUGH THE PARACLETE ~ end of chapter 6 ~ ***

Chapter 59

# 06.06. Final Work of Salvation in Us (6:1-8:39)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 VII THE FINAL WORK OF SALVATION IN US Romans 6:1-23, Romans 7:1-25, Romans 8:1-39 In this chapter, following further the argument of the Apostle, we discuss (1) the redemption of the body, and (2) the final security of the believer I. THE REDEMPTION OF THE BODY The final work of salvation in us is expressed in Romans 8:23 -- The redemption of our body concerning which he adds: "For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." The body is an essential part of the normal man, who was made dual in nature, and even in Paradise GOD had provided for the elimination of the mortality of man’s body, through the continued eating of the tree of life. But the immortality of the body in sin would have been an unspeakable curse to man, and hence GOD, in expelling man from the garden, said, "Lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever."

1. But when our souls are regenerated the hope enters the heart that the body also will be saved, and we wait patiently for that part of our salvation -- this passage expresses the idea thusly:

Oh, that my words were now written!

Oh, that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, And that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, Yet in my flesh shall I see God. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, And not another: though my reins be consumed within me.

(Job 19:23-27) And the passage is akin to the expression in Psalms 17:1-15 : "I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness" (Psalms 17:15). This harmonizes with another very striking passage in Job: For there is hope of a tree, If it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease.

Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, And the stock thereof die in the ground;

Yet through the scent of water it will bud, And bring forth boughs like a plant. But man dieth, and wasted away:

Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, And the flood decayeth and drieth up: So man lieth down, and riseth not:

Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, Nor be raised out of their sleep.

O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, That thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, That thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me!

If a man die, shall he live again?

All the days of my appointed time will I wait, Till my change come.

Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee:

Thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands.

(Job 14:7-15)

Here Job is deeply impressed with the hope of a tree cut down reviving. There is a resurrection for it, but he says, "But man dieth,... and where is he (that is, as to his soul); ...if a man die, shall he (as to his body) live again?" Inasmuch as the body was the work of GOD's hands and was originally intended to be immortal, he expresses the hope that GOD would hide him in the grave and appoint a set time to remember him there and then desire the work of His hands and call him forth from his long sleep.

2. The fulness of the salvation in us is the regeneration of the soul, its ultimate sanctification, and the resurrection and glorification of the body -- It has ever been possible to satisfy the cravings of a human heart with the hope of soul salvation only. It is ingrained in the very constitution of our being that we long for the revivification of the body. A bird escaping from its shell to fly with a new life in the air cares nothing for the cast off shell. A butterfly emerging from the chrysalis state cares nothing for the shell that is left behind. But from the beginning of time, through this ingrained hope of immortality for the body, man has cared for the bodyshell after the spirit has escaped.

It is evidenced in the care for the dead body characteristic of all nations. It is evidenced in the names given to graveyards. They are called cemeteries; that is, sleeping places. It is evident in the sculpture on the tombstones and in the inscriptions thereon, all tending to show that man desires an answer to the question "If I die, shall I live again?" And the thought being not with reference to the continuity of existence in his spiritual nature, but in his body. Hence the resurrection of the dead is made in the Christian system, a pivotal doctrine, as we learn from the letter to the Corinthians: that our faith is vain, our preaching is vain, we are yet in our sins, our Fathers have perished and GOD's apostles are false witnesses, if the dead rise not. That is the conclusion of the doctrine of salvation in us.

II. THE EVERLASTING SECURITY OF THE BELIEVER

All the rest of Romans 8:1-39 is devoted to a new theme, namely: the everlasting security of those who are justified by faith. The argument extends from Romans 8:26-39, and it is perhaps the most remarkable paragraph in inspired literature. It should be memorized by every Christian. Every thought in it has been the theme of consolatory and encouraging preaching.

Let us now consider item by item this argument on the security of the believer.

1. He takes the latitudinarian view, from top to bottom -- Down here he finds a Christian. Up yonder at the other end of the line is the Advocate. But there is an Advocate here, too. And these Advocates, one here on earth in the depths, and the other yonder in the heights of Heaven, are going to see to it that the Christian gets there all right through prayer and faith. If a Christian sins, he must confess it and ask GOD to forgive him. Sometimes he has not the spirit of prayer and

does not feel like asking. But GOD provides an Advocate, the HOLY SPIRIT, that puts into his heart the spirit of grace and supplication. And the HOLY SPIRIT not only shows him what to pray for, but what to pray. That makes things secure at this end of the line. Up yonder the Advocate in Heaven, JESUS CHRIST the righteous, takes these petitions that the SPIRIT inspired on earth and goes before the Father, and pointing to the sufficiency of His shed blood in His death on the cross, secures this salvation from depth to height.

2. The unbroken sweep of the providence of GOD -- "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Romans 8:28). With CHRIST on the mediatorial throne in Heaven holding in His hand the scepter of universal dominion, constraining everything -- beings in Heaven above and on the earth beneath and in hell below -- to work, not tangentially, but together for good -- not evil -- to them that love GOD, in the sweep of this providence all elements and forces of the material world and the spiritual world, are laid under tribute -- fire, earth, air, storms and earthquakes, pestilences, good angels and bad, the passions of men, the revolutions in human government -- ALL are made, under the directing power of JESUS our KING, to conspire to our good. Fortune and misfortune, good report and evil report, sickness or health, life or death, prosperity or adversity, it is all one -- the power of GOD is over them all. Satan is not permitted to put even the weight of a little finger upon the Christian to worry him except in the direction that GOD will permit, and that will be overruled for his good.

3. This sweep of providential government under our mediatorial KING accords with a linked chain of correlative doctrines reaching from eternity before time to eternity after time. The links of this chain are thus expressed in Romans 8:29-30 : "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Before there was any world, a covenant of grace and mercy was entered into between Father, Son, and HOLY SPIRIT, the evidences of which covenant are abundant in the New Testament, and the parts to be performed by each person of the God-head are clearly expressed, namely: The Father’s grace and love in agreeing to send the Son, His covenant obligation to give the Son a seed, His foreknowledge of this seed, His predestination concerning this seed, His justification and adoption of them here in time. Then the Son’s covenant was the obligation to assume human nature in His incarnation, voluntarily renouncing the glory that He had with the Father before the world was, and in this incarnation of humility to become obedient unto the death of the cross. The consideration held out before Him, as a hope set before Him, inducing Him to endure the shame of the cross, and the reward bestowed upon Him because of that obedience, was His resurrection, His glorification, His exaltation to the royal priestly throne and His investment with the right of judgment. And the SPIRIT’s covenant obligations were to apply this work of redemption in calling, convicting, regenerating, sanctifying and raising from the dead the seed promised to the Son, the whole of it showing that the plan of salvation was not an afterthought; that the roots of it in election and predestination are both in eternity before the world was, and the fruits of it are in eternity after the judgment. The believer is asked to consider this chain, test each link, shake it and hear it rattle, connected from eternity to eternity.

Every one that GOD foreknew in CHRIST is drawn by the SPIRIT to CHRIST. Every one predestinated is called by the SPIRIT in time, and justified in time, and will be glorified when the

LORD comes.

4. It is impossible for finite beings to say anything against the grounds of this security, because "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Romans 8:31). Because, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" (Romans 8:32) Then the challenge is sent to the universe to find any one who can lay any charge against GOD's elect -- who in Heaven, who among the angels, good or bad, who on the earth? No charge can be brought against a believer because it is GOD, the Supreme JUDGE, who has justified him. Justification is the verdict, or declaration, of the supreme court of Heaven that in CHRIST the sinner is acquitted. This decision is rendered once for all, is inexorable and irreversible. It is registered in the Book of Life, and in the great Judgement Day that book will be the textbook on the throne of that judgment. Whatever may be brought out from all the books that are opened, none of them are decisive and ultimate but one -- the Book of Life -- and it is not a docket of cases to be tried on that day, but is a register of judicial decisions already rendered: "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Revelation 20:15). Therefore the thrill excited in the heart by that song which our congregations so often used to sing: When Thou my righteous JUDGE shall come, To take Thy ransomed people home Shall I among them stand? Shall I, who sometimes am afraid to die Be found at Thy right hand?

Oh, can I bear the piercing thought, What if my name should be left out!

5. The ground of this salvation is what CHRIST does -- Spurgeon calls Romans 8:34, the four pillars upon which rests the whole superstructure of salvation. They are, (a) the death of CHRIST, (b) the resurrection of CHRIST, (c) the exaltation of CHRIST to the kingly throne, (d) His intercession as our great HIGH PRIEST. These four doctrines are strictly correlative -- they fit into each other. The soul of the Christian does not at the beginning realize the strength of his salvation. Many a one has simply believed on CHRIST as a Saviour without ever analyzing in his own mind, or separating from each other in thought, the several things done by CHRIST in order to his salvation. But as he grows in knowledge of these things, he grows in grace and assurance.

It was some time after my own soul was saved before I ever understood fully the power of CHRIST's exaltation, or kingly throne, and still longer before I understood the power of His intercession. I got the comfort of this last thought one day in reading a passage in Hebrews "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Hebrews 7:25). I had never before seen the difference between salvation in justification and salvation to the uttermost. In the same way we may not realize in our joy of regeneration the power of His continuing that good work in us until the day of JESUS CHRIST, and the great value of the SPIRIT's work in taking the things of CHRIST and showing them to us. And as we learn each office of CHRIST, and just what He does in that office, the greater our sense of security. He is PROPHET, SACRIFICE, KING, PRIEST, LEADER and JUDGE.

6. The final argument underlying the security of the believer is presented in Romans 8:35-37, that none can separate us from the love of CHRIST after our union is established with Him. The words here are, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . in all these things we are more than conquerors . . ." The argument is in full accord with the statement of our LORD, John 10:29 : "My

Father, which gave them me, is greater than all: and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." It is further expressed in another passage by the Apostle when he says, ". . . for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day" (2 Timothy 1:12). And it is further expressed in the seal of the HOLY SPIRIT. We are sealed "unto the day of redemption." When I was a youth I was wonderfully stirred by an eloquent sermon preached by J.R. Graves in which he pointed out the fact that by faith we commit our lives to JESUS; that life is hid with CHRIST in GOD; that life is sealed with the impression of the HOLY SPIRIT unto the day of redemption, and then he asked, "Who can pluck that life out of the hands of GOD?" drawing this vivid picture: "If hell should open her yawning mouth and all of the demons of the pit should issue forth like huge vampires darkening water and land, could they break that seal of GOD? Could they soar to the heights of Heaven? Could they scale its battlements? Could they beat back the angels that guard its walls? Could they penetrate into the presence of the HOLY ONE on His eternal throne, and reach out their demon-claws and pluck our life from the bosom of GOD where it is hid with CHRIST in GOD?" The pages of religious persecution are very bloody; rack, thumbscrews and fagot, have been employed. Confiscation of property, expatriation from country, and hounding pursuit of the exile in foreign lands, exposedness to famine and nakedness and sword and other perils -- and yet never has this persecution been able to effect a separation of the believer from his LORD. Roman emperors tried it, Julian the apostate tried it, Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles V., their son, and Philip II., his son, all tried it in their time. The inquisition held its secret court; war, conflagration and famine wrought their ruin, but the truth prevailed.

All this illustrates the truth that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. The Genevan, the German, the English State churches have tried, in emulation of the Romanist union of Church and State, to crush out the true spirit of Christianity. They have been able to merely scatter the fires, to make them burn over a wider territory as it is expressed concerning the decree to scatter the ashes of Wyclif in the river.

Now upon these arguments, the two intercessors, the sweep of GOD's providence, the link-chain reaching from eternity to eternity, the impossibility of any being laying a charge against one whom GOD has justified, the four pillars -- upon these, the Apostle reaches this persuasion:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:38-39).

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1. What is the final work of salvation in us?

2. What provision did GOD first make for the immortality of man's body?

3. What defeated that plan, and how is this immortality finally to be accomplished?

4. What is Job's testimony to this hope, and what the interpretation of the passage?

5. How is this hope in man evidenced in a singular way?

6. How does Paul elsewhere make the resurrection a pivotal doctrine in the Christian system?

7. Name the six arguments for the security of those who are justified by faith as taught in Romans 8:1-39.

8. What is the providential argument, and what does it include?

9. In the covenant of grace, what are the parts to be performed by the Father, Son, and HOLY SPIRIT, respectively?

10. What is the ground of this salvation, and what the four-pillar argument?

11. In view of these arguments, what was Paul's persuasion?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. THE REDEMPTION OF THE BODY 1. The body to be saved also 2. The body is to be raised 3. The body is to be glorified II. THE EVERLASTING SECURITY OF THE BELIEVER 1. The latitudinarian view 2. The sweep of GOD's providence 3. The sweep of providential government 4. If GOD be for us, who can be against us?

5. The ground is what CHRIST does 6. Who shall separate us from the love of CHRIST?

~ end of chapter 7 ~

***

# 06.07. Conclusion and Climax (9:1-10:21)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 VIII. CONCLUSION AND CLIMAX OF THE DOCTRINAL STATEMENT Romans 9:1-33, Romans 10:1-21 I. THE HARMONY OF THE PROBLEM OF JEWISH UNBELIEF WITH THE PLAN OF SALVATION

Paul's statement of the plan of salvation closes with Romans 8:1-39, so we now take up the problem of Jewish unbelief, its effect on Paul, and the occasion and extent of his concern. So far as this letter goes we find the discussion in Romans 9:1-5, and in Romans 10:1-2, but this concern is equally evident in Luke's history of his labors, addresses and sermons in Acts, and in several other letters written by Paul. One of the deepest passions of his soul was excited and stirred by this problem of Jewish unbelief.

1. The Grounds of Paul's Concern (1) These people were his kindred according to the flesh.

(2) It was his nation and country, and he had an intense patriotism.

(3) They were GOD's adopted people.

(4) They had all of the marvelous privileges of that adoption, and these privileges are thus enumerated by him in the ninth chapter, first paragraph: a. "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory." This glory was the cloud, symbolizing the Divine Presence. b. They had the covenants -- the covenant of grace with Abraham in Genesis 12:1-20, and the covenant of circumcision as expressed in Genesis 17:1-27. c. Then they had the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai -- such a law as cannot be paralleled in the later world. The circumstances under which it was given were more imposing and impressive than the giving of any other code in the annals of time. They had that. d. Then they had the promises -- the promise to Abraham, the promise to Isaac, the promise to Jacob, the promise to the nation, the promise to Moses, and so on. They had all the promises. e. Then they had the Fathers, the patriarchs. It was an illustrious heritage. No other nation had such a list of Fathers -- Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs, the great leaders all through their history. f. They had the services; that is, the imposing ritual of worship set forth in the Book of Exodus from Exodus 38:1-31, Exodus 39:1-43, Exodus 40:1-38, and in all of the Book of Leviticus, and a great part of the Book of Numbers. That service showed the place to meet GOD, the time to meet GOD, the sacrificial means of hearings before GOD, the mediator through whom they could approach GOD. They had that service. No other nation has ever had anything like it. All the churches of the present time have not improved that ritual, including the Romans, the Greeks, the Catholics, the Epicureans, and some Baptists who wear robes in the pulpit to intone their services. g. The last and greatest of the privileges was, that of them came CHRIST, according to the flesh, the line running through Abel, Seth, Heber, Peleg, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, and on down until we come to CHRIST Himself. They had CHRIST according to the flesh. That was the ground and the occasion of his interest. So the problem is, that CHRIST was rejected by His own

people.

More than once an infidel has said to me, "If the proof and the merits of CHRIST be so obvious, why is it that His own people did not take Him?"

2. The Extent of His Concern We now come to the extent of Paul’s concern for this rejection of CHRIST.

(1) He says in Romans 10:1-21, which is a part of this section, "I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge."

(2) I sincerely desire the salvation of my people.

(3) Their rejection of CHRIST gives me continual sorrow and pain of heart.

(4) Finally, "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."

There is only one similar expression in the history of men, and that is where Moses, when all Israel had sinned and GOD said, "Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book," stood in the break and said, "If thou wilt forgive their sin-: and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book." That disposition on the part of Moses and Paul not merely to suffer temporal death but severance from CHRIST if it would save the nation, approaches the feeling that was in the heart of the REDEEMER when He came to die the spiritual death for the salvation of men. Two others had the experience that is here illustrated; for instance, when Abraham offered up his only begotten son. And Isaac, in consenting to be so sacrificed, approximated the experience of the Son in voluntarily coming at the Father’s bidding to die for the world. Higher than all the mountain peaks of time, stand these four names: Abraham, representing the sacrifice of the Father; Isaac, representing the sacrifice of the Son; Moses and Paul, represent the SPIRIT that prompted JESUS to be forsaken of GOD in order to the salvation of men.

3. We come now to the key sentence of these three chapters, in Romans 10:6 : "Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect." The object of the plan of salvation as presented in Romans 8:1-39 has this objection against it: Since the Jewish people did not believe it, how can we harmonize with that plan the problem of the unbelief of the Jews themselves? He starts off to argue that question by the affirmation that this Jewish rejection of CHRIST does not militate against the plan of salvation as set forth. That is his proposition, and the first argument that he makes is that all of Abraham’s children -- all of Abraham’s lineal descendants -- were never included in that national adoption. Abraham had two sons, Isaac and Ishmael. Ishmael and his descendants, the Ishmaelites, are not included. Keturah, Abraham’s second wife, had a pretty large family, and these Midianites, descendants of Keturah, were not included. Then the next one after Abraham, Isaac, had two children, Jacob and Esau. Esau and the Edomites descended from him, through lineal descendants, were not included.

He then presents a case of divine sovereignty concerning these two children of Isaac. He says that the selection of the one to be the people of GOD in the adopted sense and the rejection of the other, was not based upon any work and good to be done by the one or evil to be done by the other. It was not according to the wish of the parents of those children. The selection was made before the children were born -- before either one of them knew good from evil. So that it was not

of Isaac that willed Esau to be the heir, nor of Esau that ran to get the venison in order that he might obtain the blessing of the heir, nor of the plotting of Rebecca and Jacob. Their plotting did not have anything to do with it. It was not of him that runneth, nor of him that plotteth; it was the act of divine sovereignty. Whatever is meant by this adoption of a nation, it was not based upon any merit in that nation, or in the particular individuals through whom this adoption came. Jerusalem when it was first established was no better than any other city; it was of GOD's sovereignty just as the raising up of Pharaoh. "For this very purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee." Right on the heels of that comes the question from the objector, "Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?" Paul is not disposed to answer that question in this connection.

We will find the answer before we get through with these three chapters, but here he waives it aside with a counter-question: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (Romans 9:21) Does not the potter have the ability to take one part of the lump and make a beautiful vessel for the parlor, and to take another part and make a very inferior vessel for the kitchen? And shall either of the vessels object to the potter? He waives it for the time being by merely denying the power of the Christian to intrude into the power of the divine sovereignty. His purpose is to show that the Word of GOD touching salvation has not come to be ineffectual because the Jews rejected it. That is the argument he is on now, and he then advances in it, and says, "Not even all the lineal descendants of Abraham in the select line according to the plan of salvation were to be saved; not all of them could see these two covenants side by side; one was a national covenant, with its seal of circumcision, and promising the earthly Canaan, and the other was the grace covenant that looked to a spiritual seed."

Or, as he puts it in another place, "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Romans 2:28-29). In the exercise of the sovereign purpose of GOD, there is nothing that the finite man can do concerning Him. It is an ocean too deep for our line to fathom. We would have to be infinite to understand it, but we do know that in all human history, without any explanation to us, GOD's purpose is working. GOD had a purpose in having this continent discovered just when it was. He had a purpose in the redemption of Texas in the battle of San Jacinto.

High above human thought, beyond the scope of human sight, of the human mind, the Omnipotence and Omniscience is ruling, and His rule is supreme, and yet nobody is taken by the hair and dragged into hell, and nobody is taken by the hair and dragged into Heaven, as he will show more particularly later.

4. Let us explain and give the application of the vessels of wrath and mercy -- in Romans 9:22-33, about the vessels of wrath and the vessels of mercy. Those that were vessels of wrath, those who voluntarily stood against GOD, GOD patiently endured a long time, and His forbearance signified that He was giving them opportunity for repentance. Those vessels of mercy, they also had opportunity for salvation, whether they were Jews or Greeks. He shows that GOD is no respecter of persons in selecting the Jewish nation, every one of them to be saved in Heaven, and rejected

every other nation, then the objection would have been sustained, but it had a different purpose. The election of the Jewish nation looked to the salvation of the Jews and Gentiles that received the message of GOD, also the covenants, and the coming of CHRIST from them according to the flesh. That election looked through them to others and, so far as salvation in Heaven is concerned, the Jews that believed were saved; and, so far as other nations were concerned, he quotes certain parts of Hosea and the Old Testament, the paragraph referring to the ingathering of the Gentiles: "I will call them my people, which were not my people." In objecting to GOD's selecting one nation and calling that nation "my people," he says, "I will call them my people, which were not my people," and in a place where it was said, "Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God," if they believe on JESUS CHRIST. He then quotes from Isaiah who distinguishes between the holy stock of Israel and the natural stock of Israel as if he had said, "Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved" -- those that by faith accept CHRIST. We see he is laying the predicate for that olive tree illustration that he will introduce later in the discussion. Isaiah then goes on to say that if the grace of GOD had not been revealed, then the LORD GOD of hosts had not left a seed, the whole of them would have been as Sodom and Gomorrah. Nothing but divine grace saves those that were saved -- not their ritual, not their law. He then reaches this conclusion, "What shall we say then?" The Gentiles who followed not after righteousness; that is, the Jewish way, attained to righteousness because they sought it in a different way. The Jew following the law had not arrived at righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but by works; they stumbled at that stumbling-stone.

5. Next he shows that the rejection of the Jews was not total -- He commences Romans 10:1-21 by stating that as far as he is personally concerned his heart's desire and prayer for Israel is that they would be saved, and he is willing to acknowledge that they had a zeal, but not the zeal of knowledge. They busied themselves to establish their own plan of righteousness, and he puts it in such a way that we cannot mistake the law righteousness and leave the faith righteousness as they did. We must not forget that the law says, "Do to live," but faith says, "Live to do." In other words, doing the will of GOD comes out of having been made alive to GOD. Life must come first; make the tree good, and then the fruit will be good. One of them makes doing the means of life and the other puts life as a means of doing. Then he shows that while Moses had handed down this law and set before them its requirements that if one would have kept its requirements in strict obedience he would have been saved; but the law required him to start right in his nature and then to continue to do everything that is contained in the law.

He goes on to quote from Moses. Paul quotes from the Hebrew and not from the Septuagint which runs thus: "The righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into Heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above: [or bring salvation down] ) Or, who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead)." This the Septuagint idea. The Hebrew idea is not that a man tries to go to Heaven as the ancient Titan tried to do -- by piling Pela on Ossa to make a stairway. Nor that he tries to go directly into the depths, down into the abyss, and wrench salvation from the depths. The Hebrew represents him, not as going down, but as going across, saying that man does not go to the other side of the sea to find salvation to bring it back. Paul changes this a little and makes it correspond better than does Moses. Instead of going across the sea, he has the man going down into the depths of the sea,

and he goes on, still quoting Moses, that the real salvation does not come from afar. Paul puts this explanation on it, that it was the word that he preached: "that is, the word of faith, which we preach." The plan of salvation is not making tedious pilgrimages; it is not wearing a hairy undershirt to irritate; it is not wearing bracelets that have thorns in them, and to keep on doing penance; it is the word of faith.

6. Thus he says, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." It is not an intellectual faith -- it is heart-faith. But a good many people misunderstand the import of confession. It does not mean to confess sins to your brother, nor to a priest, nor even to GOD -- that is not the confession he is talking about, but it is a public confession of CHRIST as Saviour. If we have not faith enough to confess the CHRIST that we say we believe in, we have not faith enough to be saved. Confession implies that whoever makes it must have a great deal of courage. In this time of peace it does not cost much to confess CHRIST, and even now sometimes shame prevents confession by young people. The young lady going in to a city is told not to join a church because that will deprive her of all social functions. "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels... But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven." And if we are afraid or ashamed to come out in public, and say, "I take CHRIST as my Saviour," then the Father will be ashamed of us. This law has no distinction as to nationality; there was only one door to the ark. The elephant went in at the same door as the snail, and the eagle swooped down through the same door at which a little wren hopped in. And there is not a side door for a woman to go in. We all go to CHRIST through the same door. While it is true that GOD called Israel out of Egypt, the same Bible says that He called the Philistines out of Caphtor, and He is the LORD of all nations, and the universality of the plan of salvation is expressed in "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Then comes up the question, How can any one call on GOD who has not believed in GOD, and how can he believe in a GOD of whom he has never heard? How can he hear unless somebody tells him -- unless there be a preacher -- and how can there be a preacher except he be sent? The sending there means GOD-sent. What a marvelous theme for a missionary sermon!

Having stated that, he raised another question, "Have they not heard? Did they not have preachers?" Has not the word gone to them? From Genesis we learn that the antediluvians had light enough to be saved, and Paul is here quoting a Psalm: ". . . their sound went into all the earth." JESUS CHRIST is the true light that lights every man that comes into the world. There has been light enough if the people had been willing to walk in the light.

I once heard a preacher state to a congregation that the heathen that did the best they could would be saved. But he didn't produce any heathen who had done his best. And where is the man that has done his best? The plan by which men are to be saved is the plan to make the promise sure to all. It is as quick as lightning in its application. It is a fine thing for a man to quit his meanness; it is a fine thing for a man to do the best he can, but certainly it is not the way of salvation; we do not secure salvation by that. ". . . by a foolish nation I will anger you." In other words, "If you will have no GOD, you adopted people, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people"; as Isaiah said, "I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me. But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands

unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." Their whole record is, no matter who called, who was sent, who preached, they rejected. Having shown them that GOD was not unjust in rejecting them, and that He did not violate the Gospel plan of salvation, Paul says, "I am one of them; not all the Jews were lost; I am one of them." Neither in its totality nor in its perpetuity were the Jews rejected. Elijah supposed once that he stood by himself, and that he was the only one left. GOD says, "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal."

Having shown from Romans 9:1-33 and Romans 10:1-21 that the rejection of the Jews was not total, we will show from chapter 11 that it was not perpetual.

II. THE LIMITATIONS AND MERCIFUL PURPOSE OF GOD'S REJECTION OF ISRAEL (Romans 11:1-36) 1. Israel's rejection was neither total nor perpetual. The elect, or spiritual Israel, were never cast off. From Abraham to Paul every Israelite, who looked through the types and by faith laid hold of the Antitype, was saved. In this sense there were no lost tribes, but out of every tribe the elect, manifested in the circumcision of the heart, not of the flesh, were saved.

(1) The Apostle cites his own case -- That he himself was an Israelite is abundantly shown here, and even more particular elsewhere (Php 3:4-6; Acts 22:3-15), and yet he was saved after Israel according to the flesh was cast off and the kingdom transferred to the Gentiles, as were all the Jews from Pentecost to Paul. The number of elect Jews thus saved was always greater than appeared to human sight, as evidenced in Elijah's time.

(2) Elijah in his panic supposed himself to be alone, but JEHOVAH showed him that through grace there were seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal.

(3) So it continued to be in Paul's time; there was a remnant spared according to grace.

2. But the Apostle is careful to show that this elect remnant, never cast off, every one of them, was saved by grace, and not one of them by the works of law. Then he explains this finding of salvation by the elect Jews by the two essentially different methods of seeking salvation. The elect sought it by faith and obtained it; the rest because they persistently sought righteousness by works of the law, rejecting GOD's righteousness, were judicially blinded as shown: by the law itself, Deuteronomy 29:4; by the prophets, Isaiah 29:10; by the Psalms, Psalms 69:22-23.

Having shown that the casting off was never total, and why, he then shows that it was not intended to be perpetual by proving the ultimate restoration of all Israel as a nation, whenever it should turn to the grace-method of salvation, the scriptural proof of which is as follows:

(1) In the law itself, which denounces their casting off, is the promise of an expiation through grace (Deuteronomy 32:43).

(2) In the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple it is suggested (1 Kings 8:46-53).

(3) In the prophets it is clearly foretold, and all the method of it (Isaiah 66:8; Ezekiel 36:22 to 37:28; Zechariah 12:9 to 13:1). The element of mercy dominant in the election of Israel as a nation is that they were chosen that through them all the nations might be blessed. The element of mercy in their rejection is that through their downfall life might come to other nations. The element of mercy toward the Jews in the call of the Gentiles was that casting off Israel might be provoked to return to

GOD. In saving Gentiles there was an aim at the salvation of his casting off people. This is proved in his argument thus: ". . . through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy," and then he magnified his own office as an Apostle to the Gentiles to provoke the jealousy of his own people in order that he might save some. He foresees a wonderful effect on the Gentiles in the restoration of the Jews. It will be even more beneficial than their downfall: "Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? . . . for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" (Romans 11:12, Romans 11:15). Then our concern, prayer and labor for that great future event -- the restoration of GOD's ancient people -- is a concern for other nations who never will be thoroughly aroused until moved by redeemed Israel. A passage from Peter shows the relation of the conversion of the Jews to our LORD's final advent, and a declaration of our LORD shows the time of this general salvation of the Jews. Peter says, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; Whom the Heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3:19-21). Our LORD says, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (Luke 21:24).

3. Then according to Isaiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah, the means and methods of this great salvation of the Jews are as follows:

(1) It will be preceded by a gathering together of Israel out of all nations.

(2) CHRIST whom they pierced will be lifted up in Gentile preaching.

(3) The HOLY SPIRIT in convicting and converting power will be poured out on them, whereby they shall mourn and pray and see the LORD as their Saviour.

(4) The nation shall be born of GOD in a day. The apostle bases this marvelous work of GOD upon the principle that "For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches... For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins... For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Romans 11:16, Romans 11:27, Romans 11:29).

4. The illustration of the olive tree -- Then follows his illustration of the olive tree, the explanation of which is as follows:

(1) CHRIST is the root (2) The holy stock is the spiritual elect, Israel.

(3) The branches broken off are the unbelieving Jews.

(4) The branches grafted in are the believing Gentiles.

(5) The principle is vital and spiritual connection with CHRIST, through faith, without respect to Jew or Gentile.

(6) The unbelieving children of Abraham are like branches merely tied on the stock externally; there is no communication of the fatness of the sap into the veins of the branches tied on

externally.

(7) So a Gentile tied on externally, without this vital connection, will be broken off. The divine purpose in shutting up both Gentile and Jew unto disobedience as shown in the argument, Romans 3:9-20, is expressed thus: "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all" (Romans 11:32).

III. THE DOXOLOGY We will conclude this discussion with an analysis of the doxology which is the climax of this argument:

1. An exclamation of the profundity of the riches of both GOD's wisdom and knowledge.

2. The incomprehensibility to the finite mind of His judgments and ways.

3. No finite being knew His mind or advised His actions.

4. No beneficiary of His goodness ever first gave to GOD as a meritorious ground of the benefaction.

5. Because He is the source of all good, and the medium of salvation from its initiation to its consummation, all the glory belongs to GOD.

Amen!

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1. What is the problem of Romans 9:1-33, Romans 10:1-21, Romans 11:1-36?

2. What are the marvelous privileges of the Jews' adoption?

3. What is the infidel argument on this point?

4. What are the items which indicate the extent of Paul's concern for his people?

5. What is Paul's meaning here, and what Old Testament examples of this experience and spirit?

6. What is the key sentence of Romans 9:1-33, Romans 10:1-21, Romans 11:1-36, and what is its meaning?

7. What is Paul's first argument on this point?

8. What is the case of divine sovereignty concerning Jacob and Esau?

9. What question from the objector is here introduced, and how does Paul dispose of it?

10. What advance did he than make in his argument, and how does he illustrate it elsewhere?

11. What illustrations of the sovereign purpose of GOD are cited by the author?

12. What is the explanation of the vessels of wrath and the vessels of mercy in Romans 9:22 ff?

13. How does Paul show that GOD was no respecter of persons in selecting the Jewish nation?

14. What is the conclusion of all this, then, as stated in the closing part of chapter 9?

15. What is the argument of Romans 10:1-21?

16. What concession does he make in favor of the Jews in the first part of Romans 10:1-21, and what is his objection raised?

17. What is the difference between the law-righteousness and the faith-righteousness?

18. What is the meaning of the confession mentioned in this connection, and what is its relation to salvation?

19. How does Paul show here that GOD makes no distinction between peoples of different nationalities, and what is the author's illustration.

20. What is Paul's answer to the question, "Have they not heard?"

21. With what reproof of the Jewish people does Paul close Romans 10:1-21?

22. What are the limits of Israel's rejection?

23. How does he explain this finding of salvation by the elect Jews, and the casting off of the non-elect Jews?

24. How does he next show that the casting off was not intended to be perpetual?

25. What is the Scriptural proof of this ultimate restoration of Israel?

26. What element of mercy was dominant in the election of Israel as a nation?

27. What element of mercy in their rejection?

28. What element of mercy toward Jews in the call of the Gentiles?

29. What effect on the Gentiles does Paul foresee in the restoration of the Jews?

30. Quote a passage from our LORD showing the time of this general salvation of the Jews.

31. In the olive tree illustration what are the root, the holy stock, the branches broken off, the branches grafted in, the principle, the condition of the unbelieving children of Abraham, and what of the Gentile tied on externally?

32. What then is the divine purpose in shutting up both Gentile and Jew unto disobedience?

33. Give an analysis of the doxology.

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. THE HARMONY OF THE PROBLEM OF JEWISH UNBELIEF WITH THE PLAN OF SALVATION 1. The grounds of Paul's concern 2. The extent of his concern 3. How harmonize with Jewish unbelief 4. The vessels of wrath and mercy 5. The rejection of the Jews was not total 6. Not intellectual faith, but heart faith II. THE LIMITATIONS AND MERCIFUL PURPOSE OF GOD'S REJECTION OF ISRAEL (Romans 11:1-36) 1. Neither total nor perpetual 2. The elect remnant was saved by grace 3. Means and methods of this salvation 4. The illustration of the olive tree III. THE DOXOLOGY 1. GOD's riches and wisdom 2. All incomprehensible 3. Not advised by humans 4. No ground of merit 5. All the glory belongs to GOD ~ end of chapter 8 ~

***

Chapter 61

# 06.08. Conclusion: Practical Admonitions (12:1-16:27)

STUDIES IN ROMANS By B.H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D. THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

- 1935 IX CONCLUSION: PRACTICAL ADMONITIONS Romans 12:1-21, Romans 13:1-14, Romans 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-33, Romans 16:1-27 I. THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION BY GRACE APPLIED TO PRACTICAL LIFE The prevalent characteristic of all Paul’s teachings concerning the Gospel is the unfailing observance of the order and relation of doctrine and morals. He never "puts the cart before the horse," and never drives the horse without the care attached and following after. He was neither able to conceive of morals not based on antecedent doctrine, nor to conceive of doctrine not fruiting in holy living. He rigidly adhered to the CHRIST idea, "Make the tree good, and his fruit good." His clear mind never confounded cause and effect. To his logical and philosophical mind it was a reversal of all natural and spiritual law to expect good trees as a result of good fruit, but rather good fruit evidencing a good tree. So he conceived of justification through faith, and regeneration through the SPIRIT as obligating to holy living. If he fired up his doctrinal engine, it was not to exhaust its steam in whistling, but in sawing logs, or grinding grist, or drawing trains. The modern cry, "Give us morals and away with dogma," would have been to him a philosophical absurdity, just as the antinomian cry, "faith makes void the law -- Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" was abhorrent and blasphemous to him. A justification of a sinner through grace that delivered from the guilt of sin was unthinkable to him if unaccompanied by a regeneration that delivered from the dominion of sin.

He expected no good works from the dead, but insisted that those made alive were created unto good works. His philosophy of salvation, in the order and relation of doctrine and morals, is expressed thus in his letter to Titus: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." So in every letter there is first the doctrinal foundation, and then the application to morals. But as in this letter we have the most complete and systematic statement of the doctrine of grace as a foundation (Romans 10:1-21, Romans 11:1-36) so in this, the following section (Romans 12:1-21, Romans 13:1-14, Romans 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-33), we have the most elaborate superstructure of morals.

1. The analysis and order of thought is this great section are --

(1) Salvation by grace through faith obligates the observance of all duties toward GOD the Father on account of what He does for us in the gift of His Son, in election, predestination, justification and adoption (Romans 12:1).

(2) It obligates the observances of all duties toward GOD the HOLY SPIRIT for what he does in us in regeneration and sanctification (Romans 12:2).

(3) It obligates the observance of all duties toward the church, with its diversity of gifts in unity of body (Romans 12:3-13).

(4) It obligates the observance of all duties toward the individual neighbor in the outside world (Romans 12:14-21).

(5) It obligates the observance of all duties to the neighbours, organized as society or state (Romans 13:1-13).

(6) It obligates the observance of all duties arising from the Christian's individual relation to CHRIST the Saviour (Romans 13:14; Romans 14:7-12).

(7) It obligates the observance of all duties arising from the Christian's individual brother in CHRIST (Romans 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-7).

(8) The last obligation holds, regardless of the race distinctions, Jew and Gentile (Romans 15:8-24), and includes the welcome of the Apostle to the Gentiles, prayer for the welcome and success of his service toward the Jewish Christians in their need (Romans 15:25-29), and prayer for his deliverance from the unbelieving Jews (Romans 15:30-33).

2. As to the sum of these obligations --

(1) They cover the whole scope of morals, whether in the Decalogue, as given to the Jews, or the enlarged Christian code arising from grace.

(2) They conform to relative proportions, making first and paramount morals toward GOD, whether Father, Son, or HOLY SPIRIT, not counting that morals at all which leaves out GOD in either His unity of nature, or trinity of persons, and making that second, subordinate and correlative which is morals toward men. The duty toward GOD the Father, in view of what He has done for us in grace and mercy, is to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable to GOD (Romans 12:1), and respect His prerogative (Romans 12:19), which is illustrated by Paul elsewhere. He says, "I die daily," meaning that though alive, his members were on the rack of death all the time. He says, I mortify my members and, "I keep under my body"; that is, he kept his redeemed soul on top, dominating his body. He made his body as "Prometheus bound" on the cold rock of Caucasus, vultures devouring his vitals every day as they were renewed every night, a living death. Our duty toward GOD, the HOLY SPIRIT, in view of what He graciously does in us is found in Romans 12:2 : Negatively -- Let not the regenerate soul be conformed with the spirit and course of this evil world, whether in the lust of the eye or pride of life. Positively -- Be transformed in continual sanctification in the renewing of the mind; that is, working out the salvation which the SPIRIT works in us, as He, having commenced a good work in us (regeneration) continues it (through sanctification) until the day of JESUS CHRIST. Or, as this Apostle says elsewhere, CHRIST, having been formed in us the hope of glory, we are changed into that image from glory to glory as by the SPIRIT of the LORD.

3. The duties toward the church are found in Romans 12:3-13 :

(1) Not to think more highly of one's self in view of the other members of the church -- Here are a lot of people in one church; now let not one member put himself too high in view of the other members of that church.

(2) To think only according to the proportion of faith given to him for the performance of some duty -- If I am going to put an estimate upon myself in the relation to my church members, a standard or estimate should be, What is the proportion of faith given to me? Say A has so much, B has so much, C has so much, D has so much, and E has least of all; then E ought not to think himself the biggest of all. The Standard of judgment is the proportion of faith given to each member.

(3) He must respect the unity of the church as a body -- in that illustration used the church is compared to a body having many members. The hand must not say, "I am everything," and the eye must not say, "I am everything," nor the ear, "I am everything," nor the foot, "I am everything." In estimating, we have to estimate the function of each part, the proportion of power given to that part, and it is always not as a sole thing, but in its relation to every other part -- that is a duty that a church member must perform.Sometimes a man easily forgets that he is just one of many in the organism.

.(4) He must respect its diversity of gifts -- That is one part of it that I comply with. If there is anything that rejoices my heart, it is the diversity of gifts that GOD puts in the church. I never saw a Christian in my life that could not do some things better than anybody else in the world. I would feel very mean indeed if I did not rejoice in the special gifts of other members in the church. What a pity it would be if we had just one kind of mold, and everybody was run through like tallow so as to make every candle alike. They duty of the church is to respect the unity of the body, and its diversity of gifts.

(5) Each gift is to be exercised with its appropriate corresponding limitation.

4. The duties to the individual neighbor of the outside world, even though hostile to us, are found in Romans 12:14-21.

(1) To bless him when he persecutes.

(2) To be sympathetic toward him, rejoicing in his joy, and weeping in his sorrow.

(3) Several Christians should not be of different mind toward him -- The expression in the text is to be of the same mind one toward another. What is the point of that? We are dealing now with individuals outside. Here is A, a Christian; B, a Christian, C, a Christian; and the outsider is watching. A makes one impression on his mind, B makes a different one, and C makes still a different one. The influence from these several Christians does not harmonize; it is not like-minded; but if he sees A, B, C, all in different measures perhaps, be every one of the same mind, then he sees that there is a unifying power in Christian. How often do we hear it said, "If every Christian were like you, I would want to be one, but look yonder at that deacon, or at that sister"! We should be like-minded to those outside so that every Christian that comes in may make a similar impression for CHRIST's sake.

(4) We should not, in dealing with him, respect big outsiders only, but condescend to the lowly -- to men of low estate. Some of them are very rich, some of them are influential socially, some of them are what we call poor, country folk. We should not be high-minded in our dealings with these

sinners, but condescend to men of low estate. Let them feel that we are willing to go and help them.

(5) We should not let our wisdom toward him be self-conceit; that is, let it not seem to him that way.

(6) When he does evil to us, we should not repay in kind.

(7) We should let him see that we are honest men -- Ah, me, how many outsiders are repelled because all Christians do not provide things honest in the sight of the outside world!

(8) So far as it lies in us, we should be peaceable with him -- That means that it is absolutely impossible to be peaceable with a man that has no peace in him. He wants to fuss anyhow, and goes around with a chip on his shoulder. He goes around snarling and showing his teeth. There are some people that are not peaceable, but so far as our life is concerned, we should be peaceable with them.

(9) We should not avenge on him wrongs done us by him -- Vengeance belongs to GOD; we should give place to GOD's wrath.

(10) We should feed him if hungry, and give him drink if thirsty.

(11) We should not allow ourselves to be overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. We should not get off when we come in contact with evil people, but just hang on and overcome evil with good.

5. The duties to the state are as follows:

(1) Be subject to higher powers, and do not resist them, for (a) GOD ordained them, (b) GOD makes them a terror to evil works, (c) GOD's minister for good, (d) and for conscience' sake we must respect the state.

(2) Pay our taxes.

(3) Whatever is due to each office: "Render . . . honour to whom honour."

(4) Keep out of debt: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another."

(5) Keep the moral code: "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet."

(6) Avoid the world's excesses, revellings, and such like.

6. The duties toward GOD the Son, in view of what He has done for us and in view of our vital union with Him, are set forth in Romans 14:7-12.

(1) Negatively: Live not unto self (2) Positively: Live unto JESUS, respecting His prerogatives and servants.

7. Let us now look at the duties to individual Christians -- We have considered the Christians as a body. What are the duties to individual Christians? Romans 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-7 contains the duty to individual Christians. Let us enumerate these duties somewhat:

(1) Receive the weak in faith -- We have a duty to every weak brother; receive him, but not to doubtful disputations. If we must have our abstract, metaphysical, hair-splitting distinctions, let us not spring them on the poor Christian that is just alive.

(2) We should not judge him censoriously, instituting a comparison between us and him; we should not say to him, "Just look at me."

(3) We should not hurt him by doing things, which though lawful to us, will cause him to stumble. The explanation there is in reference to a heathen custom. The heathen offered sacrifices to their gods, and after the sacrifice they would hang up the parts not consumed and sell as any other butchered meat. Could we stand up like Paul and say, "It won't hurt me to eat that meat, but there is a poor fellow just born into the Kingdom, and he is weak in the faith. He sees me eating this meat that has been offered in sacrifice to idols, and he stumbles; therefore, I will not eat meat"? He draws the conclusion that if a big fellow can do that he can too, and he goes and worships the idols. The strong, through the exercise of his liberty that he could have done without, caused his fall into idolatry. That is what he meant when he wrote, "Do not hurt him; do not cause him to stumble." He gives two reasons why we must not cause him to stumble on account of a little meat. He says, (a) "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (b) If we consider this weak brother, our consideration will be acceptable to CHRIST, and approved of men, but if we trample on the poor fellow that is weak in the faith, CHRIST won't approve of it, and men won't approve of it.

(4) Follow the things that make for peace -- It is individual Christians that we are talking about, and we come in contact with them where we have A, B, C, D, and E and the first thing we know a little root of bitterness springs up among them and stirs up a disagreement. The point is that we should follow the things that make for peace, just as far as we can, and sometimes that will take us a good ways. He gives this illustration where he says, "If my eating meat offered to idols causes my brother to stumble, then I am willing to take a total abstinence pledge." Then he extends it: "Nor drink wine, nor do anything whereby my brother is caused to stumble." There is meat other than that which is offered to idols.

(5) Bear his infirmities -- One man said, "There is much of human nature in the mule, but more of the mule in human nature." The best man I ever knew had some infirmities, and I can see some of mine with my eyes shut, and I believe better with them shut than with them open. We all have infirmities in some direction or another.

(6) We should seek to please him rather than to please ourselves -- We are not to sacrifice a principle, but if we can please him without sacrificing a principle, rather than please ourselves, why not do it? Let us make him feel good if we can. This is the duty to the individual Christian. The duties of Christian Jews to Gentile neighbors are found in Romans 15:8-24. There they are all elaborated. Even in the Jew's Bible, all through its parts, it is shown that GOD intended to save the Gentiles. The duty of Gentile Christians to the Jews is found in Romans 15:15-27, showing that there is a debt and that it ought to be paid.

II. SOME FRAGMENTS OF Romans 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-33, Romans 16:1-27

These Scriptures have been covered generally in the discussion already. So in this chapter it is our purpose only to gather up the fragments that nothing may be lost.

1. Then let us commence by expounding Romans 14:9 :

(1) The death of CHRIST was on the cross; the living after death is His resurrection -- life in glory. (Compare Revelation 1:18)

(2) The end of CHRIST's dying and reviving is said to be that He might be LORD of both the dead and the living, the dead meaning those bodies sleeping the grave to be raised from the grave at His coming. The latter clause of Romans 14:14 does not make our thought of what is sin the standard of sin, but GOD's law alone determines that. It means that when a man violates his own conception of the law he is in spirit a sinner, seeing that he goes contrary to his standard.

2. The doctrine of Romans 14:20-21 is that what is not sin per se may become sin under certain conditions arising from our relations to others. For example:

(1) Eating meat offered to idols is lawful per se (Romans 14:14; 1 Corinthians 8:4).

(2) But if it causes a weak brother to worship idols, then charity may justify a total abstinence pledge (Romans 14:21; 1 Corinthians 8:13).

(3) This thing lawful per se, but hurtful in its associations and effects on the weak, may be also the object of church-prohibition, the HOLY SPIRIT concurring (Acts 15:29).

(4) And a church refusing to enforce the prohibition becomes the object of CHRIST's censure and may forfeit its office or candle (Revelation 2:14-16).

3. In this whole chapter (Romans 14:1-23), particularly in the paragraph, Romans 14:22-23, (1) what is the meaning of the word, "faith," (2) does the closing paragraph make all accountability dependent on subjective moral conviction, and (3) does it teach that the actions of unbelievers are sins?

(1) Faith, in this chapter throughout, does not so much refer to the personal acceptance of CHRIST as to the liberty in practice to which that acceptance entitles -- So that, "weak in the faith," Romans 14:1, does not imply that some strongly accept CHRIST and others lightly. But the matter under discussion is, What liberty in practice does faith allow with reference to certain specified things, the lawfulness or expediency of which may be a matter of scruple in the sensitive but uninformed conscience of some? One may have faith in CHRIST to receive Him though in his ignorance he may not go as far as another in the conception of the liberty to which this faith entitles him as to what foods are clean or unclean, what days are holy or common and as to partaking in feasts of meats which have been offered to idols.

(2) The "whatsoever" of Romans 14:23 is neither absolute nor universal in its application. It is limited first to the specified things or their kind, and second, to believers, having no reference to outsiders making no profession of faith.

(3) Subjective moral conviction is not a fixed and ultimate standard of right and wrong, which would be a mere sliding scale, but it is GOD's law; yet this chapter, and particularly its closing paragraph, seems to indicate that the wilful violation of conscience contains within itself a seed of destruction as has been intimated in Romans 2:14-16.

(4) If this whole chapter was not an elaboration of the duties of a Christian toward his fellow Christian, both presumed to be members of one body, the particular church, it might plausibly be made to appear that "faith" in this chapter means belief of what is right and wrong.

4. The theme of Romans 16:1-27 is The Courteous Recognition of the Christian Merits and Labors of all Workers for CHRIST, Each in His Own or Her Own Sphere. The great lessons of this chapter are --

(1) As we have in this letter the most complete and systematic statement of Christian doctrine, and the most systematic and elaborate application of morals based on the doctrine, so appropriately its conclusion is the most elaborate and the most courteous recognition of the Christian merits and labors of all classes of Kingdom workers in their respective spheres.

(2) With the Letter to Philemon, it is the highest known expression of delicate and exquisite courtesy.

(3) It is a revelation of the variety and value of woman’s work in the apostolic churches, and in all her fitting spheres of activity.

(4) It is a revelation of the value of great and consecrated laymen in the work of the Kingdom.

(5) It is a revelation of the fellowship of apostolic Christians and their self-sacrificing devotion to each other.

(6) It magnifies the graces of hospitality.

(7) It magnifies the power of family religion whether of husband and wife, brother and sister, more distant kindred, or master and servant.

(8) It digs up by the roots a much later contention, and heresy of one big metropolitan church in a city, with a dominant bishop, exercising authority over smaller churches and "inferior clergy" in that it clearly shows that there was not in central Rome one big church, with a nascent pope, lording it over suburban and village churches. There was not here no "church of Rome," but several distinct churches in Rome whose individuality and equality are distinctly recognized.

(9) It shows the fellowship of churches, however remote from each other, and their comity and co-operation in Kingdom work.

(10) It shows in a remarkable way how imperial Rome with its worldwide authority, its military roads and shiplines, its traffic to and fro from center to each point of the circumference of world-territory and its amalgamation of nations, was a providential preparation for the propagation of a universal religion.

(11) The various names of those saluted and saluting, about thirty-five in all, indicating various nationalities, not only show that the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles is broken down in the churches, but that in the Kingdom "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all" (Colossians 3:11).

(12) But the lesson seems greatest in its mercy and privileges conferred on women and slaves.

(13) The homiletic value, in pulpit themes suggested, from these various names, labors and conditions, which Spurgeon seems to have recognized most of all preachers.

5. Let us now expound the entreaty in Romans 16:17-18 containing the following points.

(1) We need to distinguish between those that "cause divisions" and those that "put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall." The "divisions" wold most likely come from a bigoted and narrow Jew insisting on following Moses in order to become a Christian, as in the churches of Galatia, Corinth and elsewhere, but those causing "an occasion to fall" (as in Romans 14:13-22) would likely be Gentiles insisting on the extreme of liberty in the eating of meats offered to idols, and like things.

(2) While both classes are in the church, and not outsiders, as many teach, yet neither class possesses the spiritual mindedness and charity of a true Christian, but under the cloak of religion they serve their own passions for bigotry in one direction or license in another direction, utterly misapprehending the spiritual character of the kingdom of GOD.

(3) Both classes are to be avoided as enemies of the cross of CHRIST (Compare Php 3:18; Galatians 5:19-23).

6. In Romans 16:20, there are three points:

(1) There is an allusion to the promise in Genesis 3:11 that the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head.

(2) This was fulfilled by CHRIST’s triumph on the cross over Satan (Colossians 2:15).

(3) And will be fulfilled in all CHRIST’s seed at the final advent.

QUESTIONS FOR STIMULATION AND REVIEW 1. What are the prevalent characteristics of all Paul’s teachings concerning the Gospel? Illustrate.

2. What is Paul’s attitude toward the modern cry, "Give us morals and away with dogma"?

3. How is this thought especially emphasized in this letter?

4. What is the analysis and order of thought in this letter in Romans 12:1-21, Romans 13:1-14, Romans 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-33?

5. What is the duty toward GOD the Father, in view of what He has done for us in grace and mercy?

6. What is the meaning of "living sacrifice"? Illustrate.

7. What is our duty toward GOD the HOLY SPIRIT, in view of what He graciously does in us?

8. What are our duties toward the church?

9. What are our duties toward the individual neighbor of the outside world, even though hostile to us?

10. What are our duties toward the state?

11. What are our duties toward GOD the Son, in view of what He has done for us and in view of our vital union with Him?

12. What are the duties to individual Christians?

13. What are the duties of Christian Jews to Gentile neighbors?

14. What three things are noted in Romans 14:9?

15. Does the latter clause of Romans 14:14 make our thought of what is sin the standard of sin? If not, what does it mean?

16. What is the doctrine of Romans 14:20-21? Give examples.

17. In the whole of Romans 14:1-23, particularly in the paragraph, Romans 14:22-23, (1) What is the meaning of the word "faith"? (2) Does the closing paragraph make all accountability dependent on subjective moral conviction?

18. What are the great lessons of Romans 16:1-27?

19. Expound the entreaty in Romans 16:17-18.

20. What are the three points of Romans 16:20?

LET US RETHINK THE CHAPTER I. THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION BY GRACE APPLIED TO PRACTICAL LIFE -- Paul always insisted on doctrine and morals - 1. The analysis and order in this great section 2. The sum of these obligations 3. Duties toward the church (Romans 12:3-13) 4. Duties to the neighbor outside 5. Duties to the state 6. Duties to GOD 7. Duties to individual Christians II. SOME FRAGMENTS OF Revelation 14:1-23, Romans 15:1-33, Romans 16:1-27 1. Commence by expounding Romans 14:9 2. Expounding Romans 14:20-21 3. Expounding Romans 14:1-23, especially Romans 14:22-23 4. Expounding Romans 16:1-27 5. The entreaty in Romans 16:17-18 6. The three points in Romans 16:20.

~ end of book ~

Chapter 62

# 07.00. THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA

THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA BY

B. H. CARROLL TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 2. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS 3. CONDITION OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES IN ASIA 4. PROMISES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES

# 07.01. Introduction

INTRODUCTION

The first word in this book, as in the Old Testament books, gives its name: Greek, Apocalupsis; Latin, Revelatio; English, Revelation. They all mean literally an upveiling of that which is hidden. The source of the revelation, as you see from the text, is God the Father. The medium of the revelation is Jesus Christ. The agent employed in signifying it is an interpreting angel. The revelation is made to John the apostle for the people of God. Notice that the word "signify" is appropriately used, since the revelation is to be made known by signs or symbols. The angel, who signifies it, is the author of the great voice as of a trumpet in Revelation 1:10. We hear his voice again at the beginning of Revelation 4:1-11, and he reappears on the scene in the last chapters of the book. Revelation 1:2 tells us which John received this revelation in these words: "Who bare witness of the word of God and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, even of all things that he saw." It is quite important to know when John bare witness of the word of God. The tense is the "aorist" and usually, according to grammatical construction, refers to something in the completed past. Following this sense of the aorist we are bound to construe Revelation 1:2 as identifying the John to whom this revelation was made and the bearing witness would refer to the witness that he had already borne in his Gospel. This construction would conclusively establish the authorship of the book. It would prove that the author of the Gospel is also the author of this book, and that the Gospel was written first. The only escape from this conclusion is to make the witness bearing refer to what John now does concerning this revelation which he is receiving. Many great scholars insist on making this the meaning, and calling the tense the epistolary aorist. I see no necessity for adopting this latter construction. By reference to John’s Gospel, and indeed to his first letter, we see that he there claims to have borne witness to the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ and of all things that he saw and heard. In Revelation 1:3 we have the words: "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy." We know that in later times the churches had readers who would read to them any communication received and explain the communication. The rest of the church would hear. We have already found that Paul gave directions that his letter to one church should be read to another church, and the letter to that church be also read to the first church named. So it is unnecessary to go to a later date to find the origin of a reader to the churches. The New Testament itself gives the origin. From Revelation 1:4-6 we have John’s greeting to the seven churches of Asia. to whom the entire book is addressed. Not only all of Revelation 2:1-29, Revelation 3:1-22 are specifically devoted to special messages for the churches named, but at the end of the book, Revelation 22:16, we have these words referring back to the whole book, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things for the churches." It is important to note in this connection our Lord’s use of the word ecclesia. In Matthew 16:1-28, he says: "I will build my church," using the term to signify the institution. In Matthew 18:1-35, he says, "tell it to the church," referring to whatever particular congregation the decision of the case of discipline belongs. Many times in the book of Revelation he uses the word "church," and in every case the reference is to particular churches. Our Lord’s

usage of the word knows nothing of a now existing universal church, whether visible or invisible. He does not say to the church of Asia, but the seven churches of Asia. There is nothing in His use of the word to indicate the existence of church in any provincial, national, worldwide, or denominational sense. On the contrary, he seems to guard very carefully against such a use of the term. It is true that in Revelation 12:1-17, without using the term "church," he does present the idea of the church as an institution under the symbol of the woman arrayed with the sun and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars, which woman later becomes, in chapter 19, the bride of Christ or the church in glory.

We have a remarkable vision which is the key passage to the interpretation of the whole book of Revelation in Revelation 1:12-16. The elements of the vision are, first, seven golden candlesticks, and in the midst of the candlesticks a vision of Christ as the Sun of Righteousness. He holds in His right hand seven stars and out of His mouth proceeds a sharp two-edged sword. This vision He explains himself: The candlesticks represent the churches; the stars represent the messengers or pastors of the churches; the two-edged sword represents His word, or the gospel. The whole vision is one of light. The central light ¾ Christ, the Sun of Righteousness; the lower lights ¾ the churches and the preachers; the instrumentality of dispensing the light ¾the Word of God. In Revelation 13:1-18 we see. that while Christ is in the midst of the churches, He is not there in person, but through the other Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, who is His "alter ego," His vicar here upon earth. John in his Gospel had previously represented Christ as the light of the world, but since He ascended into heaven this light is reflected in the churches and preachers through the Spirit and by the Word. The object of the vision is to show that the whole world will be illumined by the churches and the preachers in the dispensation of the gospel, which dispensation is the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, for when Christ speaks to the churches He says: "If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit sayeth to the churches." The doctrine of this vision is of incalculable importance. It teaches that the Spirit dispensation, or Word dispensation through the churches and the preachers, is to accomplish the whole work of the application of the salvation achieved by our Lord’s vicarious death. We will find in every subsequent revelation this ruling thought; the world to be illumined by these light-bearers. There is no hint of any other source or medium or instrumentality of light. There is no hint that the churches will fail on the earth and that some other divine interposition must take place to finish the mystery of the kingdom of God. This is in accord with the Great Commission in Matthew 28:19-20

"Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I will be with you all the days, even unto the end of the world."

# 07.02. General Observations

2. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS This chapter on the analysis is the second revelation, Revelation 2:1-29, Revelation 3:1-22, an earth scene of "the things that are." It consists of the letters to the seven churches, and is a revelation of their condition in God’s sight. Now, upon these seven letters I wish to make some general observations. My first is that you should find a map ¾ generally the last map in your Bible ¾ of the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea. That will show you the province of Asia - the southwestern part of Asia Minor. And on that map you must locate the seven churches. Commence at the southwestern coast of Asia Minor ¾ there you will find the first church, Ephesus, a seaport, or used to be, situated on a little river that flows into the Aegean Sea. Follow the coast line north until you come to Smyrna, another seaport. Still going north you come to Pergamum, or Pergamos (either is correct). That is not a seaport, but is close to the sea. The first three churches, then, are found by following up the coast going north. The other four churches are inland, and you will find them by commencing a little north of where Pergamos is located, and by following a line south you come to the other churches in the order named: Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea. Now, look a little off that coast from the southwestern part of Asia Minor, and you will find a little island, barely discernible on the map, called Patmos. That is where John was. So, my first observation is that the reader should locate on a map the province of Asia, the seven churches (noting which are seaports and which are inland) and Patmos. My next observation is based upon what we considered in the last chapter, that is, the key passage of the book (Revelation 1:12-16), representing Christ as the original light, the Sun of Righteousness, shining as the sun in its full strength, reflecting His light upon the churches, and through them here on earth His reflected light is to illuminate the world. The description of this glorified Christ shows Him in the garb of a high priest, and invested with kingly rule ¾ a royal priest. If that be the key passage, then the whole of this book up to Revelation 20:11, where you strike the climax of the book - the whole of the book up to that point is what is called the Spirit’s dispensation, or the dispensation of the churches, or the dispensation of the gospel preached. Everything up to Revelation 20:11, where Christ comes to raise the dead and judge the world.

Now take that key passage of Christ as the light of the world, and trace its connection through this section we are studying, Revelation 2:1-29, Revelation 3:1-22. In order that you may trace it, open your Bible and read the following verses ¾ the beginning of each letter to a church ¾ Revelation 2:1; Revelation 2:8; Revelation 2:12; Revelation 2:18; Revelation 3:1; Revelation 3:7; Revelation 3:14. As you read these verses introducing what is said to each church, you will see that the titles or appellatives applying to Christ, through whom this light comes, are all citations or allusions to the first revelation. So all of this section shows that this key passage unlocks everything said to the churches. In the same way we may trace the key passages through the whole of the book unlocking the meaning of every vision. The connection, therefore, between this section and the first revelation is evident in these verses. To impress that on you perhaps you had better read these verses. Begin at Revelation 2:1-29 and read only the beginning of each letter to the churches: "To the angel of the church at Ephesus write, These things saith he that holdeth the

seven stars in his right hand, that walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks." Now that is a quotation from Revelation 1:1-20, where the key passage is given; Christ is seen walking in the midst of the candlesticks; Christ is holding the seven stars in His right hand.

Revelation 2:8 : "And to the angel of the church in Smyrna write, These things saith the first and the last, who was dead and liveth again." By reading the first chapter you will find these allusions to Christ: "The first and the last, who was dead but liveth again to die no more."

Revelation 2:12 : "To the angel of the church at Pergamos write, These things saith he that hath the sharp two-edged sword." In that first revelation a two-edged sword is represented as issuing from His mouth, standing for His word of judgment.

Revelation 2:18 : "To the angel of the church in Thyatira write, These things saith the Son of God, who hath eyes like a flame of fire and feet like unto burnished brass." That is the description of His eyes and feet as seen in the first revelation.

Now Revelation 3:1: "And to the angel of the church in Sardis write, These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God and the seven stars."

Evidently that is an allusion to the first revelation.

Revelation 3:7 : "And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write, These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and none can shut, and he that shutteth and none can open."

These things are alluded to in the first revelation.

Revelation 3:14 : "And to the angel of the church of Laodicea write, These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." My third general observation is based upon Christ’s own uses of the word "church" as found in Matthew and Revelation. There are twenty-three instances of Christ’s using the Greek word ecclesia ¾ church. In Matthew 16:18, He says, "I will build my church." In Matthew 18:17, He says, "Tell it to the church." The references in Revelation where he uses the term church or churches are the following:

Revelation 1:4; Revelation 1:11; Revelation 1:20, and again Revelation 20:1-15; Revelation 2:1; Revelation 2:7-8; Revelation 2:11-12; Revelation 2:17-18; Revelation 2:23; Revelation 2:29; Revelation 3:1, Revelation 3:6-7, Revelation 3:13-14, Revelation 3:22; Revelation 22:16.

Now here are twenty-three examples of the use of the word ecclesia - church - as spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself; and it is evident from a study of these twenty-three instances of the use of the word, that Christ never said anything about an invisible or universal church. His teaching is to the contrary; He does not say the church in Asia, but "the churches in Asia." He does not use the word church in any provincial sense, or state sense, or national sense, or denominational sense. This is a very convincing exhibit of the uses of the word, as coming from the lips of our Lord, rebuking the contention of many people of the present day who talk about a universal church here on earth, whether visible or invisible ¾ the New Testament does not know anything about either one. It is true that in Revelation 12:1 under the symbol of a woman, also in Revelation 17:3, under the symbol of another woman, He presents first the church as an institution and then the apostate church as an institution, and it is equally true that in Revelation 9:7-8 He presents the

church in glory, under the symbol of a bride, and in Revelation 21:9, under the symbol of the heavenly Jerusalem, a city. So that we may say that Christ used the word to describe the time church as an institution, and to name the concrete example of this institution particular churches, and to foreshadow the coming glory church ¾ something which does not yet exist. My fifth general observation is the significance of Christ walking amid the candlesticks, knowing, revealing, rebuking, threatening, promising. The body of each letter will show their condition: "I know thy works," or "where thou dwellest" - and the rest of the terms to the churches telling the condition of each church. He tells the things favorable, and the things unfavorable, He rebukes, exhorts to amendment, and closes each with a precious promise. This unseen presence, this exercise of actual omniscience, this authority to rebuke or remove, this diversity and wealth of promise, tend to produce extraordinary results: it encourages the faithful that He knows and will reward; it stimulates the backslidden to revival and amendment; it alarms the unworthy and terrifies with certain and speedy judgment. My next general observation is that this presence of Christ in the churches is not a personal presence ¾ He is up in heaven, but He is present through the Spirit, His alter ego, the one that came down according to His promise to be His vicar, His vicegerent here on earth. Now, as proof that this is the meaning, read Revelation 2:7 : "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches"; Revelation 2:11 : "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches"; Revelation 2:17 : "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches"; Revelation 2:29 : "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches"; Revelation 3:6: "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches"; Revelation 3:13 : "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches"; Revelation 3:22 : "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." So that every time He says anything to any of these churches, He closed by calling it "what the Spirit saith unto the churches." That teaches that Christ is present with His people here on earth, not in a personal sense, but through the Holy Spirit, whom He sent after He ascended into heaven. So in the Great Commission, "I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world." He is not with us in person: we cannot see Him, touch Him, feel Him, but He is present in the Spirit. That also shows that this whole book comes in the Spirit dispensation, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit all through the book, up to Revelation 20:11. Christ stays up in heaven until the time of restoration of all things. While He stays up there the Spirit represents Him down here. When He comes (Revelation 20:11), the Spirit dispensation is ended, the gospel dispensation is ended, the gospel preaching is ended. My seventh general observation is that the condition of no two of these churches is exactly the same. Look and see that the deficiency of one is not the deficiency of another. Ephesus is sound in doctrine, but deficient in love. Smyrna was poor but rich. Laodicea rich but poor. Pergamos was faithful in persecution, but wanting in discipline. In Ephesus the first works were greater than the last, while Thyatira the last works were greater than the first, and in Sardis none of its works, first or last, was perfect in God’s sight. Smyrna was attaining to a crown of life, while Thyatira, having a name to live, was dead. Philadelphia glowed with fervor while Laodicea was lukewarm. I ask you to note this diversity of condition in the seven churches, that you may apply it to any seven churches in Texas. The same examination of the First Church in Fort Worth, in Dallas, Austin, Houston, San Antonio, Waxahachie, Galveston, or of the seven leading churches in any one city, would reveal similar diversity of conditions in God’s sight. This application goes to confirm what is evident, namely, that these are real letters to seven contemporaneous churches. My eighth observation, that Christ’s titles, and Christ’s threats, and Christ’s promises are adapted to meet the specific condition of each church as it comes up: He does not use the same threats, He does not use the

same titles; He does not offer the same promises, but in every case there is an adaptation to the need, showing the infinite diversity in Christ so as to suit the diverse needs. My ninth observation is that you may gather up into one sentence the promises made to the faithful ones in all of the churches - make one sentence of it. A special succeeding chapter will expound these promises to you. Let us make up that sentence now (Revelation 2:7): "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life"; Revelation 2:11 (latter part): "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death"; Revelation 2:17 : "To him that overcometh will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon that stone a new name written which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it"; Revelation 2:26 : "To him that overcometh and he that keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give authority over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of the potter are broken to shivers; as I also received of my Father, and I will give him the morning star"; Revelation 3:5 : "He that overcometh shall be arrayed in white garments, and I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life, and I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels"; Revelation 3:12 : "He that overcometh I will make a pillar in the temple of my God and he shall go out thence no more; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is the new Jerusalem which cometh down out of the heaven from my God, and I will write upon him my new name"; Revelation 3:21 : "To him that overcometh I will give to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame and sat down with my Father in his throne." Only by grouping all of these promises into one great sentence do we understand the riches of the heavenly reward to the faithful. My next observation is that a calm survey of the imperfect conditions of the churches and pastors makes it seem impossible that such instrumentality can bring about the glorious results set forth in Revelation 11:15 - "The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." There are, however, two elements of hope in the picture: Christ is walking in the midst of the churches, leading to repentance, and the Spirit is directing and enabling. I know the first time I very carefully studied the condition of the seven churches in Asia, and then applied the revelation to any seven churches around me, with their seven pastors, I found no perfect pastor and no perfect church. Every church had some fault or faults and every pastor had some weakness or faults. So I said in my heart: "How are preachers like these and churches like these to capture the world?" and I never got over that discouragement until I read Revelation 4:1-11, Revelation 5:1-14, when the heaven scene of the "things that are" revealed the throne of grace with agencies and activities helping the churches and preachers on earth. My next observation is: That the doctrine of this book of Revelation necessitates the perpetuity of the churches. The doctrine is just this: Christ will appoint no other instrumentality for the evangelization of the world; the world is to be lighted through these churches, and that when a candlestick is removed, another church is raised up, and that in every age of the world there will be some churches faithful to the Lord. That is the teaching of this book, and particularly do you find it when you come to that view of the church presented as an institution under the symbol of a woman, and the apostate church presented under the symbol of a woman. You will see the woman that represents the true church driven into the wilderness, where she is in hiding for a long time; just like Israel led out of Egypt wandered in the wilderness for thirty-eight years, and as historians would have a hard time tracing every day’s steps of Israel in the wilderness, so a church historian now has a hard time in putting the surveyor’s chain on the trace of the true churches in this wilderness period. There is no difficulty in tracing the New Testament history. Nor is there any difficulty from the Reformation period to the present. It is easy to prove that there are now

churches similar in faith, doctrine, ordinances, officers, and purposes to the New Testament churches. My next general observation is, that a candlestick be removed ¾ that is, a particular church organization be dissolved ¾ has no bearing on the preservation of the true Christians who are members of that church. Sardis, as a church organizer, was declared to be "dead," but "thou hast a few names in Sardis that did not defile their garments: and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy." The church was blotted out, but "I will in no wise blot out their names from the book of life." My last general observation is this: Since Christ has appointed these churches for the evangelization and illumination of the world, what is the law on the preacher or the member that destroys one of these churches? Paul answers that question for us. He says to the church at Corinth: "Ye are God’s building, ye are the temple of God, and him that destroys the temple of God will I destroy." And I tell you that is a very solemn thought for a preacher who so ministers that he destroys a church, or for any deacon, or deacons, who so act as to blot out a church of our Lord. The candlestick is indeed removed, but woe to him that causeth its removal. You would do a thousand times less harm to reach up and blot out the most brilliant planet in the sky than to blot out the feeblest little church here on earth which is trying to do good. Every pastor ought to bring this question up in his own heart: Is my ministry of this church building it or pulling it down; is it strengthening or destroying? What a solemn responsibility upon anybody who takes charge of a church. You may track some preachers by a trail of decayed, divided, or dissolved churches. You may track some other preachers by a trail of growing, illuminating churches - every one they labor with prospers.

I put my hand on a man’s shoulders, once, when he asked me to congratulate him on being called to a certain church. I said to him: "I will give you just six months to split it into shivers." He said, "What do you mean?" I said: "Is not that the result wherever, so far, you have preached? Go back over your ministry and name a church that you really built up." To my astonishment that man still thinks a great deal of me, and the last talk I had with him he promised that if he was ever a pastor again he would prove by his pastorate that he did not split things.

# 07.03. Condition of the Seven Churches in Asia

3. CONDITION OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES IN ASIA

I will begin this chapter with some additional general observations. My first observation is that in each city of these seven churches there are three competing religions ¾ heathen, Jewish, Christian. In every part we see evidence of the conflict. My second general observation refers to the meaning of the term "angel" ¾ each letter commences: "to the angel." Some people have wrongly supposed that each church has a guardian angel. They fail to tell us how these guardian angels communicated these messages to the churches. There are quite a number of Greek words like "apostle," "deacon," "angel," that have both an etymological meaning and an official meaning. Officially, the term "angel" refers to these messengers from God ¾ from the upper world ¾ but the word means messengers or representatives, and in this book ¾ particularly in the cases of the angel in the churches ¾ it means pastor who is the representative of the church. If I were to write a letter to the church at Austin, I would direct it to the pastor of the church, and through him as the representative it would be communicated to the church. My third general observation relates to the doctrine of Balaam, to which reference is made in the letters to two or three of the churches. You will remember the analogue in the Old Testament where Balaam was called upon to prophesy against Israel, by Balak, the king of the Moabites, and God would not let him. prophesy any evil, but he coveted the big pay that Balak offered him, and later suggested how Israel could be destroyed - by bringing about the alienation from God, telling Balak to introduce to the Israelites the most beautiful of the Moabitish women, and let them seduce the Israelites to partake of the festivals of the heathen religion as well as of the Jewish religion, and this open communion with the heathen religion resulted in the worst form of immorality and idolatry that brought about the alienation between Israel and Jehovah. Now there were two men and women living in these churches, or in these cities, who taught that doctrine. They preached open communion between the Christian religion and the heathen religion: "You come to my festival and I will go to your festival: I will partake of your Lord’s Supper with you if you will partake of the heathen feast with me." Paul had already said: "You cannot partake of the cup of the Lord and the cup of the devils; you cannot cat at the table of the Lord and at the table of devils." That was the teaching of Balaam as found in these churches - and very hurtful to several of them, as you will see in the exposition. My next general observation relates to the meaning of Nicolaitans, at least twice referred to in our letters to the churches. Some people suppose that Nicholas, who was ordained one of the seven deacons in the Jerusalem church, mentioned in Acts 6:1-15, afterward founded the doctrine here referred to, and hence those who adopted the doctrine were called "Nicolaitans." There is no particle of evidence to connect Nicholas in Acts 6:1-15 with these Nicolaitans. There was a Nicholas, doubtless, who did teach the doctrine that is here mentioned, but what you want to know is not who started the doctrine, but what was the doctrine. It was a form of Antinomianism: If election be true, and you are saved by Christ and not by works, then it does not make any difference what sin you commit; you are all right. I have seen in Texas a preacher who was a Nicolaitan, who boldly taught in private that immorality committed by a Christian cannot possibly

result in any harm to him, and based his seduction to evil upon that theory. But it is the doctrine of the devil, no matter if it be a preacher who holds it, or somebody else. My next general observation is to show Paul's connection with these seven churches of Asia. All of them were established either directly or indirectly by Paul. You will find the history in Acts 19:1-41, where he held his great meeting at Ephesus, in which all of the province of Asia heard the word of God. The next part of the history is in Acts 20:1-38, where Paul delivers his memorable address to the elders of the church at Ephesus. Then, during his first Roman imprisonment, he wrote to churches in this section concerning the Gnostic philosophy. These letters are to the Colossians and the Ephesians. Then to Philemon, who lived in this section, he wrote concerning Christianity's attitude toward slavery. Then, still in the first Roman imprisonment, he wrote to its Christian Jews ¾ the letter to the Hebrews. After he escaped from that Roman imprisonment, he wrote the first letter to Timothy, who had charge under Paul's direction of the church at Ephesus, and when the second time he was imprisoned at Rome and had been condemned to death he wrote the second letter to Timothy, still at Ephesus. So that up to A. D. 68, when Paul was martyred, all these churches were under his apostolic jurisdiction. My next general observation is to show John's connection with these seven churches. You may see from uniform tradition that John moved to Ephesus as a last surviving apostle and had charge of all these churches at least by A. D. 80. While living at Ephesus he wrote his three letters, which we have considered. One of the fathers, Clement of Alexandria, expressly says that after the death of Domitian, John escaped from exile in Patmos, and returned to the city of Ephesus. Now we are ready to take up the churches in the order of their condition: First, Ephesus: this city was the metropolis of proconsular Asia, one of the greatest cities of ancient times, having in it one of the seven wonders of the world - the temple of Diana, whose religion, however, was not so much a Greek religion as Oriental, since the Diana of the Ephesians was represented by a wooden idol, a monstrous image that set forth the fruitfulness of nature ¾ a very different Diana from the Diana of the Greeks.

"To the angel of the church at Ephesus." Who was he? Some claim that Timothy was the pastor at the time that John wrote this letter. There is no evidence of it, and it is very highly improbable from the fact that Timothy was not a pastor at all, but an evangelist, an apostolic delegate, and even in the second letter to him Paul is calling him from Ephesus to come to Rome. It is not at all probable that Timothy remained at Ephesus as pastor from A.D. 68 to 96, when this book was written. So we will say we do not know who this pastor was at Ephesus.

What things were commended in this letter to the church at Ephesus? If I was teaching the book of Revelation to a class in Greek, I would have much to say of the shades of meaning in the words employed. But confining myself to the English, I will say that the things commended are: "Thy works, thy toil of service, thy adherence to sound doctrine and the motive that prompted the work." All was done for Christ's sake. Another thing commended was the attitude of this church to false prophets. "Thou hast tried them that say they are apostles and are not" ¾ and just here we find an overwhelming argument in favor of the late date of the book of Revelation. If you turn to 1 John 4:1, which he wrote from Ephesus, between A.D. 82 and 85, he gives his commandment to try the spirits, whether they be of God. Now, later, he says that Ephesus had obeyed that injunction: "Ye have tried them that say they are prophets, or apostles, and are not, and condemned them." We will find one of the seven churches that did not try them ¾ I will tell you which one when we come to it. The attitude of that church to the Nicolaitan doctrine we have just discussed is also

commended: "Thou hatest the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which also I hate." So these are the things commended in that church. The thing reprobated was just one thing: "Thou hast left thy first love." That means: "You do not now possess that fervor of love which filled your hearts when you professed to be Christians, when you were first converted." Whoever has abated in the love that he had in his heart when God converted him, that one needs a revival. That is a condition of the Ephesus church. Sound in doctrine, sound in discipline, but they had not the love which characterized their conversion.

How would that affect you, brothers and sisters? It hits me sometimes ¾ not all the time. I can never forget the love in my heart for God and man when God converted me. At times it has abated, but characteristically it remains with me, and many a time has even gone beyond what it was when I was first converted.

Let us look then, at the exhortation to this church: "Repent and do thy first works" ¾ that is to say, in the spirit of the love as you did at first. The threat: "If you do not, I will come and remove thy candlestick." We do know that the Ephesus candlestick was removed. The church at Smyrna: Smyrna for more than two thousand years had been a city ¾ it is a city now, as it has now a population of about 200,000, and three-fourths of the population today are nominally Christians: whether Greek Catholics, Roman Catholics, or Protestants. It is the seat of great commerce, situated as it is with such a splendid harbor on the Aegean Sea.

"And to the angel of the church at Smyrna" ¾ who was that angel? I can tell you this time. In A.D. 168 a pastor of that church, Polycarp, was martyred under the rule of Marcus. Aurelius, the Roman emperor. As he was about to be executed he said to the proconsul who governed the province: "I have been a Christian eighty-six years." Subtract 86 from 168, and you find that he was converted in A. D. 82. Now we know that he was a pastor in A.D. 108, for Ignatius in his writings says he visited Polycarp, the pastor at Smyrna, that year. Tertullian, Ireneus, Eusebius, all say that Polycarp was made pastor at Smyrna under the administration of the apostle John, and if he was converted in A.D. 82 he would have been a Christian fourteen years when this letter was written. That is time enough for him to become pastor of the church. He was one of John’s own converts. John went to Asia about A. D. 80, and in A. D. 82 Polycarp was converted, and when he became a preacher he was installed as pastor of the church at Smyrna.

Now, what things are commended here? "I know thy tribulations and thy poverty, but thou art rich" ¾ while in this world’s goods the members of the church were poor, in spiritual things they were rich. We will find, when we come to Laodicea, the exact reverse: they were rich in this world’s goods, but in the sight of God they were miserable, poor, blind, and naked.

We notice in this letter to the church at Smyrna the attitude of the Jewish religion to Christianity ¾ "the synagogue of Satan" ¾ those who say they are Jews and are not. That is, they claim to be Jews on account of fleshly descent from Abraham, but they are not the spiritual descendants of Abraham. So that the Jewish church existed there as the bitterest enemy of the Christian church. They are the people who accused Polycarp in A.D. 168, they brought the wood to burn him at the stake, and helped to pile the fagots on the fire as he was burning. You will notice that it makes no difference as to the mere form of organization, whether Christian or Jewish, it is the devil who is the real author of the evil, and hence it says here that "Satan shall cast many of you into prison." Satan can work just as well, or maybe a little better, through one who claims to be religious and is

not, than through an outsider. There is no censure on the church at Smyrna. There is an exhortation to be faithful unto death. "They will put you to death, but I will give you the crown of life." As it is expressed in Christ's address to the apostles: "Fear not them who kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," and though they kill you in the body, which is the first death, I assure you, you will not be hurt by the second death.

Pergamos: This is a city, at the present time, of about 30,000 inhabitants. One-tenth of them are professing Christians, either Greek Catholics, Roman Catholics, or Protestants of some kind. The heathen religion in this city was the dominant force of evil, the patron deity was the demigod Esculapius - that is, the physician god - but there were also temples in the city to Jupiter, Minerva, Apollo, Venus, and Bacchus. Hence "I know where thou dwellest, where Satan's throne is" ¾ that is to say, the heathen religion in the city of Pergamos was the religion of state, and enforced tests of allegiance on pain of death.

What is commended here? That they hold fast, notwithstanding the persecuting test, and do not deny Jesus Christ. Particularly was that so in the case of their illustrious pastor, Antipas, who is mentioned here. When the heathen authority demanded of him that he turn loose Christianity and avow the heathen religion, he held fast and did not deny, and suffered death.

What is reprobated in this church? That it did not exercise gospel discipline; they retained in their members Balaamites and Nicolaitans. I doubt not that it was fear that prompted many of them, after the pastor was put to death, to say this: "I will submit to the government test, at least have open communion with the heathen; I will partake of their feasts and the things sacrificed to the idols." Some of them were following the doctrine of Nicholas, saying: "If you are a Christian it doesn't make any difference what you do." The exhortation calls on them to repent, or else judgment from the sword that issues from the mouth of Jesus Christ shall come upon them. The next church is Thyatira. This inland church is commended for the following things: love, faith, service, patience, and unlike the church at Ephesus, its last works were better than its first. In Ephesus the first works were the best, and the last works not up to the mark on account of having lost their love.

What things are reprobated? They had not exercised discipline: "Thou hast that woman Jezebel, who claims to be a prophet." That demand in 1 John 4:1 to try them that say they are prophets and apostles was disregarded. In this case great trouble came to the church from a woman. When a woman is good she is better than a man, but when she is bad she is worse than a man. The woman has much to do with Christianity; she is for or against it, and the man who does not recognize the might of woman's influence is blind. That is why I rejoice to co-operate in every good work which the women undertake. I wish to assure you that Lydia, who is mentioned in Acts 16:1-40, as being a woman of Thyatira, is not the Jezebel who is mentioned here; it is a slander on Lydia. It is every way improbable that Lydia of A.D. 52 is the Jezebel of A.D. 96. I am more inclined to think she was the wife of the pastor. I do not know who the pastor was. You pastors, your wives will be mighty where you work ¾ mighty for good or mighty for evil. Anyhow, this Jezebel claimed to be a prophetess, and that this prophetic spirit told her that open communion with heathenism had no harm in it. Now comes the great text for the preacher: "I gave her space to repent, and she repented not." As a young preacher, in every revival meeting I preached on "the space to repent,"

emphasizing the fact that beyond that allotted time there was no hope of salvation. This woman crossed the boundary line, she sinned against the Holy Spirit and her sin, therefore, had never forgiveness, either in this world or in the next. There is such a boundary line and then no more space for repentance.

There is reference in this letter to "the depths of Satan." It is a little difficult to translate the Greek so as to convey the right idea. It is quite probable that this is the thought: The Gnostic philosophers claimed that they had a new knowledge, later and better than any revelation, as if to say: "You know what Paul says, and you know what John said, but we have the depths of a later and better knowledge." Our Lord admits the depths, but declares them "the depths of Satan."

Sardis: This city is the capital of Croesus, said to be the richest man in the world in his day. You read how Cyrus captured him and destroyed his empire. Sardis, his capital, was always a city of great wealth. There is no commendation in this letter, except toward the last he says: "There are a few in Sardis" ¾ not many ¾ "who have not defiled their garments," but the church was absorbed in the acquisition of wealth and swallowed up in worldly mindedness. It is distinctly stated: "None of thy works are perfect." We have found heretofore something exceptionally good to commend ¾ especially in the case of Smyrna. But the church at Sardis had no excellence in any direction, whether in growth, fellowship, or mission work: "None of thy works is perfect," hence the exhortation to repent is accompanied by this sharp threat: "Repent, or I will come like a thief in the night and visit you with my judgment." This is a coming of the Lord, but not His final advent. It is like that coming in His other great prophecy, concerning the evil servant who said in his heart, "My lord tarrieth," and began to beat his fellow servants and to eat and drink with drunken, to whom in an unsuspected hour the lord came, cut him asunder and appointed a portion with hypocrites (Matthew 24:48-51); or like the rich fool who heard the summons: "This night shall thy soul be required of thee." The sixth church is Philadelphia. This was the smallest and weakest, and apparently the most insignificant of the churches. Philadelphia was only a village situated on the top of a volcanic range of mountains; earthquakes destroyed the place two or three times. An open door is set before it. The persecuting Jews were to fall down before it and know that the Lord loved it. There is a sweeping promise: "I will keep thee from the hour of trial, that hour which is to come upon the whole world to try them." It is difficult, in the light of subsequent history, to define precisely this "hour of trial." It may refer in part to the great apostasy which developed into the Roman hierarchy discussed in this book (chapter 17). Or in part to the rise of Mohammedanism, A. D. 600, and which by A. D. 1392 had conquered all the territory in which these churches were located. At any rate, Dr. Justin A. Smith, at this point, quotes from the infidel historian, Edward Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, referring to this Turkish conquest: "in the loss of Ephesus the Christians deplored the fall of the first angel, the extinction of the first candlestick of the Revelation; the desolation is complete, and the Temple of Diana or the church of Mary will equally elude the search of the curious traveler. The circus and three stately theaters of Laodicea are now peopled with wolves and foxes; Sardis is reduced to a miserable village; the god of Mahomet, without a rival or a son, is invoked in the Mosques of Thyatira and Pergamos, and the populousness of Smyrna is supported by the foreign trade of the Franks and Armenians. Philadelphia alone has been saved by prophecy or by courage. At a distance from the sea, forgotten by the emperors, encompassed on all sides by the Turks, her valiant citizens defended their religion and freedom above fourscore years, and at length capitulated with the proudest of the

Ottomans. Among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia, Philadelphia is still erect ¾ a column in the scene of ruins ¾ a pleasing example that the paths of honor and safety may sometimes be the same." So this church survived at least thirteen hundred years, long after the other six had passed away. Indeed, the "pillar" to which Gibbon refers still stands, as if to accentuate the promise in Revelation 3:12, "I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God" ¾ what a glorious thing for that weak church. Paul once wrote about Ephesus: "I will tarry at Ephesus until the Pentecost, for a great door is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries," but the Ephesus door had been shut a long time with the Philadelphia door still open. There on the mountaintop the faithful pastor and the faithful little village church were leading the people to Christ. The "open door" connects suitably with the words of our Lord in the first revelation: "I have the keys of death and Hades," and with the beginning of this letter: "I have the key of David."

We may also compare Matthew 16:19, "I will give unto you the keys of the kingdom of heaven." But the "keys" of the three passages are not the same; the ideas are different:

1. The keys of the kingdom mean apostolic or church authority to declare the terms of entrance into or rejection from the kingdom of heaven, illustrated by the latter clause of Matthew 16:19; Matthew 18:18; John 20:23; Acts 2:38; Acts 5:9; Acts 8:20-23; Acts 10:43; Acts 16:30-31.

2. The keys of death and Hades mean Christ's authority over the death of the body and to open the state or place of disembodies souls. As when He says: "The gates of Hades shall not prevail against the church," i.e., the death of disciples, sending their souls into the spirit world, shall never so prevail as to leave no surviving church on earth. Or when it is said: "Thou wilt not abandon my soul unto Hades" (Acts 2:27), i.e., my soul will not continue disembodied, for my body will be raised (Acts 2:31). The same authority over the dead would not permit Lazarus to return to the earth to warn the brothers of the rich man, nor permit the prayers of the lost rich man to relieve his own condition, nor to intervene for his kindred on earth (Luke 16:23-31). This authority exempted Enoch and Elijah from death as it will exempt living Christians at His final advent (1 Corinthians 15:55-56), brings back with him the souls of the saints in heaven when He returns (1 Thessalonians 4:14), and causes both the grave to give up its dead bodies and Hades to give up its disembodied souls at the judgment (Revelation 20:13).

3. The key of David means Christ's authority to confer great opportunities for saving men, as here in our passage, and in 1 Corinthians 16:8-9, i.e., of admitting them to the saving presence of the Lord. Compare Isaiah 22:22. The seventh church is Laodicea. Smyrna was hot ¾ it flamed like fire in its zeal; its fidelity unto death glowed like an oven. Sardis got as cold as ice. But Laodicea was lukewarm, neither cold nor hot ¾ it did not come out strong and openly for anything. It was like the man in the canoe who once had lost his paddle in the stream, and prayed: "Good Lord, help me ¾ Good devil, help me." That is the weakest of all characters, and when the strong expression is here used: "I will spew thee out of my mouth," it is designed to show that this condition is nauseating to the Lord Jesus

Christ. That was the Laodicean condition. And strange to say, they thought they were rich and needed nothing; whereas, as God saw them, they were miserable and poor and blind and naked.

I have heard Laodicean letters read at associations: "Dear Brethren: This year's letter reports to you that we are at peace. Baptized ¾ none; received by letter ¾ none; excluded ¾ none; restored

¾ none; given to missions ¾ nothing." That is the peace of death. I again wish to repeat that in no age of the world have all of the churches been like Ephesus, or Smyrna, or Pergamos, or Thyatira, or Sardis, or Philadelphia, or Laodicea. And in every period of history there have been churches like all these types. What if next Sunday the recording angel should come down and write on the board of every church in Fort Worth some one of these seven names: Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, or Laodicea? Some of the brethren would stand out and read the inscription, and their knees would shake like Belshazzar's when the handwriting of the Lord appeared on the wall.

We cannot in these chapters go into all the details of criticism like a commentary ¾ the salient points must suffice. But one verse concerning Laodicea must be noticed somewhat: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." It is a mistake to preach a sermon to sinners from this text. It is addressed exclusively to delinquent church members. In walking among the candlesticks our Lord knocks at the hearts of backslidden or hypocritical members, demanding admission and promising spiritual intercommunion to those who admit Him. In this way He often rings the spiritual doorbell at the houses of professing Christians whose ears are quick to hear the calls of fashion, pleasure, ambition, or business, but so stopped as never to hear the ringing of Him who comes often and patiently stands and keeps ringing. Sometimes He rings by sickness, sometimes by financial loss, sometimes by death in the house. The sickness, loss or death are realized, but they do not recognize them as the calling of the Lord.

# 07.04. PROMISES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES

4. PROMISES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES

Let us recall again that the Lord adapts His titles, exhortations, threats, and promises to the varied conditions of the churches. In no two cases are they alike. This chapter is devoted to the promises. All these promises are connected with one word "overcometh" ¾ Greek "nikao." The details of these promises are given in even distinguishing series in the second and third chapters, and the sum of them expressed in Revelation 21:7, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things" ¾ or better, "These things" referring back to the things enumerated in Revelation 21:1-6.

Let us group into one sentence all the detailed and distinguishing promises of the seven series: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God" ¾ and "He shall not be hurt of the second death" ¾ and I will give to him the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it" ¾ and "I will give him authority over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of the potter are broken to shivers; as I also have received of my Father: and I will give him the morning star" ¾ and "he shall be arrayed in white garments, and I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life, and I will confess his name before my Father and of my God, and he shall go out thence no more; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name" ¾ and "I will give to him to sit down with me on my throne, as I also overcame and sat down with my Father on his throne" (see Revelation 2:7, Revelation 2:11, Revelation 2:17, Revelation 2:26-28; Revelation 3:5, Revelation 3:12, Revelation 3:21).

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE PROMISES 1. They are all clothed in the most sublime imagery.

2. Their character, multitude, and magnitude are overwhelming, outshining any galaxy in the natural skies. The mind is dazzled by their blended brilliance. The hand of apprehension looses its grip in trying to grasp them and comprehension must wait for understanding until the realization of postjudgment experience.

3. Yet even now unstaggering faith receives them, and hope lives in their radiance. They reverse gravitation because they draw upward; they pull toward heaven and uplift.

They stimulate more than wine until one is intoxicated with the Spirit. They awaken desire, develop strength, and inspire zeal.

4. Laying aside all dogmatism, comparing scripture with scripture in exceeding humility, praying fervently for spiritual guidance, let us attempt an interpretation. Inasmuch as all these promises are to him that "overcometh," our first concern is to know the meaning and sweep of this word, and just what or whom must be overcome, and with what means we may overcome.

Evidently the word "overcometh" is not limited to one definite transaction, but has a continuous meaning ¾ a sweep beyond a single event. What are its terminals? When does the overcoming

commence and where does it end? It commences with justification and ends at the death of the body with complete sanctification of the soul. "He that endureth unto the end shall be saved" ¾ "Be thou faithful unto death, and thou shalt receive a crown of life." John elsewhere supplies the object of the verb. Twice he says: "Ye have overcome the wicked one" (1 John 2:13-14). Three times he declares the world as the object to be overcome (1 John 5:4-5). Only those "born of God overcome the world." The means of overcoming is "the blood of the Lamb"; the instrumentality is faith ¾ "and this is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4). Satan, his emissaries and the world that lieth in him, must be overcome. By faith the child of God goes on from victory to victory ¾ from grace to grace ¾ from strength to strength ¾ from glory to glory.

Let us now look separately at the promises themselves:

1. Access to the Tree of Life in the Paradise of God. (Revelation 2:7) Here, evidently, there is allusion to the Genesis story. The purpose of the tree of life in the original garden was to eliminate the mortality of the body. So that, in unfigurative terms, this promise is the glorification of the body to be experienced without death by all Christians living when our Lord comes, and by all Christians who have died, after their resurrection. We may count the glorification of the bodies of the two classes as practically simultaneous, since the righteous dead are raised before the righteous living are changed, and together they are caught up to the Lord (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18). The promise means everything set forth in Paul’s words (1 Corinthians 15:42-49, 1 Corinthians 15:51-58): ¾ incorruption, glory, power, a spiritual body in the image of the Second Adam; or in his other words, "Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be like the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself" (Php 3:21). Or as John elsewhere puts it: "We know that if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him" (John 3:2). Hence the psalmist: "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." This title to access to the tree of life arises from cleansing by the blood of the Lamb, effected in us when in regeneration and sanctification the Spirit applies the blood. After Adam’s fall he was expelled from the garden lest he eat of this fruit and live forever in a body of sin (Genesis 3:22), but a throne of grace and mercy was established at the east of the garden where the sword flame, or Shekinah, dwelt between the Cherubim to keep open the way to the tree of life through vicarious sacrifices (Genesis 3:24; Genesis 4:4; Hebrews 11:4).

2. "Shall not be hurt of the second death." (Revelation 2:11) The meaning of the second death is the casting of both soul and risen body into the lake of fire (Revelation 20:14-15). It is the final decision of our Lord at the judgment, and fixes forever the status of the lost. The lake of fire is a metaphor, of course, but expresses a reality not less fearful than the figure. Into this torment the soul of a lost sinner goes immediately after the death of the body ¾ see the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Luke 16:1-31. But from this disembodied state of torment the soul is called to the judgment, where it is united to its risen body ¾ "Death and Hades gave up the dead which were in them" (Revelation 20:13), i.e., the body came from the grave and the soul from its place in torment. Then on the sentence of the judge the lost man, soul and body, is cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death. While both memory and conscience will afflict the lost forever, the lake of fire is punitive, and not the remorse of conscience, which is only consequential. That this final sentence is punitive appears from Matthew 25:41; Matthew 25:46, and 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9. It is further described by our Lord as a destruction of soul and body in Gehenna, and directly contrasted with the first death, or the death of the body: "And be not afraid of them that kill the

body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Greek Gehenna). This promise was specially precious to the church at Smyrna, at that time undergoing persecution unto death. The devil, through his agents, might kill their bodies, the first death, but these martyrs should not be hurt of the second death.

3. "I will give to him the hidden manna." (Revelation 2:17) The "hidden manna" is an allusion to the memorial pot of manna hidden in the ark of the covenant. This represented Christ as the bread of life, sent from heaven ¾ see the great discussion, John 6:27-59. Whosoever by faith appropriates the body and blood of Christ has eaten food which nourishes unto eternal life. An eater of the manna in the desert did not escape death, but the believer in Jesus Christ, antitype of the memorial manna hidden in the ark of the covenant, shall never die. This promise is on a line with the preceding one, and particularly appropriate to Pergamos, whose heretics were eating the meat offered to idols, following Balaam, which was a food unto death, but whose faithful ones are promised the bread of life.

4. "1 will give him a white stone and on the stone a new name written which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it." (Revelation 2:17) Observe that this is the second promise to the church at Pergamos. To the same person is given both "the hidden manna" and "the stone," whose inscription is hidden to all but the recipient. There appears to be a connection of thought between the two promises which may be helpful toward an interpretation of the white stone. Let us follow up this clue.

Satan’s throne was at Pergamos. That is, he completely dominated the municipal government. This was a Greek city, subject to Greek method of judicial procedure. A test of loyalty to the government would be a participation in the idolatrous feasts. We know from Paul’s letter to the Greek city of Corinth that a Christian might not eat at both the Lord’s table and the devil’s table, nor drink of both the Lord’s cup and the cup of devils. So refraining from the heathen idol feasts was a test of loyalty to Christ. And so the same Satan who inspired Balaam to spring this test on the Israelites inspired the later Balaamites to compromise on this open communion between the two religions, and inspires the municipal government to demand like compromises of the other members of the church. Fear may have prompted the tempted to this compromise, and fear may have inspired the church to refrain from disciplining the heretical and immoral members, especially after their pastor, Antipas, was murdered for his fidelity. A Greek city expressed judgment on persons arraigned by a kind of ballot, using shells as at Athens, or pebbles here whose significance declared for acquittal or condemnation ¾ white for acquittal or black for guilty. Following this line of thought the promise would mean: If the devil-prompted city condemns your loyalty to Christ by a ballot of black pebbles, He will acquit you by the white stone of justification. This view gathers force from the title of our Lord when addressing the church: "These things saith he that hath the sharp two-edged sword." (Revelation 2:12) In the vision, Revelation 1:16, this sword issues from His mouth, and hence represents His word of judgment. It is a judge symbol (Hebrews 4:12-13). Moreover, the inscription on the white stone can be made to harmonize with this interpretation. It is a "new name" unknown to the heathen judges, but well known to the recipient. If this be our Lord’s own new name as later revealed in the book (Revelation 12:1-17; Revelation 13:1-18; Revelation 16:1-21) it is intensely significant in the connection: "Word of God," "King of kings and Lord of lords," i.e., the earthly judgment condemns, the divine judgment acquits, the condemnation is from earthly lords ¾ the justification from the Lord of lords. The expression

"known only to him who receives it" means the assurance of divine acceptance, the witness of the Spirit, bearing witness with His own spirit, which, being entirely a matter of personal experience, cannot be known to any one except the recipient.

5. "And I will give him authority over nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of a potter are broken into shivers." (Revelation 2:26-27)

More than any one of the other promises does this one need careful exposition. Its misinterpretation has been productive of monstrous evils in the Christian centuries, and the end is not yet. It is quoted to support the Romanist pretension that all nations are under the absolute jurisdiction of the Papal hierarchy, in the exercise of which continents have been bestowed upon favorite monarchs, kings have been dethroned, subjects absolved from allegiance, crusades preached, property confiscated, cruel persecutions waged, marriages annulled, family ties dissolved. The record of these evils constitutes the bloodiest volumes in the annals of time. Nor has its misuse been limited to the Romanists. The evils are not less evil when flowing from Protestant or Greek Catholic misapplication. They have prevailed whenever and wherever religious sectaries of any name have usurped control over states. "The mad men of Munster," the Cameronians of Scotland, the Fifth Monarchy men of Cromwell’s day, the Muggletonians and Mormons of this country, all belong to the same category. In order to correct interpretation we must first understand the terms employed and their biblical usage.

(a) First of all, the promise, whatever it means, is not to any religious denomination or ecclesiastical organization, but only to the individual Christian who overcomes: "To him that overcometh I will give" ¾ it is not a grant of power to any one of the seven churches, nor to all of them combined. This is a capital, fundamental, crucial, vital fact, essential to correct interpretation.

(b) The promise is not "power" ¾ Greek dunamis ¾ but "authority" ¾ Greek exousia.

(c) The verb "shall rule" is not basileuo, but poimaino, which means "to shepherd" ¾ "he shall shepherd them."

(d) "The rod of iron," Greek rabdos ¾ rod of correction ¾ is the shepherd’s rod, iron-tipped at one end, and with a crook at the other end. See the Septuagint for the Shepherd Psalm: "Thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." The shepherd does not carry two things, one a rod, and the other a staff, but the same thing is either rod or staff according to its use. See the author’s sermon on Psalms 23:4.

(e) The "breaking into shivers as a potter’s vessel," is not necessarily for ultimate destruction, but may look to reconstruction (see Jeremiah 18:4-10). It becomes destructive only when impenitence becomes incorrigible (Jeremiah 19:1-11), and even then applies not to all the nation but only to its hostile elements. In other words, we miss the mark if we construe all this rule as punitive. The primary intent looks to correction and salvation; as the shepherd goads the wandering sheep with the iron-tipped end of his staff into a safer path, or draws him back from a precipice with the crook at the other end, or sets up the staff as an ensign for rallying the flock together in time of danger, or with it counts them each morning and evening as they, one by one, "pass under the rod" in leaving the fold for pasturage or returning to it for shelter, or in using it as a weapon of offence against the enemies of the flock.

(f) This rule, or shepherding, so far as exercised mediately in time by him that overcometh, is not executive, but instructive and declarative. When God, in time, "hews a nation by a prophet," the prophet simply declares, but does not execute the divine threat. As Jonah was sent, not to overturn Nineveh, but merely to declare "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown" (Jonah 3:4). And the case of Nineveh will show the merciful intent of Jeremiah's illustration of the potter's vessel: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation or kingdom to pluck up, and to break down, and to destroy it, if that nation concerning which I have spoken turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them" (Jeremiah 19:7-10). The overcoming Christian, like the ancient prophet, is God's mouthpiece to the nations:

"Behold! I have put my words into thy mouth: see this day I have put thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy, and to overthrow, to build and to plant" (Jeremiah 1:9-10).

Even in the prototype of our passage (Psalms 2:8-12), where the nations are given to our ascended Lord for an inheritance, and where it is said: "Thou shalt break them with an iron rod, and shalt dash them into pieces as a potter's vessel," the verses which follow show the merciful and instructive intent of the threat. Which passage naturally leads to our last thought in this connection: The authority promised is derivative and limited, and not inherent and absolute, and arises from the overcoming Christian's unity with Christ and His representative function of acting mediately for Christ. This is evident from the modifying clause: "even as I have received from my Father" (Revelation 2:27).

Here it is quite important to understand the meritorious ground of Christ's own authority, how received and to what end, since what He received is that which He imparts and certainly to the same end, and which so imparted must be exercised as He Himself used it. The authority in question does not rise from His Sonship in eternity, but from His Sonship in the flesh. It is expressly said to be derived from the voluntary humiliation and vicarious expiation of sin in the flesh. See particularly Php 2:6-11. Hence, historically, He was invested with universal sovereignty after His resurrection. The author insists that you carefully study this proof: Daniel 7:13-14; Psalms 2:1-12; Psalms 110:1; Acts 2:33-36; Acts 4:25-27; Revelation 5:12-14. In times antecedent to His actual historical sacrifice for sin, when sin is remitted to a penitent believer or rule exercised over a nation, it is by anticipation of that sacrifice, God accepting His promise to die for man as if already it had been done, so that as this book later puts it: "A Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." In His exalted and glorified humanity He was made "head over all things to his church." It is to this He refers as the predicate of His Great Commission: "All authority in heaven and on earth is given unto me. Go ye, therefore, disciple all the nations" (Matthew 28:18). And from this passage we gather both the method and the end of "shepherding the nations." The method is not a carnal one, by fire and sword, as rule is enforced by worldly kingdoms, but spiritual. The primary end is not destruction, but salvation. The exercise of this authority, whether by Himself directly, or mediately through His people, is to promote the interest of His spiritual kingdom. Hence the proximate result of its exercise is expressed in Daniel 2:44; Psalms 72:5-17; Revelation 11:15, and its ultimate result in Revelation 21:23-27.

6. "And I will give him the morning star" (Revelation 2:28). This is the second promise to the faithful in Thyatira. The meaning of this symbolism is obvious. As the morning star is the herald of the

coming day, so to the faithful our Lord will give a premonition of the final glorious triumph. This, of course, is the inward assurance by the Spirit realized in personal experience, just as the white stone symbol of acquittal bears an inscription equal to internal assurance, known only to the recipient. As Peter expresses it, we have the surer word of prophecy shining as a lamp in the night: "until the day star arise in your hearts." Paul (1 Thessalonians 5:3-4) declares that in the day of our Lord, which comes as a thief in the night, the destruction of the wicked is sudden, and adds by way of contrast: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." There is no question that the final advent of our Lord to raise the dead and judge the world will be personal, visible, audible, palpable, and that this advent is the great event of the future, as His first advent was until His incarnation. Nor is it questioned that this book, as others of the New Testament, clearly discusses it. But it is equally clear, in this and other New Testament books, that signal time events, as the coming of the Spirit, and particularly great judgments ¾ as the destruction of Jerusalem, or the removal of a candlestick, or death to an individual, are called "a coming of the Lord." In this sense He is always coming. He is only a tyro in biblical interpretation who insists that every scriptural reference to a coming of the Lord must be construed as an allusion to His final advent. The promise of the gift of the "morning star" applies as much to these time comings as to His final advent, e.g., He gave to His elect a premonitory sign which enabled them to escape the wrath of His coming in the destruction of Jerusalem.

7. "He shall be arrayed in white garments" (Revelation 3:5). This is the first promise to the overcoming few in Sardis who "had not defiled their garments." In order to a correct interpretation of this passage we must collate it with the following correlative passages: The "wedding garment" of Matthew 22:12; the "white robe" conferred on the souls of the martyrs, Revelation 7:9; Revelation 7:13-14; the fine linen or wedding garment of the Bride at the marriage of the Lamb, Revelation 19:7-8; and the "washed robes" that entitle to the tree of life, Revelation 22:14. Once in my early ministry, before preaching a sermon on the "Wedding Garment" of Matthew 22:12, I read Dr. Broadus' comment on the passage interpreting the wedding garment to mean righteousness in character and life, adding: "But to bring in the Pauline conception of imputed righteousness, and understand the parable to teach that, we must put on the wedding garment of Christ's imputed righteousness, is altogether out of place." Then, I read Dr. Gill's comment, taking the opposite position, insisting that we must interpret the wedding garment to mean the imputed righteousness of Christ. Whereupon a lawyer of my congregation whispered to another lawyer: "When Broadus points one way and Gill another way this darky is gwine to take to the woods." The other replied: "Before taking to the woods, let's hear the pastor." So I say now, before taking to the woods on this promise, hear the author, for there is a middle road agreeing in part with both Broadus and Gill, and following neither altogether. Both are right in interpreting the wedding garment to mean righteousness, or holiness, rather, but this holiness is not limited, as Gill would have it, to justification, nor to character and life as Broadus has it. But Dr. Broadus is nearer right than Gill in this that the wedding garment righteousness refers not at all to the salvation done for us ¾ that is to say, in its legal aspects as accomplished by redemption, justification, and adoption ¾ but altogether to the salvation wrought in us by both regeneration and sanctification. Every redeemed, justified, and adopted man is at the same time internally cleansed from the defilement of sin by the Spirit's application of Christ's blood. This is the first and an essential part of regeneration. Regeneration consists of (1) cleansing from the defilement of sin by the Spirit's application of the blood of Christ, and

(2) of renewing. Both of these integral parts of regeneration come at justification. Then the work of internal cleansing, begun in regeneration, is carried on through sanctification, which is completed at the death of the body, so that of these disembodied saints we may say with Hebrews 12:23, "The spirits of just men (justified) made perfect," or with Revelation 6:11, "And there was given them to each one a white robe" ¾ i.e., to the soul of each martyr underneath the altar, as revealed at the opening of the fifth seal. The cleansing part of regeneration was typified by the sprinkling with a bunch of hyssop, of the liquefied ashes of the red heifer, or water of purification (Ezekiel 36:25; Hebrews 9:13-14). This is "the washing of regeneration" in Titus 3:5, referred to also in 1 Corinthians 6:11, "Such were some of you, but ye were washed." And, if you are able to bear it, this is the "born of water" in John 3:5, which Nicodemus, a teacher in Israel, was rebuked for not understanding, so clearly was it taught in the Old Testament. In the same way was the cleansing of sanctification applied to the penitent backslider David (Psalms 51:2; Psalms 51:7), "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin; purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." And to the cleansing of both regeneration and sanctification does Paul refer in Ephesians 5:26-27, "That he might sanctify it, haying cleansed it by the washing of the water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not haying spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." The grace of this cleansing, whether in regeneration or sanctification, appears from its efficient cause, the blood of Christ: "And one of the elders answered saying unto me: These that are arrayed in the white robes, who are they, and whence come they? And I say unto him, My Lord, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they that come out of great tribulation, and they washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." "Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life and may enter in by the gates into the city.

Now, this internal cleansing, this perfecting in personal holiness, is symbolized by the white robe, or wedding garment: "And it was given unto the Lamb’s wife that she should array herself in fine linen, bright and pure; for the fine linen is the righteousnesses of the saints." Note the plural "righteousnesses," which does not mean as the Revision puts it "the righteous acts of the saints." This would flatly contradict the regeneration part of this righteousness (see Titus 3:5). And so it would contradict the many cleansings of sanctification ¾ "Christ being made unto us sanctifications," every time as in David’s case, the Spirit applies the same cleansing blood.

It is true enough that the regenerated man, progressing in sanctification, acquires personal character, exhibited in life and good works. But this is not what is meant by the wedding garment of Matthew or the white robe of Revelation, which is the same thing. The white robe means holiness, as God is holy. The means of the cleansing is Christ’s atoning blood. This is applied by the Spirit and apprehended by faith. The whole of it is God’s work and is of grace from the first cleansing in regeneration to the last cleansing of sanctification. That it is not character on earth is evident from Revelation 6:2, where it is bestowed after death. So with the teaching of Revelation 7:13-14; Revelation 19:7. The glorious result is expressed in Ephesians 5:27 ¾ "that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." It will also be forever true that the elect are immune from any law charge because wrapped in the righteousness of Christ imputed to us when by faith we are espoused to Christ. And also forever true that the white robe of the marriage is another

thing, being personal holiness wrought in us by the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Dr. Gill is in error when he expounds the wedding garment to be Christ's righteousness imputed to us, or anything done for us in the legal acts of redemption, justification, adoption, and equally so that Dr. Broadus is mistaken when he interprets it to mean our character or life as the embodiment of deeds done by us, no matter how much they may have been the fruits of grace. But it means personal holiness wrought in us by the Holy Spirit:

(1) By the cleansing of regeneration when the blood of Christ is applied by the Spirit. Ezekiel 36:25; Hebrews 9:14; first clause of Hebrews 10:22; Titus 3:5, first clause; 1 Corinthians 6:11, first clause.

(2) By the continued cleansing of sanctification until holiness of spirit is perfected ¾ as in the cleansing of backslidden David (Psalms 2:2; Psalms 2:7); in the continual changes into Christ's image (2 Corinthians 3:18). That both the cleansing in regeneration and the subsequent cleansing of sanctification are meant is evident from that one supreme proof text, Ephesians 5:26, compared with Revelation 6:11, first clause, and Revelation 7:13-14; Revelation 22:14. The plural "righteousnesses" in Revelation 19:8, refers therefore not to acts of the saints but to the Spirit's acts in the saints.

8. "1 will in no wise blot out his name out of the book of life" (Revelation 3:5). This is the second promise to the faithful at Sardis. Two questions are:

What is the book of life, and

the exact force of not blotting out the name?

What, then, is the book of life? By its very name it is a register of immortals. "He that believeth in me shall never die" ¾ shall never come into condemnation ¾ "but hath eternal life." The nature of this book may be considered from one of two views:

(1) A list of all His elect as God saw them before the foundation of the world. This would be the list of the original divine purpose. This view has been supported largely by an interpretation of Revelation 13:8; Revelation 17:8; but this interpretation is very doubtful, since it makes the phrase "from the foundation of the world" modify "written in the book" rather than the "Lamb slain." Your Standard Revision supports this view.

(2) A much safer view is that it is a register of judicial decisions, each name written when the owner is justified (Isaiah 4:3). It has this meaning in Revelation 20:15; Revelation 21:27, and Daniel 12:1. And because this judicial decision is irrevocable, it explains the ground of joy in our Savior's words to the seventy (Luke 10:20), and the fact that no indictment can be drawn against God's elect, since it is God that justifies (Romans 8:33). See also Php 4:3, and Hebrews 12:23. On the meaning of this book and its use at the judgment (Revelation 20:15) is written this hymn: When thou, my righteous judge, shalt come To take thy ransomed people home, Shall I among them stand? Shall I, who sometimes am afraid to die, Be found at thy right hand?

Oh, can I bear the piercing thought:

What if my name shall be left out?

What then is the exact force of not blotting out the name? In all Greek cities, and later at Rome, there was an enrollment of citizens as distinguished from the general population who had no rights of citizenship. Citizenship could be forfeited during life by adjudged infidelity to the city, decided by a vote of the unaccused citizens, followed by erasure of the name. Some of the best citizens were thus, by prejudice, ostracized, as Greek history shows. A Christian citizen of Sardis might thus lose citizenship on account of loyalty to Christ. Of course, death ended this earthly citizenship. It is the object of the promise to contrast the enrolled citizenship in the heavenly Jerusalem with the enrolled citizenship in Sardis. The point of contrast lies between two citizenships, the two enrollments, and particularly in the fact that heavenly citizenship, after once being enrolled, was never forfeited: "I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life." Many commentaries miss the point in supposing that the heavenly enrollment is a probationary list, subject to erasure, and that this implication inheres in the promise as well as in the threat of Revelation 22:19. Your author is fully persuaded that this position is untenable. He not only admits, but contends, that citizenship was forfeitable not only in Greek cities and in Rome, but also in the Jewish state, but utterly denies it of the heavenly citizenship, and that this very fact is the essence of the promise.

9. "I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and my own new name" (Revelation 3:12).

Perhaps the most imposing, most ornamental, if not the most useful parts of a great edifice are its pillars. Only the wealth of a king could supply even one of the pillars of the temple of Diana at Ephesus. The surviving pillars in the ruins of ancient temples and cities yet challenge the admiration of the world as masterpieces of human skill and genius. It marked the prominence and importance of James, Cephas, and John to be "reputed as pillars" in the Jerusalem church (Galatians 2:29), and glorified the church when called "the pillar of the truth" (1 Timothy 3:15). To be made, therefore, an everlasting pillar in the heavenly temple is an expression of the highest honor. This honor is enhanced by the inscriptions on it by the divine architect Himself - the name of God, the name of the new Jerusalem, the new name of the architect Himself, to wit: "Faithful and True ... KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS" (Revelation 19:11; Revelation 19:13; Revelation 19:16).

10. "I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame and sat down with my Father in his throne" (Revelation 3:21). This is not the throne of ruling, expressed in a previous promise, but the throne of final judgment. On the last great day, earth’s supreme assize, the faithful ones are placed at the Lord’s right hand, i.e., on His judgment throne (Matthew 25:31; Matthew 25:33), and shall participate with Him in passing judgment on wicked men and angels. Jesus had already promised to His apostles that in the world’s regeneration (palingenesia, i.e., the time of the restoration of all things), they should sit on the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matthew 19:29). And Paul had said: "Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" (1 Cor 6:23). What a reversal of earth condition when the Sanhedrin that tried Peter and

John shall be judged by them! When Gallio, Festus, Agrippa, and Nero shall stand before Paul’s tribunal. What poetic justice when job and Peter shall judge the devil.

# S. A Discussion of the Lord's Supper

A DISCUSSION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

(This sermon is respectfully and kindly dedicated to all fair-minded, truth-loving PedoBaptists. Most earnestly does the author disclaim any intention or desire to wound their feelings, but makes his appeal to their reason and love of justice. B.H. Carroll, Pastor First Baptist Church, Waco, Texas.) TEXT: Be ye followers of me even as I also am of Christ. Now I praise you, brethren, that ye*** keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you*** For I have received of the Lord, that which I also delivered unto you, etc. - 1 Corinthians 11:1-2; 1 Corinthians 11:23. For preaching this sermon, my own mind is satisfied with the following reasons:

1. It is ever the duty of the pastor to instruct his congregation in doctrine. Especially is this so with regard to positive institutions. Everything relating to a positive institution should be clearly set forth and understood. What is it, and how is it to be administered?

2. The scriptural observance of the Lord's Supper is inseparably connected with efficient church discipline. 3. Several true, earnest Christians, who are anxious to do right, and therefore seek to know the truth, have requested me to preach on this subject. They are Baptists upon all other points. Upon this, their minds have been perplexed and annoyed by suggestions from without and doubt from within. This sermon is for them. 4. I am desirous of relieving my beloved church from unjust censure-from the unwarrantable charges of bigotry and illiberality. 5. Restricted communion is necessary not only to the wellbeing but to the perpetuity of Baptist churches. 6. Its importance to the prosperity and perpetuity of Baptist churches, makes it the chief point of attack by our enemies. They evidently regard it as our Gibraltar. Beyond all question it is the citadel of our beloved Zion-that key position, which when once lost, ultimately necessitates the lowering of our flag all along the line of our fortifications. When then the enemy makes any one of our distinctive features the chief point of attack, let that assailed principle be our chief point of defense. In defense let me not be content with exculpating our close communion from the charge of bigotry, but make a sally beyond our fortifications and establish in the sight of God's truth THE SIN OF OPEN COMMUNION. 7. As the last reason necessary now to assign, it is claimed that this attack is masked. It is not an outright, downright assault. It appears to be masked because - (a) Communion with the Baptists is evidently not the thing desired. A careful survey of the situation would not lead us to conclude that their solicitude for inter-communion is the occasion of all the mighty outbreaks of indignation against "close communion." (b) I regard the attack as masked because they make no war on the principles which underlie the communion question. All denominations, with remarkable unanimity, agree to the principles which control the communion. If they admit that the tree is good, let there be no quarrel with the fruit. (c) The attack seems masked because it is generally made in private circles, where it cannot be met. The mischief is accomplished before it is discovered. "I like Baptists very much. I have charity for all denominations, but Oh! that close communion! " (d) Yet again it seems masked, because sophistries are used instead of arguments. That is, they use a word that has a different meaning in

the conclusion from what it has in the premise. It is adroitly managed by a misuse of terms to array against our communion of bread and wine the scriptural communion of heaven and the Christian communion of earth. (e) It is masked because the true Baptist position is misstated. What Baptist minister accustomed to conduct his protracted meetings has not met with these difficulties? How often he leaves a young convert, happy in the hope of glory and about ready to obey the Savior, to find on his next visit that something has intervened. The convert hesitates, speaks evasively and ambiguously. What is the difficulty? It seems to have no head, no shape, no tangible form. Perhaps at last it will be developed that somebody has made an impression on the young convert's mind that Baptists "will get people to work for them and they won't feed them;" that "they believe baptism essential to salvation;" that "they unchristianize other denominations;" that "they refuse to receive people that the Lord Jesus Christ receives;" that "in heaven they are going to have a separate table from the rest of the redeemed;" that "they separate the husband and the wife from the same communion table, though the Lord has said, 'What God has joined together, let not man put asunder.'" In a word, that "they are exclusive, illiberal and bigoted." These are some of the reasons that have induced me to discuss this subject today. The discussion is entered in kindness, bluntness and with such ability as I possess. Preparatory to the discussion, let terms be defined. What is communion? Joint participation of the Lord's Supper. What is Free or Open Communion? That in which everybody, without any restrictions whatever, is invited and allowed to partake. Without the fear of successful contradiction, I affirm that there is none such in the world. Upon a real bona fide open communion table the sun of God or the light of stars or lamp or torch never shone. What is Close, or Restricted Communion? When a church administering the ordinance limits the invitation to participate. ALL IN THE WORLD ARE SUCH. Some have fewer limitations than others but all have limitations. Some open the door wider than others, but all open it. With regard to restrictions, they are either HUMAN OR DIVINE. The divine are to be observed, the human rejected. It is the acknowledged prerogative of the Son of God "to open so that no man can shut, and to shut so that no man can open." In all the universe lives there no intelligence high enough in authority to lift from the communion table of Jehovah a single restriction imposed by Almighty God. From what ought communion to be free? Dare the arch angel affirm that it is free from a Divine limitation? Who of the created beings presumes to impose a limit more than Jehovah has imposed? It is a remarkable fact, attested by the Word of God, that the prevalence of a human restriction or tradition makes void the Divine. God has said, "Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother." The Pharisee by his limitation of that commandment made void the law of God by his tradition. (See Mark 7:11.) Let this fact and illustration be retained in mind for application after a while. In this connection it is proper to call attention to the obstinacy of error-to mark its power of retention and tenacity of life. It may be embedded in truth, like a worm in the heart of an apple. It may be as tares in a wheat field, planted when the ground was made mellow for the reception of the good seed. As the tares have grown up side by side with the wheat, so has error matured side by side with truth. To pull it up seems to uproot truth. It may be a false thread interwoven in the warp and woof of a fabric of cloth. To destroy it you must rend the garment. It may have been made sacred by hallowed associations. To assail it seems to lift a hand of sacrilege against holy things. Like the devil, it comes as an angel of light. It may be so connected with marriage that to smite it seems to strike that holy institution of God. It may be so associated with maternity that he who assails it is regarded as the murderer of a mother's joys, as one who mocks her sorrows. It may be so associated with old age-with burials-with the holidays of a people, that to strike it seems

like scorning the hoary head-like overturning the tombstones of the dead-like calling of a weary people from their festivities. When a man has thus imbibed error, to abandon it seems to repudiate his childhood, to abjure parental influence, to pull off the wedding ring, to tear down the Christmas garlands and to strip life of its sweetest memories. Every passion, every prejudice of his nature is aroused. His ear cannot hear the truth, his eye cannot see its beauty, his heart cannot receive it. A direct attack upon the error is as mad as the charge of the “Light Brigade.” He who assaults it is regarded as a personal enemy. No power of argument, no array of facts, no accumulation of testimony, though “Pellon be on Ossa piled,” can move him. The only remedy is to let the error alone. Fight it not. But teach truth. Truth received into the heart expels the error. The expulsive power of truth received is the only hope. They must be led to consider religion as relating to God, that repentance is towards God, faith is in God, that Jesus and His authority are higher than father, mother, brother, sister, husband or wife. One of the most seductive and at the same time fatal forms of error is a FALSE LIBERALITY, a spurious charity, a fictitious sentimentality. Instead of “rejoicing in the truth,” it rejoices in uniting with everybody, in admitting all claims, in fellowshipping all claimants. He who opposes this broad platform of never-ending compromise is ostracized as a bigot. With this statement of these preliminaries the question is now asked, WHAT IS THE BAPTIST POSITION? “It is an indispensable qualification for this ordinance, that the candidate for communion be a member o f the church o f Christ in full standing; that he shall be a person o f piety; that he should have made a public profession o f religion; and that he should have been baptized.” I suppose there is not a close communion Baptist on earth who would refuse to receive this as expressive of his position. To a man they would endorse it, item by item, and as a whole. And yet this is the language of Timothy Dwight, D.D., President of Yale College, and Professor of Divinity in that institution the Agamemnon of Pedo-Baptists. What then, according to this great Presbyterian, are the qualifications for communion? 1. Church membership. 2. Good standing in the church, that is, he must not be under discipline. The idea - is that communion and church discipline are co-extensive. And what are his qualifications for church membership? 1. Practical piety. 2. Profession of religion. 3. Baptism. Where is there a Baptist who wants communion any closer than that? That such a platform is derived from the Word of God, let us see what are the doctrines of the text. 1. Jesus delivered His ordinance to Paul. (1 Corinthians 11:23.) God alone is lawgiver. He ordains-churches keep ordinances. 2. Just what Paul received he delivered to the church. See 1 Corinthians 1:1 and the text. 3. Just what they received they were to keep, maintain, perpetuate. 4. They were to keep the ordinances as he delivered them, in the place, in the manner and for the object instituted. 5. Paul himself, though he had been caught up to the third heaven, was to be followed only, as he followed Christ. Mark the power of this last doctrine. Paul elsewhere said, “Though an angel from-heaven teach any other gospel, let him be accursed.” Galatians 1:8. “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,” were among the last words of Jesus. Matthew 28:20. “Let God be true but every man be a liar.” Romans 3:4. “All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof fadeth away; but the word o f the Lord endureth forever. ” 1 Peter 1:24. If there be any force in this doctrine, corroborated by these Scriptures, why is it that some hesitate to obey truth because so many wise, good men preach and practice error? 6. The sixth doctrine of the text is that the church received praise, in faithfully observing God’s commandments. 1 Corinthians 11:1-2. 7. That the church was condemned in making any departure from the divine requirement. 1 Corinthians 11:22. As an illustration of the last two doctrines, take the decree referred to in Acts

15:28. This decree was referred to the churches to be kept. Acts 16:4. For failing to keep it the Savior threatened to remove the candlestick of one of the seven churches of Asia. Revelation 2:14. With these seven doctrines of the text confronting us, let us ask the following questions: Was the church of Corinth free to substitute the paschal lamb for the appointed bread and wine? Were they free to add bitter herbs to the elements of communion? Were they free to withhold the cup from the laity, when the Savior had said, “All ye drink of it?” Were they free to set the table out of the kingdom, when the Savior had said, “I appoint unto a kingdom to eat and to drink at my table in my kingdom? ” Luke 22:30. Were they free to commune to satisfy hunger and thirst, when Paul said, “What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God?” 1 Corinthians 17:22. Was “the believing wife” (1 Corinthians 7:13) allowed to commune with her unbelieving husband, when the Word declares, “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?” Were they free to commune as individuals or in groups, when Paul said, “My brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another?” 1 Corinthians 11:33. Were they free to extend the communion to a man not in good standing, when God’s Word emphatically commands, “But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one no not to eat? ” Has any church on earth the right to tempt a man “to eat and drink damnation to himself?” And yet the Word of God declared that every communicant does this who “does not discern the Lord’s body.” 1 Corinthians 11:29. And as spiritual things have to be “spiritually discerned,” (1 Corinthians 2:14), which is by faith, were they free to invite a man to commune who had no saving faith in Christ? A heretic after the first and second admonition was to be rejected (Titus 3:10), and they were commanded to withdraw from the disorderly, 2 Thessalonians 3:6. A man thus rejected, from whom the fellowship of the church was withdrawn, was to be to them as “a heathen man and a publican,” Matthew 18:17. Now, were they to have a communion so open that this excluded heretic could come up to the communion table of that church from which he had been expelled? Any right thinking mind, attentively considering the bearing of these questions, must conclude that Almighty God is the author of close communion. Having read the Baptist position in the language of President Dwight, I now submit it in the language of a Baptist, with some of the terms defined: “We believe the Scriptures teach that CHRISTIAN BAPTISM is the immersion in water, of a believer, by a qualified administrator, to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried and risen Savior, with its effect in our death to sin, burial from the world and resurrection to newness of life; that this baptism is a prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation, among which is the Lord’s Supper, in which the members of the church, by the sacred use of bread and wine are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ; always preceded by solemn, self-examination.” With this position before us, let us test some of the objections urged against our practice. Query 1st. Is the Baptist practice censurable because it is the “Lord’s table”? Surely they cannot be censured because they fail to teach that it is the Lord’s table. With great emphasis they quote Jesus as saying, “My table,” Luke 22:30. And Paul, in calling it “the Lord’s table,” and “the cup of the Lord,” 1 Corinthians 10:21. John, the first Baptist, never denied more emphatically that he was the Christ than Baptists since then have disclaimed all ownership in the Lord’s table. With remarkable unanimity they say, “To our own private table we cordially invite PedoBaptists, but God alone can invite to His table.” It is equally evident that they cannot be justly censured in declaring what is meant by its being the Lord’s table. They say it is His table because - 1. He instituted it, 1

Corinthians 11:23-25; Matthew 26:26:2. He prescribed the elements, bread and wine. 3. He located it “In His kingdom,” in His church, (Luke 22:29), and compare 1 Corinthians 1:1 with 1 Corinthians 11:22-23. 4. He distinctly stated its object: “This do in remembrance of me-as oft as ye do this ye do show my death until I come.” 5. He defined qualifications for the communicant, that he must be a disciple, a penitent believer, a baptized man. Not only baptized, but a member of the church and in good standing. Less than this no church of Jesus can require. This, according to Dr. Dwight, is God’s law of communion. 6. It is the Lord’s table, because He fixes even the manner of observing it. Communicants must eat and drink in a worthy manner. That decorum and solemnity becoming the church of God in remembering earth’s greatest tragedy must be observed. It was no heathen festival-no drunken orgy of Bacchus. 7. As, the Lord’s table, and not a table of the church, Jehovah left no arbitrary discretion to the church, as to the bidding of guests, but fixed, by express and irrevocable statutes, the character of the communicant. As the church was to withhold the bread and wine from the heretic, the heathen, the adulterer, the covetous man and all that walked disorderly, the Lord of the Table, by this prohibition, made the CHURCH and not the INDIVIDUAL the judge of heresy, adultery, covetousness and order. 8. It is the Lord’s table, because He alone must prescribe in what the communicant must judge. The judge cannot read the heart. In communion the Lord’s body and blood must be discerned spiritually discerned. Our faith must see Him and rest in Him. Without this faith we eat and drink condemnation to ourselves, though we be members of the church. Nor is the church to blame if we have made credible profession of religion and in all outward deportment carried ourselves circumspectly and prudently. A tree may be covered with green foliage and yet be rotten to the core on the inside. Their heart may be as empty of life as a blasted nut. This is a matter between the communicant and the heart-searching God. Hence, to every church member the law is, “Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat.” These then are some of the considerations that induce Baptists to believe, teach and call it the Lord’s table. They mean by it that Jesus instituted it, located it, prescribed the elements, object of it, qualifications of communicants, manner of observing it, in what the churches were to judge and in what the individual communicant. Can any reasonable censure be attached to their construction of the phrase, “the Lord’s table”? But perhaps they censure us because of the conclusions we deduce from this construction. With Christian candor and fairness, let us examine their deduction, and see if bigotry does not lurk in it. The Baptist Conclusion. As it is not our table, but the Lord’s, it is unhallowed presumption and rebellion for a church to violate any of these requirements of the Master. We dare not add one. Noah, however indignant at the blasphemies of the people before the flood, dared not shut the door of the ark as long at God’s Spirit was striving. And after God shut the door, he dared not take in any drowning wretch through the window. While this is not in itself a question of salvation, it is a question of obedience to God. Over our own table we have authority. We can set it where we please-in the parlor, dining room or yard. We can put on it what viands we please, invite whom we please, and withhold invitation from any. God has left some things to our control. As a beautiful and forcible illustration of the distinction between the personal right of the subject and the right of the sovereign, I quote from Sir Walter Scott. King James of Scotland had sent the English Ambassador, Lord Marmion, to be entertained by the Earl of Douglas. When about to leave the castle of Douglas, Lord Marmion said, holding out his hand: “Part we in friendship from your land, And, noble Earl, receive my hand.” But Douglas round him drew his cloak, Folded his arms, and thus he spoke: “My manors, halls and bowers shall still Be open at my sovereign’s will, To each one whom he lists, howe’er Unmeet to be the owners here; My castles

are my king's alone From turret to foundation stone, The hand of Douglas is his own, And never shall in friendly grasp The hand of such as Marmion clasp." But it is charged against us that we get others "to work for us and then will not feed them that we will not eat with other Christians that we deny hospitality and Christian courtesies to Pedo-Baptists." These are grave charges and ought not to be lightly made. Is it true that Baptists are dishonest, denying food to the laborer? Do they go beyond the Pharisees, who would not eat with publicans and sinners, and actually decline to sit down at the same private board with other Christians? Are they so inhospitable as to shut their doors in the face of Pedo-Baptist guests? In the name of Almighty God I deny it, and call for proof of that which, without proof, is slander. "Oh, no!" they say, "you misunderstand us; we are not talking about your house, your table; but you will not invite us to the Lord's table." Then in the name of fairness, why use equivocal expressions? Why array prejudices against us by casting a reflection upon our courtesy, hospitality and honesty? The world knows that Baptists are behind no denomination in welcoming guests to their homes, tables and hearthstones. Brethren, Baptist brethren, set your table where you will, but dare not move the Lord' s table out of the church. Invite at your discretion to your own board, but allow the same privilege to Almighty God. Usurp not the prerogative of Jehovah. If a man is hungry, feed him from your own table, but appease not his hunger with the sacramental bread. Do not rob God that you may appear benevolent. Upon all proper occasions show your fellowship for all Christians, and your regard for the sacred relations of husband and wife. But don't prostitute the Lord's Supper for such a purpose. Lead the poor sinner to the Savior, but dare not administer God's holy ordinance to him as a "means of grace." God never intended to make baptism and the Lord's Supper converting agencies. Shall we quail before the loud clamor raised against us? Shall unjust charges of bigotry and inhospitality coerce us to abandon principle? Forbid it, Almighty God! Paralyzed be the Baptist hand that reaches that bread and wine over one of God's limitations, and "to the roof of his mouth may the tongue of that Baptist cleave," who gives an invitation broader than the warrant of God. The ground is perilous and borders on rebellion and blasphemy. Listen to the Scriptures: "Whatsoever thing I command you observe to do it. Thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish therefrom," Deuteronomy 12:32. "Add not then to His work, lest He reprove thee and thou be found a liar," Proverbs 30:6. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," Matthew 28:30. "If ye love me, keep my commandments. Ye are my friends if you do whatsoever I command you." Of the Pharisee, Jesus said: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God ye hold the tradition of men. *** Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition." Mark 7:7-13. Upon the same subject Paul wrote: "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, are ye subject to ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship and humility, etc. Touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using," Substantially Colossians 2:20-23. In allowing a sickly sentimentality, an affectation of charity to transport us beyond a divine requirement, we may expect the chiding God's prophet gave to Saul: "Who hath required this at your hands?" Of such a one the Lord Himself asks: "Why do you call me Lord, Lord, and do not the things I command?" Again He says: "Wherefore, whosoever shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." These scriptures establish broad principles. From them we deduce the doctrines that human traditions respecting any ordinance of God if (a) mere will-worship; (b) impugns the authority of God; (c) makes void His law; (d) perishes with the using;

(e) that such traditions we are to touch not, taste not, handle not. (f) That he who teaches them diminishes his importance in the kingdom of heaven. If a man be on the rock Christ Jesus, that only foundation, he will be saved. But if he build upon that foundation wood, hay and stubble, in the fiery ordeal through which all men's actions must pass, his works will be burned up and he shall suffer loss. But the man himself, if on the rock, shall be saved, "though as it were by fire," 1 Corinthians 3:11-15. These scriptures and principles apply to Baptists as well as others. If it is our people holding traditions and making void the law of God, their works will be burned up. Brethren, forget not the day of trial the ordeal of fire. But if Baptist principles be correct then OPEN COMMUNION MAKES VOID THE LAW OF GOD, in the following particulars: 1. The bread and wine are given to some who do not even profess conversion. To those who are unbaptized. To some who are under church censure and who have been disciplined. As far as the subjects are concerned, the law of God is thus made void in three specifications. 2. The object God had in view is "laid aside." He said, "This do in remembrance of me." Open communion invites the unconverted to commune "as a means of grace." Sometimes it is said, "If ever I was converted in the world, it was in the act of communing," thus making a mere emblem a converting agency and glorifying an act of rebellion. Open communion loses sight of God's object in being administered to show fellowship for other denominations. The Savior said, "This do in remembrance of me." Fellowship among denominations is a great thing, but if the shadow of our coming together darkens the cross of Calvary, and causes us to lose sight of the Redeemer, then, O mighty God, keep us forever apart! Open communion is observed sometimes that husband and wife, belonging to different organizations, may eat at the same sacramental table. When two are agreed it is well to see them walk together. The Word of God commands the husband to love his wife even as his own body. Let him love her, guard her from peril and make all his faculties the servants of his love in her behalf. Let her be dearer than all the world to him. But, O husband, exalt her not above God! Why should "a man's foes be those of his own household?" Thy wife may be wondrously fair, but though the orange bloom be fresh in her hair, let her not be obtruded before a dying Savior! In communion He says, "Remember me" not your wife. 'Tis not the time to think of her. Scourged from our hearts in that hallowed hour be every image but that dear face, "marred" for us "more than that of any of the sons of men." 3. Open communion makes void the law of God in setting His table out of His kingdom. He said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, to eat and to drink, at my table, in my kingdom." Open communion gives the bread and wine to some who have never been baptized, or who have been excluded from the church. For when a man is excluded from one denomination, he has only to join another, and then come to that table from which he had been expelled. That emphatic triple prohibition of Paul, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," is far more pertinent to this subject than to the drinking of ardent spirits. It has no direct reference to whiskey-drinking, but primarily refers to something even more obnoxious to God's law, i.e., to partaking of "ordinances after the commandments and traditions of man." It is a downright close communion text. If, as they confidently believe, the Baptists hold the traditions, it says to all PedoBaptists desiring to approach our communion table, "Touch not, taste not, handle not." If, as we confidently believe, they are making void God's law by their traditions, it comes like the point of a two-edged sword to the heart of thee open communion Baptist, "TOUCH NOT, TASTE NOT, HANDLE NOT." We therefore cherish the conviction that no just censure attaches to the Baptist practice because it is the Lord's table. Let us then, in our search for "Baptist bigotry," examine another query: Are Baptists bigoted because they make baptism a prerequisite to communion? Let

an appeal be made to the Word of God. From that holy book we learn: 1. That baptism was first appointed and practiced. The first baptizer never saw the communion table. Jesus Himself was baptized, then made and baptized disciples, long before He Himself commanded or appointed communion for others. See John 3:22-23; John 4:1; Matthew 26:26. 2. First in the commission. “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, ” Matthew 28:20. Here the order of the commandment is (a) make disciples, (b) baptize them, (c) teach them to commune. For communion is one of the things He had commanded them to observe. 3. We find that the apostles so understood this order by their practice. Take the first instance, with which all the rest harmonize. On the day of Pentecost Peter preached a sermon. The people were convicted and said, “What must we do?” The apostle replied, “Repent and be baptized,” etc. Then the record says, “They that gladly received the word were baptized,” and then adds, “They continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship and breaking of bread, ” etc. Acts 2:38-40. Even a child can see that the people were baptized before they communed. 4. In instructing the churches the connection shows that baptism was first. Take one instance as an illustration that one most relied on by open communionists. It is that much quoted Scripture, “Let a man examine himself and so let him eat.” By this Scripture they seek to prove that the individual and not the church must judge. Ten thousand times it has been quoted in triumph, as if it were the “end of the controversy.” Let us fairly test this invincible (?) argument. Unto whom was this language addressed? To everybody? Where do we find the language, “Let a man examine himself and so let him eat”? It is found in 1 Corinthians 11:28. What do we know about these Corinthians to whom Paul was writing? Turn to Acts 18:1-11 : “After these things Paul came to Corinth-and reasoned in the synagogue and Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed and were baptized. ” This is the account of their baptism. Now mark the beginning of that letter in which the expression occurs: “Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, ” etc. This shows that they were organized into a church. Finally, examine carefully the very chapter in which the expression occurs, and you will find (1 Corinthians 11:18; 1 Corinthians 11:20; 1 Corinthians 11:22-23) that when assembled together, in one place, in church capacity, then, and only then, it is said to these baptized Corinthians, “Let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” It is a perversion of the Word of God to make this justify open communion. 5. The scriptures make baptism the initiatory ordinance. It is the emblem of the beginning of spiritual life. Communion is the emblem of the nutrition of that life. Shall we reverse the analogy of nature and adopt the absurdity that food must be given to the non-existent? 6. There is some analogy between the Lord’s supper and the Jewish passover; and some analogy between circumcision and baptism, though baptism did not come in the place of circumcision. The Jewish law was explicit (Exodus 12:48) “No uncircumcised man must eat thereof,” and following the analogy, and in the language of a distinguished Methodist, “No unbaptized man must eat of the Lord’s Supper.” All Baptists make these arguments from the Scriptures; but they do not stand alone in thus interpreting the Word of God. It is common ground, for, ALL DENOMINATIONS TEACH THAT BAPTISM MUST PRECEDE COMMUNION. And every denomination determines for itself what is baptism. I submit, as a fair sample of a great mass of testimony, the following: Wall (noted Pedo-Baptist historian), in his “History of Infant Baptism,” Part 2, Chapter 19, says: “No church ever gave the communion to any persons before

they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized." To the same effect speaks Dr. Doddridge, "Lectures," page 511: "As far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity teaches, it is certain that no unbaptized person ever received the Lord's Supper." Note again the testimony of Dr. Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College: "It is an indispensable qualification for this ordinance that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible church of Christ, in full standing. By this I intend that he shall be a person of piety; that he should have made a public profession of religion; and that he should have been baptized." The only scriptural grounds on which any minister can invite other denominations to commune is that they are members of the church of Christ and baptized. The denial of this necessarily precludes communion. As proof, I submit the following quotations from Dr. O. Fisher, the great Methodist baptismal debater: "The Baptists, setting themselves up for the only right ones holding all others as out of the church, because unbaptized, they themselves are after all proved to be just what they have held others to be, unbaptized, as they certainly have neither the mode nor design of baptism, and have only a part of its subjects. And it may be seriously questioned whether the baptism administered by our Baptist brethren, holding the views they do respecting it, ought to be received as valid by the other evangelical churches, and therefore-whether it be truly and strictly lawful to hold communion with them, even where they are willing. " ("Christian Sacraments," section "History of Immersion" pages 184, 185). This then is the true issue: What is a visible church of Christ? What is baptism? Never, while remains the testimony of Mark, that. "John baptized the people in the river of Jordan"; never, while Enon, the place of much water, remains in the bible; never, while it is said "that Philip and the Eunuch both went down into the water"; never while the record of our blessed Savior's baptism remains, concerning whom it is said, "When He was baptized He came up straightway out of the water," and with whom, Paul says, "we are buried in baptism"; never, while these remain, will Baptists concede that moistening the forehead from a pitcher is baptism; and so never can'invite with consistency the Pedo-Baptists to communion with them. Since the great principles which underlie the communion question are held in common by all denominations, to all the fair minded and candid I submit the question: Is it right to attribute our practice to bigotry? Let a great Methodist historian answer. Hibbard, in his "History of Methodism," says: "It is but just to remark that in one principle the Baptist and Pedo-Baptist churches agree. They both agree in rejecting from communion at the table of the Lord, and in denying the right of church fellowship to all who have not been baptized. Valid baptism they consider as essential to constitute visible church membership. This also we hold. The only question, then, that divides us is: What is essential to valid baptism? The Baptists, in passing a sweeping sentence of disfranchisement upon all the Christian churches, have only acted upon a principle held in common with all other Christian churches, viz: That baptism is essential to church membership. They have denied our baptism and, as unbaptized persons, we have been excluded from their table. That they greatly err in their views of Christian baptism we, of course, believe. But according to their view of baptism, they certainly are consistent in restricting this their communion. We would not be understood as passing a judgment of approval upon their course; but we may say their views of baptism force them upon the ground of strict communion and herein they act upon the same principles as other churches. They admit only those whom they deem baptized persons to the communion table. Of course they must be their own judges as to what baptism is. It is evident that according to our views we can admit them to our communion; but with their views of baptism, it is equally evident

they can never reciprocate the courtesy; and the charge of close communion is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us; insomuch that the question of church membership is determined by as liberal principles as it is with any other Protestant churches-so far, I mean, as the present subject is concerned, i.e., it is determined by valid baptism." Will my Methodist brethren allow me to call special attention to this extract? They have no greater man than Hibbard, of New York, and very few of his equal in candor. The points to which attention is especially directed are as follows:

1. He says that Baptists, in determining church membership, are governed by as liberal principles as any other church. No bigotry there.

2. The charge of close communion is no more applicable to them than to PedoBaptist churches. No bigotry there. 3. In making baptism precede communion, they act on principles shared by all PedoBaptist churches. No bigotry there. 4. The Baptists are consistent in their restricted communion. No illiberality there. 5. They must be their own judges as to what baptism is. 6. The only question that divides us is, What is valid baptism? Will our brethren of other denominations follow this magnanimous leader and do us common justice at least? And since they hold baptism as an indispensable prerequisite to communion, I have another question to ask them: Is it right or fair to quote Robert Hall, the open communion Baptist, against us, since they despise his premise? Do they really respect his position? Listen to his words, and as they love his conclusion, let them accept his premise. Either retain both or reject both. He says: "We certainly make no scruple in informing a Pedo-Baptist candidate that we consider him as unbaptized, and disdain all concealment on the subject. If we supposed there were a necessary, unalterable, connection between the two positive Christian institutes, so that none were qualified for communion who had not been previously baptized, we could not hesitate for a moment respecting the refusal of Pedo-Baptists, without renouncing the principles of our denomination." Vol. I, pages 403 and 445, Hall's works. In other places he argues for open communion on the ground of human weakness, their weakness in the faith. Thus we see that Robert Hall receives Pedo-Baptists to the communion only on two grounds: (1) That baptism is not essential to communion. (2) In condescension to their weakness. Let us propound yet other queries: Are Baptists censurable in making the church and not the individual the judge of external qualification? By external qualification I mean a credible profession of religion, baptism, church connection and orderly walk. When God sent out His ministers to disciple the nations, do you suppose that Paul or John or Peter ever left it to the candidates to say what was baptism, or for what purpose they were baptized? Were a group of converts left free to determine the form of church government? Or did the apostles go out discipling according to the Savior's method, baptizing as He was baptized, and organizing churches according to the Divine model? Let candor and common sense answer. But whatever may be the scriptural argument, as long as their position is the same as ours, let them pass no censures. Just here the question will arise in the Baptist mind, Why this late war on the communion question? It is not the ancient battleground. There are men living, nearly old enough to remember when communion with Baptists was never sought when Baptists were not accredited worthy to commune at their table. Stripes and fagots have given place to kisses and embraces. Again the question recurs, growing mightier and more massive from every consideration of the past, Why is the battleground shifted, and the weapons of warfare changed? Baptists believe it is because Pedo-Baptists have been driven to the wall on the baptismal question. They are profoundly conscious that the young convert, unbiased by prejudice, finds in his Bible that the

Savior was immersed. That he ought to follow Christ. And all the power of childish associations, and all the memories of father and mother are not sufficient to make this convert believe in infant baptism. He wants to be baptized for himself, and upon a profession of his own faith. How shall he be hindered? By presenting to his heart, all aglow with the freshness of love, close communion all invested with horror. By darkening it with epithets and clothing it in mantles of bigotry and intolerance. What community has not its adept in this work? But after Hibbard and men like him have spoken, surely none but the ignorant, or those blinded by prejudice, or those thoroughly carried away by the popular clamor for charity, will continue the work of misrepresentation and darkening counsel. But are Baptists censurable for refusing to make this ordinance a means of exhibiting Christian fellowship for other denominations? Are we driven to such straits to show our Christian love, that an ordinance of God must be perverted? Is the arena for the exhibition of Christian charity so circumscribed as to warrant such a report? Is the field of Christian co-operation so narrow that we must have recourse to such an expedient? How many times must it be repeated, that in communion the local congregation of Baptist believers, assembled together in one place as a church, as a bride, “remembers Jesus, the absent husband, and shows forth His death until He comes”? All other objects of communion are foreign to God’s one, original purpose. In prayer, by the bedside of the dying, in life’s multiform battles, we can evidence our love and Christian fellowship. BUT DOES NOT CLOSE COMMUNION UNCHRISTIANIZE OTHER DENOMINATIONS? No true Baptist ever believed it or taught it: Baptists, alone, of all denominations, can clearly show that their standard works teach that neither baptism nor communion is essential to salvation. Their uniform doctrine has been salvation essential to baptism. They have ever been taught that “whosoever believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation.” That even out of Rome, “the mother of harlots,” will God call many of His people. But one single fact settles this question forever. Here on my left sits a brother whom we have just received. He is adjudged a Christian by the unanimous vote of the church. He is to be baptized this evening. And yet, until baptized, our communion table is closed against him. We believe him to be as much baptized as any PedoBaptist. Shall we allow more privileges to other denominations than to those converts received for our baptism? But more to the point: Does our close communion unchristianize this brother, who, by the undivided voice of the church, has been declared a Christian? If our reason has not lost its balance, we must answer, No! There can be no sectarian bigotry here. Where then in our practice shall it be found? Is there any force in that threadbare statement that hackneyed phrase “WE SHALL COMMUNE TOGETHER IN HEAVEN, WHY NOT ON EARTH?” This is one of the sophisms referred to. All great logicians, Aristotle, Hedge, Whately and others, unite in anathematizing the sophist. Surely if an attorney-at-law is disgraced who wilfully uses a sophism to gain a case, no man can be held guiltless who uses one in religious controversy. Under the fair surface of this much quoted and popular expression there lurks a fallacy. But little attention is necessary to point it out. It is the use of the same word in both premise and conclusion, when the word has a very different meaning in the one form from what it does in the other. It is the word COMMUNION. The premise is “We shall, all commune together in heaven.” The conclusion is “Therefore we should all commune together on earth.” The communion referred to on earth is a communion of bread and wine. The communion in heaven referred to is a spiritual communion. No one expects a communion table of bread and wine to be set in heaven, because such communion expires with the coming of the Savior. He says, “Ye do show the Lord’s death until He come.” The earthly communion table has

fulfilled its mission when Shiloh comes again. In order for premise and conclusion to harmonize and the one to necessarily flow from the other, the meaning of the word must be the same in both. If our PedoBaptist brethren say, “We shall all hold spiritual communion in heaven, therefore we ought to have spiritual communion on earth,” we accept the conclusion, and claim that we do have with all Christians Christian fellowship and spiritual communion, as the whole world knows. But if they say, “All denominations will gather around one communion table of bread and wine in heaven, just such one as we have here, therefore the earthly practice should conform to the heavenly,” we reply: (1) The premise is false, as it is not in evidence from the Bible that there will be such a table set. (2) Even if the premise is true, the conclusion does not follow, because in heaven, if we ever get there, we shall all have one faith and shall have left behind us in the ashes of the great conflagration those differences which necessitate different tables here. Thus the emptiness and fallacy of this redoubted sophism is made manifest; but let us put the question to them: Do they receive all to their communion table whom the Lord proposes to save? Is this their law of communion? All whom Jesus receives? They make no pretension to it. Brethren of other denominations, all of you who love justice and truth, I make my appeal to you. Is that man guiltless before God who, to the detriment of another denomination, perpetrates this sophism? If to pervert Scripture be criminal, how much more to misuse the heavenly glory? Is there any force in the objection that close communion separates members of the same family from the same sacramental table? In the first place, if close communion is of divine appointment, it is not the separating power. God said to the Jews, “Your sins have separated between you and me.” It was not the law that separated, but sin. Law was ordained to life. Its purpose was to bind to God. But transgression may make that which was ordained to life a means of death. See Paul’s argument Romans 7:1-25. There is, however, a secondary sense in which it divides families or arrays them against each other, so that “a man’s foes are those of his own household.” But whatever of force there is in this objection against restricted communion applies with equal power against the Christian religion. Our Savior says: “Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth; I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man’s foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me.” See Matthew 10:34-39. This was the very objection the enemy used against the Christian religion: “They are come here also who have turned the world upside down.” In these latter days religion is wounded in the house of its friends. Principle is sacrificed to convenience and pleasure, and family relations are exalted above God’s Word. The dignity and majesty of law is sold out to gratify human passions and to conciliate the world. How often you hear it: “Join that church where you can enjoy your religion the best.” “You had better go along with your wife or your husband or father.” As if our enjoyment had anything to do with it. O God, send thy Spirit to impress us, until we ask no longer, “What will I enjoy? What will please my husband or wife?” but “What wilt thou have me to do? ” In the next place let us inquire: IS CLOSE COMMUNION A BAR TO CHRISTIAN UNION? I know that this charge is made all over the land. Papers that profess to be non-sectarian thus covertly thrust at our beloved principles. The pulpit, the press, the parlor and the kitchen unite in the declaration. The impression is made that if it were not for “those bigoted, close communion Baptists,” the Protestant world would be a unit. Now, is there a shadow of truth in this assumption* If facts ever did explode a fallacy, they have burst this air-bubble. Facts! Yes, well-established,

stubborn facts give it the lie. If close communion were the bar to Christian union, then where there is no close communion there would be Christian union. But let one solitary instance stand up as a colossal monument sublimely protesting against this phantom of the brain. Let it be written in broad capitals over ever communion table CHARLES H. SPURGEON WAS DEBARRED FROM THE BRITISH EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND IN CONSEQUENCE FROM THE WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE! Yes, the world's greatest and most influential open communion Baptist, a man whose pulpit efficiency, whose height and depth of influence have had no equal since the Apostle Paul, this man representing the open communion Baptist churches of England had no part in the far-famed World's Evangelical Alliance, while J. L. M. Curry, the silver-tongued orator of the close communion Baptists, not only held in that august body an honorable position, but made before it the grandest speech delivered at its late session in the United States! "O Tempora! O Mores!" Did Spurgeon's open communion sentiments save him? No. Do they exempt him from Pedo-Baptist onslaught? Nay, verily. Exists there as much Christian union between him and the open communion churches and the PedoBaptists of England, as between the Pedo-Baptists and the close communion Baptist churches of America? Most certainly not. The fact is, open communion forfeits rather than secures Pedo-Baptist regard. In going to the table of another denomination, a Baptist makes the fatal concession that it is the church of Jesus Christ and its members baptized. Making this, it is his duty to join it. The assumption that close communion is the bar to Christian union is as unsubstantial as an idle dream, a hallucination lighter than a gulf cloud. But- I have yet other questions to urge: Do Pedo-Baptists regard Baptists as acting conscientiously in their communion views? If not, how dare they invite to God's table those whom they regard as unprincipled and unconscientious? If they do, how can they have the face to ask a fellow Christian to violate the promptings of his conscience? Upon which horn of the dilemma do they desire to be impaled? Yet again: As they admit our baptism and church membership, and can therefore, as far as that is concerned, invite us to commune with them without violation of conscience, and as we do not admit their baptism or church connection, and cannot therefore invite them without violation of conscience, where is our illiberality? Where is the bigotry? The principle on which both proceed is precisely the same. Let me ask the fair-minded and candid among them to show me a way out of this dilemma: Shall I invite them to the communion as baptized? This stultifies my principles. Shall I invite them as unbaptized? They themselves regard this as rebellion against God. What kind of an invitation would they have, an honest or a dishonest one? If it be dishonest, who shall answer for us to God? If honest, will they accept? How much would they be flattered with such an invitation as this, and how much would it recommend us: "Brethren Pedo-Baptists, we do not regard you as baptized; we agree with you that baptism is necessary to communion, but respecting your views more than our conscience or the Word of God, we ask you to come along with us to the communion table. We do not regard it as appointed to show Christian fellowship, nor to unite husband and wife, nor as a means of grace, but in deference to your superior judgment we yield these matters." Who of them would accept the invitation thus given? And now to my own brethren I turn, with the question: DOES OPEN COMMUNION HAVE A TENDENCY TO PROSPER AND PERPETUATE BAPTIST CHURCHES? As an answer,

(a) Look to the melancholy history of John Bunyan's church. He stood out with Robert Hall as one of the champions of open communion. He believed, preached and practiced it. How did it affect his church? After his death, PedoBaptists claimed that they had the right to vote as well as to

commune. As none could consistently deny it, they exercised that right, and for a hundred years put Pedo-Baptist preachers in old John Bunyan's pulpit and pastorate. From 1688 to 1788, no Baptist preacher was pastor. And when the last of these pastors was converted to the Baptist faith, he was retained only on the condition that he would not preach on baptism. He was gagged in his own house. Yes, open communion throttled him and made him keep back part of the counsel of God. In 1700, and again in 1724, they refused to grant letters to their members desiring to unite with close communion churches. Open communion is to Baptists what the Trojan horse made by Greeks was to Troy. It pretended to be an offering to the immortal gods. But it was made so large that the walls had to be broken down for its reception, and in its cavernous interior many of the bravest Greeks were concealed. (b) Look next to the fading glories of the Free-will Baptists, and last (c) to the shameful downfall of Dr. Pentecost. But yesterday he cast a shadow across a continent-now none so poor to do him honor. The prosperity of Spurgeon's church is attributable to the fact that their open communion has never had a chance (and could not in his lifetime) to be carried to its legitimate consequences. Wait until, like Bunyan, he has been sleeping one hundred years, then read the history. Again: DOES OPEN COMMUNION ENABLE BAPTISTS TO MAKE CONVERTS MORE RAPIDLY OF PEDOBAPTISTS? As a test, take an instance: The Rev. John Foster, of London, left his church to accept the call of the Independent Church at Piner's Hall. But though for years their pastor, he never baptized one of them. They, of course, concluded that if he would accept the pastoral care of their church, they were near enough right. If you ever want to convert Pedo-Baptists, make no compromise with their errors. But does the avowal of opera communion sentiments and the most earnest invitations for intercommunion ever secure much of it? No Pedo-Baptist regularly communed with Robert Hall's open communion church. It existed in name almost altogether. Inter-communion with Spurgeon's church was infrequent, and never, except in the case of isolated individuals. It is beyond my knowledge if there was ever any church communion in his case. It is known that Pedo-Baptists do not throng the tables of the Free-will Baptists. And how long and how far did they follow the misguided Pentecost? It is either a fruitless theory, or the fruits are apples from Sodom for Baptists. I desire to stand by the old landmark today and lift a voice of warning to my brethren OPEN COMMUNION IS THE ENTERING WEDGE OF DEATH TO OUR CHURCHES. The kiss of intercommunion is as the kiss of Judas, and their embrace the embrace of death. In preference, give us back the fagot, the dungeon and the martyr fires. These were the portions of Baptists not many years ago. No Pedo-Baptist denomination sought communion with us then. Read the history of ecclesiastical affairs in the reign of Elizabeth, and since that time. If my statement is questioned, let me be put to the proof. What, then, should be done with the Baptist minister who preaches and practices open communion? If he be an Apollos in eloquence, a Rothschild in wealth, or a Jesse Mercer in influence, let his name be blotted from our records. He costs us far too much to retain him. We cannot pay the price of existence for the honor of having him among us. What shall be done with a private member who practices open communion? If he be sound in the faith in other particulars, kindly admonish him and have patience with him, that you may gain your brother. Show him how it is far better to comply with the genius and rules of his church. Bear with him. But if he persists, the welfare of the church imperatively demands his expulsion. He is walking disorderly. Let the fellowship of the church be withdrawn from him. If he is sincere, if he is conscientious and determined in his practice, his common sense, as well as our discipline, will show him that the Baptist church is no place for him. If he persists for popular effect, for any unworthy, time-serving motive, he is

unworthy of membership in any church. Politics as well as religion might well unite in the prayer, “From all trimmers, Good Lord, deliver us!” Those of our brethren who are Baptists upon all other points, and simply have doubts upon the communion question, and who do not purpose practising open communion, nor propagating it, but can conscientiously comply with the church regulations, had better remain in the Baptist church, because (1) in going to another church they do not secure open communion, since by going they lose Baptist communion and

(2) in joining a Pedo-Baptist organization they will have to endorse and support many things obnoxious to their faith. It certainly is passing strange that for the sake of anything so empty of practical good as open communion, a man will give up his convictions (1) That immersion alone is baptism. (2) That believers only are subjects of baptism. (3) That the church of Jesus Christ is a democracy. And now in all kindness let me once more impress upon the minds of my brethren THE SIN OF OPEN COMMUNION. At the bar of God’s truth I impeach it of sin and of treason, because (1) It violates the law of God making it a church ordinance. They set their table “out of the Kingdom.” (2) It is a sin, because it gives the bread and wine to the unconverted. (3) It is a sin because given to the unbaptized. (4) I impeach it of the sin of substitution. God’s reason for communion is superseded,, and it is received to show Christian fellowship and to unite husband and wife. (5) It is treason, in that it makes void the law of discipline. (6) It is sin in being used “as a means of grace.” (7) It is a sin in that it seeks the destruction of Baptist churches. (8) It is a sin, in that it is founded upon a sickly sentimentality, an affected charity, and upon fallacies and sophisms, and teems with glaring inconsistencies. In all the universe of created things, animate and inanimate, it has no counterpart. It stands before us like Nebuchadnezzar’s dream. “Thou, O King, sawest and beheld a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee. And the form thereof was terrible. This image’s head was of fine gold, his breasts and his arms of silver, his body and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay.” Such is its picture, and, as in the case of that other image set up by Nebuchadnezzar, the whole world is called upon to fall down and worship it, and “wonder at the beast with a great admiration.” This luminous, this terrible image! Who can stand before it? “Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon its feet, that were of iron and clay, (which could not cleave to one another), and brake them in pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth.” So the truth of God smites the great image of open communion upon its earthen foundation, and shivers into countless fragments its incoherent particles.

Chapter 68

# S. A Sermon to Preachers

A SERMON TO PREACHERS

Delivered Before The Baptist General Convention of Texas, at Belton, October 7, 1892, and reproduced here by the courtesy of the American Baptist Publication Society. TEXT: I magnify mine office. Romans 11:13. However far, and by whatever license a minister may depart from the primary meaning of a text in its immediate connection, it is always obligatory that he should first give the primary and contextual import and then explain how the general principle contained in it may be safely applied to all his deductions from it. In the present case the connection is this: The Apostle seems to anticipate an objection in the minds of the Gentiles whom he addresses, that he, their apostle, should manifest such concern for the salvation of the Jews. He justifies his solicitude for the redemption of his Jewish brethren, though he is an apostle to the Gentiles, and even magnifies his office as their apostle that by their glorious success in the gospel the Jews may be excited to emulation and thereby some of them be saved. He argues that, if the Gentiles derived benefit from the fall of the Jews, they would derive yet more by their recovery. Nor does he content himself with the salvation of only “some of them.” He looks to the salvation of the whole Jewish nation and to this end he speaks in the text and its conections: “But I speak to you that are Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify my ministry; if by any means I may provoke to emulation them that are my flesh.” But while this is the primary meaning of the text, in its connections it embodies a great principle of wider application. It is this great principle which burns in my heart and which I feel impelled to discuss before this Convention. The fairness and safety of this wider application may be gathered from the first Scripture read- Ephesians 4:11-16 -in which it is alleged that God gave apostles, pastors, teachers and evangelists for the same glorious purpose. Therefore, if the office of one is to be magnified, so the office of the others to the same end. Hence the THEME: The office of a minister must be magnified -glorified always, everywhere, and by all incumbents. In discussing this theme, it is purposed to emphasize three thoughts: The office itself, why pit should be magnified, how to magnify it.

I. THE OFFICE -

First impress on your minds the fact that the work of the ministry, is official. It is an office in the true and common acceptation of that term. Let us define: Webster’s International Dictionary says: “Office a special duty, trust, charge or position, conferred by authority for a public purpose; a position of trust or authority; as an executive or judicial office; a municipal office. A charge or trust of sacred nature, conferred by God Himself; as, the office of a priest under the old dispensation, and that of the apostles in the new,” quoting our text as an example. Mark the essential elements of an office. The duty, trust or charge is special. It is conferred by authority. It is for a public purpose. In the case of a religious office, the trust is sacred and God Himself confers it. While in civil affairs it is the duty of every citizen to do all in his power toward the enforcement of law and the preservation of order, certain functions devolve exclusively on officers appointed for the purpose. A private citizen cannot perform the official duties of the sheriff, judge, governor or

president. So in the church and kingdom of Christ. While it is the privilege of every Christian to tell the story of the cross and to otherwise aid in the dissemination of the gospel, yet in magnifying individual duties and privileges let it never be forgotten that God has called out a special class of men and set them apart officially and committed to them certain official duties. “This is a true saying, if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.” The truth of the proposition just set forth is more recognized than realized. Let us impress ourselves with it by carefully reconsidering some things well known to all of us.

1. The terms by which God designates His ministers not only indicate office but suggest the nature of the office and its duties. In many places the minister is called a shepherd. A shepherd performs special duties committed to him alone. He must watch over the flock, feed them when hungry, heal them when sick, guard them in peril, keep them from worries and alarms, and shelter them in the fold. He is called a bishop, which means an overseer. The overseer has special duty and authority. He directs the labor of those he oversees. He is called a steward, one who holds in trust the goods or business of another and who acts for his principal, as an agent in the matter committed to him. He is called an ambassador, a term which implies official functions. The ambassador acts by special appointment, under definite instructions, and carries credentials authenticating his mission. There are other terms of similar purport. 2. The form or ceremony by which the minister is set apart to his work indicates an office. He is separated to this work by prayer and laying on of the hands of the presbytery (Acts 13:2-3; 1 Timothy 4:14). 3. The special provision made for his support indicates an office (1 Corinthians 9:1-14). As there is a salary for the governor of a state, or the sheriff of a county, or a soldier in the army, so the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel. Now it is evident that all Christians cannot live of the gospel-cannot be put on a salary out of the common fund. The fact, therefore, that special provision is made for the financial and material support of a certain class who devote their time and labor to a solemn trust for the public benefit; is a demonstration that such class are in office. There is no escape from this alternative: Either the preacher is an object of, charity in receiving pecuniary aid from his congregation, or he receives it. in compensation for official duties. 4. Ministerial responsibility is proof of office. I mean to say that there is a responsibility laid on every preacher that does not rest on any private member of the church, and that in the great day of account he must answer to God for the manner in which he has discharged his official duties. Now, by these four facts-the terms employed to designate his work, the form by which he is set apart to that work, the provision made for his support while engaged in it, and his responsibility for its performance, it is demonstrable that he fills an office in the ordinary sense of that word and the duties of such office are in contradistinction to the duties of private members of the church. These private members are not called shepherds, bishops, ambassadors, nor even stewards, in the sense that he is a steward. They are not ordained. They rely upon their secular business for a support. They have not his responsibility.

II. WHY THE OFFICE SHOULD BE MAGNIFIED -

1. Because of Him who appoints. The dignity of every office is measured largely by the dignity of the appointing power. The servant is not above his master. When one holds an official position under the commission of a king, that royal signature ennobles every official action performed under its authority and confers on it the royal sanction, however paltry it may seem in itself. But what earthly potentate can be compared in majesty with the King of kings and Lord of lords, who

as the eternal God, Himself specially calls every man, appoints every man, and sends forth under His supreme authority every man who lawfully enters the ministry? How does such a commission, handed down from the Supreme Court of Heaven, infinitely transcend in majesty and dignity any commission issued by any lower court, so finite in time and power! The divine Lord of the harvest sends forth His laborers into the harvest. He separates them from the masses of Christian people. He kindles on the altar of their hearts an unquenchable desire to preach His gospel. He counts it as rendered to Himself the treatment they receive. An audience given to them is given to Him. Their message scorned is His message scorned. Therefore, every minister should magnify his office. 2. This office should be magnified because of the work involved in it. What is the minister to do? For what service is he commissioned? Even those in high authority sometimes necessarily commission their servants to perform trifling and unimportant services. But is such your work, my brethren? Let us re-read our commission tonight. The Scriptures, (‘Scriptures read: Ephesians 4:11-16; Acts 20:28-92; 1 Peter 5:1-4; 1 Corinthians 4:1-2; 2 Corinthians 2:14-17; 2 Corinthians 3:1-12; 2 Corinthians 4:1-7; 2 Corinthians 6:18-20; 1 Timothy 1:12-13; 1 Timothy 4:12-16; 2 Timothy 2:1-7; 2 Timothy 4:1-8,) which introduced this service tell their own story. They were earnestly and solemnly read were they reverently heard? By them our work is divided into two distinct parts-reconciliation and edification. The reconciliation of sinners to God the upbuilding of the reconciled in their most holy faith. How awful the responsibility, how solemn the obligation, how important the service of carrying to the lost the word and hope of eternal life! Salvation! Salvation! How much it means! Life! Eternal life! What is thy purport? Hear what was said to one of the early preachers: “I send thee to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and. from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me” (Acts 26:17-18). What privation of the lost is here disclosed! What subjection! What guilt! What orphanage! What bankruptcy! What homelessness! They are blind. Night overshadows them. Satan has bound them hand and foot. His cloven foot presses their quivering hearts. They are without God and hope in the world. They are condemned and the sword of execution hangs over them suspended by one brittle thread. They are heirs to an inheritance of despair. And what service does the, minister render to them? He brings sight for blindness; light for darkness; forgiveness for guilt; hope for despair; a heavenly inheritance for spiritual bankruptcy; fatherhood for orphanage; and thrusts back the triumphant devil from off the prostrate victim and stands him up unshackled before God, “redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled.” Hear that same early preacher tell of this part of his work: “And hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God” (2 Corinthians 5:18-20). Oh, the enmity of man against God! Oh, the sweetness of reconciliation! And “How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things.” Beautiful feet! Though bare, and bruised, and bleeding, and swollen, and dust-covered. Beautiful feet! When thy Saviour has girded Himself and washed them shall they evermore walk on a less holy mission! My brother in the ministry, is this trifling work? And how like it, in importance, is the other part? “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28). “… Feed my lambs…. Feed my sheep” (John 21:15-16). “And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets;

and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith,, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with, every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the' truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love (Ephesians 4:11-16). Ministers of God, have you studied these Scriptures? Have you gauged these responsibilities? Have you measured these duties? My brethren, let our bare hearts be the targets of the fiery arrows of interrogation: Are any sheep of our flock hungry? Is any lamb astray? Are wolves howling around the fold committed to our care? Are any laborers idle under our oversight? Are the "babes in Christ" in our charge growing? Have you heard any of them crying for the "sincere milk of the word," while you crammed them with solid food they were unable to digest? Are our people unified in the faith? Are any of the young converts tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine? Are they at the mercy of every theological tramp, who, for revenue, seeks to sidetrack them from their straight road of service? Are they a prey to religious cranks, who poison them with patent nostrums and quack medicines? Is the body over which you preside fitly joined together? Does every joint supply compactness? Does every part work effectually? Does the body increase? Is it edified? O watchman, have you blown the trumpet at the coming of the sword? My brethren in the ministry, was this Scripture written for our sakes: "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves I should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed: but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them. And they were scattered, because there is no shepherd: and they became meat to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered" (Ezekiel 34:2-5). And under our mismanagement has it become necessary for God to "judge between cattle and cattle"? Have we allowed some of the flock to "eat up the good pasture and tread the residue under their feet-to drink the water and foul the residue with their feet"? Have we stood cowardly silent while some "have thrust with side and shoulder, and pushed all the diseased with their horns, till they are scattered abroad".? Oh, "when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, shall we receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away"? Brethren, I press this question: Are not reconciliation and edification work enough? And should we not magnify our office because of the work? 3. This office is to be magnified because of the extraordinary means appointed for the accomplishing of the work of reconciliation and edification. I waste no words on the Koran nor the Book of Mormon. I mention no vagaries of human speculation, nor hallucinations of earthly philosophy. I hold up no glow-worm light of science. I speak not of the Constitution of the United States nor of any statutes evolved from it. But I do speak of the inspired Word of God as the instrument appointed for reconciliation and edification. When we consider this inspired volume as the means of glorifying his office placed in the preacher's hands, we would not dare mention in comparison the office of the Supreme Court of the United States, which expounds only the principles of earthly jurisprudence. Let them quote Blackstone. and Kent. Let them painfully and laboriously gather up

the doubtful opinions of dead men - that is their business. But the man of God takes a Word inviolable and infallible-which has breathed on those who wrote it; this must he expound and illustrate. It is the Word which God at sundry times and in divers manner, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets and in these last days by His Son. This Word is “quick and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of ‘the heart.” This “Word of the Lord endureth forever.” It is brighter and more potent than the light of all the heavenly bodies (Psalms 19:1-14). It is more credible than a visitor from the dead (Luke 16:28-31). It is surer than the evidences of the senses (2 Peter 1:13-19). Therefore, the preacher is “charged”; that is, put on his oath, “before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, to preach the word” (2 Timothy 4:1). Such extraordinary and potential means would not have been provided for an office that men could refuse to magnify. 4. The office should be magnified because of Him who accompanies the official and gives efficacy to his words. I speak of the Holy Spirit, whose presence and power constitute the only guarantee of ministerial success. Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God alone gives the increase. To what earthly office, however great, are such presence and power attached? The minister is a “laborer together with God.” No reverent mind can think of this presence and power, and depreciate the office which they sanctify and energize. 5. The office is to be magnified on account of the extraordinary qualifications required of the officer - qualifications mental, moral and spiritual. I maintain that there is no other office among men that calls for the kind and degree of qualifications which God’s Word requires for the ministerial office. He must have gifts, graces and character such as no human law requires for any earthly office. While the measure of his knowledge and scholarly education is not prescribed, he must be apt to teach. Without this aptness he never can be a preacher. He must wrap himself in a mantle of personal purity whiter than the ermine of a judge. This mantle no minister can smirch with impunity. He must be unspotted before the world and must preserve a good report of them that are without. He may as well resign when the world seriously questions his sincerity or his morals. In an age of mammon, while the world bows before its golden calf, he must not be covetous. “Not for filthy lucre” must he take charge of any flock. While other men hate and fight, he must be no “striker or brawler.” His spiritual qualifications are yet higher. He must be full of the Holy Spirit. He is the instrument of the Spirit. He must ever yield to the monition of the Spirit. Therefore, because of his extraordinary appointment, because of his extraordinary work, because of the extraordinary means furnished him, because of the extraordinary presence, and because of the extraordinary qualifications required, it is demonstrable that this office should be magnified above every other office. We now come to the main question

III. How SHALL THE OFFICE BE MAGNIFIED? BRETHREN, -

I feel pressed in spirit tonight when I look out over this audience-among whom are so many ministers, so many older than myself, so many of longer service in the ministry.

And I speak with great diffidence, but I do desire to express very earnestly and without the slightest reservation my own deep and abiding convictions concerning the truth of God as I understand it, in answering the question how all ministers may magnify their office. 1. By a profound realization of its importance. Pardon a personal reference, for men only theorize when they go beyond their personal experience. In delivering addresses on other subjects, I have been singularly free from embarrassment, but I never stand up to preach without trembling. It is not

stagefright, for perhaps I esteem too slightly the judgment of men and women, whether expressed in praise or censure. But there is something about preaching which affects me even more than the approach of death. I never refuse to preach on any proper occasion when invited I love to preach. I was not driven into the ministry. I never fled from God's message, like Jonah. I never hide behind modest apologies, but I never in my life stood up to preach except once-which exception I profoundly regret - without first isolating myself from all human company, even the dearest, and prostrating myself in spirit before the dread and awful God, imploring Him, in deepest humility, to bless me that one time. Perhaps I am wrong. I would not judge harshly, but I cannot rid myself of the conviction that a man who can lightly, who can arrogantly, who can with, seeming effrontery of manner, get up in the pulpit, get up unstaggered with the weight of responsibility resting on him, get up as an ambassador for God, as if God was his ambassador, is disqualified for this holy office. Just think of it seriously. Eternal interests hinge on every sermon. Every sentence may be freighted with eternal weal or woe. Every word may be the savor of life unto life or of death unto death. Would any one of deep moral sense deliver idly or lightly even a political oration if every word uttered might be a winged bullet of death, or a message of reprieve from a death sentence? What must be his moral character, what the turpitude of his nature, if he was more concerned to display his wit or logic or eloquence than to measure the effect of his speech 'on human suffering or joy! But can such trifling, however selfish, compare with his, who, standing up for God in matters which cost the life of Christ and engaged the attention of the three worlds men, angels and devils-who stands up as Heaven's agent to dispense terms of life and conditions of pardon, or to denounce eternal judgments, and there poses as a wit or attitudinizes as a rhetorician, or plays the actor, as if the whole service were a theatrical display and heaven and hell were but scenic paintings to accentuate his dramatic talent! Therefore, the impression never leaves me that no irreverent man should ever dare preach. I do not care how much he knows, nor how well he can declaim, nor how many his admirers. I shudder-cold chills of apprehension creep over me when I hear him. Is it the office of a mountebank? Is it the vocation of a circus clown? Is it the lifework of a privileged jester? Oh, the agony of Paul's question: "Who is sufficient for these things?"! Oh, the richness of his experience: "I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"! If one of you were-commissioned to give directions of safety to a crowd of men, women and children standing on a quivering sandbank - encircled by an ever-rising flood, which moment by moment encroached on the narrow space where they stood, and your word meant life or death to every strong man, to every loving woman, to every clinging child, would you, could you-how could you, standing on a safe shore, speak those words in the carefully practiced declamation of a rhetorician! Did you ever in your life hear of a preacher noted for habitually reaching souls, for leading thousands to Christ, who stood before a mirror and studied the postures and gesticulations with which to ornament his sermons! I submit to you, if your own interest has not slackened, if your spiritual nature has not been shocked, every time you detected art in the preacher's declamation! I would not depreciate proper culture of voice or manner, but I do believe that if you realize the importance of your work, and forget yourself in it-if the great deep of your own soul is moved upon by the Spirit of God your manner and gesticulation will take care of themselves. 2. Profound and abiding gratitude to God for putting you in the ministry will help you to magnify your office. Your heart must gratefully appreciate that you, a worm as other men-that you, not on account of your own merit-you, from among thousands naturally as good - and

perhaps better by grace-you were selected by the Divine Master for this distinguished honor; as much higher above the crowns of earth as the stars in heaven are above their reflection in a well. How can I ever forget the impression made on my heart, or get beyond its influence on my life, when I heard Doctor Broadus at Jefferson, Texas, in the Southern Baptist Convention, preach from the text: “I thank Christ Jesus, my Lord, for that he hath enabled me, putting me into the ministry”? Let thy call to preach unseal a ceaselessly flowing fountain of gratitude. Rejoice in the honor conferred on you. You who desire to magnify your office, let me pass the question around and press its point on every heart: Are you glad you are a preacher? Are you? Are you grateful? Do you thank Him? Do you appreciate it as a priceless treasure? 3. You can magnify your office by studying; that is, being diligent, “To show yourself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” This diligence applies to every department of ministerial work, and therefore includes a profound acquaintance with all the revealed will of God in its proper order and relation. This knowledge, and the use made of it, must be “unto the approval of God,” and not of man. But how can a man magnify his office who is too lazy to study that Word which it is his business to preach who lives year after year in ignorance of the very rudiments of Bible-teaching who has not studied that sacred library, book by book, and chapter by chapter? I refer not so much to mere mental study as to heart study. I mean such study as places the heart against every Bible doctrine, and prays: “Lord God, filtrate into my heart the very essence of this doctrine let me receive into my soul experimentally just what is the mind of the Spirit; let me so assimilate it as food that it will be a part of my being; let me not only know it but be nourished by it.” I knew a young preacher who bade fair, in his youth to eclipse all competitors. Endowed with a wonderful fluency of speech, captivating address, a vast amount of magnetism, as a boy preacher he so captured his admiring crowd that he began to imagine he “had the world in a sling.” Much concerned about the permanency of his usefulness, I paid him a special visit and said “My boy, you have no books. I never see you studying the Bible. You are ignorant of the great body of its teachings. You seem not to understand it as a system of truth, fitly correlated in all its parts. You preach without investigation, on such striking passages here and there as in the English version impress you by their sound. What are you going to do after a while? You will soon use up this emotional power on which you rely. You go around as an evangelist, preaching over and over the same old sermons, using the same old illustrations, because your audiences are different. But have you considered this: That these sermons and illustrations by frequent use will become tame to you! Their lack of freshness will kill your own interest in them. They will lose the good taste, even in your own mouth. Then they will have no power over the people. You “are fast approaching shipwreck as a useful preacher. Your doom is to join the crowd of soreheads and growlers who complain that they are not appreciated, unless you study, study, study! If you like, I will make out -for you. a list of books, with some suggestions as’ to their use, and if you are not able to buy them I will see that you get them.” Perhaps you are curious to know the result. Well, he did not appreciate my proffered counsel or help. He seemed to think that I was jealous of his power and wanted to handicap him. If he ever studied, I never heard of it. He did, join the growlers. He never stays longer than tit years with any church, because in that time he tells all he knows and some things he doesn’t know. The rose color and glamour of a new field of labor, where he can use the old material, entices him away. He criticizes the management of Boards and denominational enterprises, and talks much of “rings and bosses and favorites,” and complains that the oldfashioned gospel is superseded by new-fangled notions. My brother, if you would magnify your

office, make the Word of God your life-study. Let down your buckets into the wells of salvation; lengthen your cords and let them down deep, and draw up the water fresh and sparkling every day, and give it out freely to your thirsty congregations. Burn all your written sermons that you carry around in your valise. Don't you know that when you keep on gnawing the same sermons they become like what a wolf leaves of a once juicy antelope dry bones? An unchanged sermon never suits two congregations. Conditions vary. Be fresh. Be flexible. Learn proper adjustments. Study the needs of the people before you, and preach from a full heart that within that very hour has sought the Spirit's guidance as to the theme and the Spirit's power as to utterance. 4. You can magnify your office by giving yourself wholly to it. No man should give himself wholly to a work that is too scant in character and too small in volume to call out and employ all his reserve force, and to develop to their full capacity every faculty of his being. But in the ministry God has committed to a man an office as high as heaven, as deep as hell, as broad as space. There is a broad margin for all his powers. There is room enough for all possible development in all directions. Let me again refer to myself. When I was converted I was making two thousand five hundred dollars a year -more than I have ever received since. I was ambitious of distinction and promotion. I had luxurious tastes and a wonderful appreciation of conveniences. Now, to abandon all this pride, ambition and prospect of luxury, to come down to a few hundreds a year, grudgingly given, was very grinding to my sensitiveness. But the crisis was one for solution. I determined never to be burdened with its solution but once. Without a dollar in my pocket or in sight; with a wife, baby and feather bed as the sum total of earthly possessions, I settled that question once for all. I made a solemn covenant with God, that while I lived I would never have any other business or profession or calling than to preach the gospel to give myself wholly to that, "sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish," to turn back to any other, NEVER, NEVER, NEVER, FOREVER. I learned to see that it was a small matter if I did die. I remembered the Master's words: "He that loseth his life for my sake, and the Gospel's, shall find it; and he that findeth his life shall lose it." Indeed, it might be the best for me to die. It might be the best that I should starve to death. I didn't know. Who can tell? But I was certain that whether I starved or fattened it was my duty to preach the gospel. My brother, take home to thyself the charge of Paul to Timothy: "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate on these things; give thyself wholly to them." How is it you can undertake so many lifeworks? I call upon you to interpret this Scripture: "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of life." Is it addressed to a preacher? You cannot deny it. Is it not directly in connection with the charge to Timothy to "commit to faithful men, who shall be able to instruct others also" the things which he had heard and learned? You cannot deny it. Does it not fairly apply to preachers of today? You cannot deny it: Then will you answer candidly to your own heart and to God: Are you so entangled? Does the entanglement help you as a preacher! Are you content to remain so! Not long ago I said to a beautiful and brilliant wife that her husband had descended when he left the pulpit to be just a governor. Magnify this office above every other office. If it is an anti-climax to stoop from Mont Blanc to a molehill, how much more for a preacher to vacate an office higher than that of field-marshal, president or king, to seek a subordinate position in politics or commerce. The lustre of all the diamonds in the diadems of kingly crowns pales before God's promised reward to the minister: "They that be wise shall shine as the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever." You can magnify this office by regarding God's interests, solemnly committed to you, as transcendently above place

and congregation and world. This is a hard saying. I know it by experience. How seductive the temptation to a preacher to yield to selfish considerations as to where he shall preach and what he shall preach! The preacher is included in the “mankind” so graphically pictured by Robert Burns: Ouch! Mankind is unco’ weak, And little to be trusted, If self the wavering balance touch, Tis rarely right adjusted. And how most shameful of all the weakness when he gets in front of the Cross and hides it from the people to show off himself! Some years ago I invited a minister to preach for me the following Sunday. He came with a valise full of written sermons on various sensational topics. He read over to me about a dozen of them who can doubt my patience in view of it! and asked me, the pastor of the flock, which one would make the most favorable impression for him on my congregation. I turned on him in scorn and said: “That matter is one of supreme indifference to my people. I wanted you to so preach from an humble, full and loving heart of our Divine Redeemer as to make a favorable impression for Him, but as no man can preach Jesus when self fills his vision, I withdraw my invitation for you to occupy my pulpit.” He did not preach for me then, nor has he since. And I am glad he is out of Texas and out of the Baptist denomination. At another time I heard one of our greatest Texas ministers preach a sermon of marked simplicity, of the sweetest humility, and of tremendous power. And as it was on a topic peculiarly suited to the needs of my own congregation, I urged him to come and preach it for us. We needed it just then. I knew it would do us good. Well, he came, but when he looked out over the upturned faces, when he saw among many prominent men a host of university students, he concluded that the sermon I asked him to preach was much too homely for the occasion, and without consulting me, delivered instead one of his early sophomore sermons. Oh, it was full of stardust and diamond-lustre and rhetorical sheen, excusable, perhaps, in an inexperienced boy, but simply ridiculous from him on that grand occasion. It was the most mortifying failure of his life. The people were sorely disgusted and disappointed. They insisted that I didn’t know who could preach, and suggested to the to leave such matters to the deacons. The hungry who came for bread had to content themselves with a bouquet of artificial flowers. The sad-hearted who came for consolation were treated to a display of literary fireworks, and the lost who were seeking a Saviour’s face found only a word-painter. But more than all others was he hurt by it. It seemed to crush him to the earth and grind him to powder. Being a good man, his penitence was swift and profound. He spent the afternoon in tears and prayer. At night he preached a sermon that it seemed would melt a stone, but alas! the audience of the morning was not there to hear him. Nor was he ever afterward able to get out much of a congregation in that place. The temptation sometimes comes in another form, wafted on the seductive breath of flattery. People “with itching ears,” who cannot endure sound doctrine and holy living, will come with honeyed words about his “broadness” and “liberality.” “He is no moss-back,” no “straight-jacket.” “He belongs to higher culture and criticism.” Ah, me! if the preacher drinks once of this intoxicating champagne, you may count the days till he hearts the gospel as a squirrel hearts an acorn, leaving only a shattered shell, without even a germ of life. It sometimes comes in the growls of his congregation. “He presses some things too much.” “He is crazy on the subject of missions.” “He urges too many collections.” “He has too much zeal.” Woe to him and to his people if he heed the growling! It sometimes comes in the clamor for short, soothing and soporific sermons, about fifteen minutes long. Let me tell you of a case: In a city once, I went to hear a sermon. Preachers get hungry to hear others preach. I was oppressed in spirit and gravely solicitous about a great matter. I wanted my faith strengthened. Quietly taking my seat, I listened. The rendition of the music, confined exclusively to the choir, was very artistic, I suppose. I held

myself in reserve for the sermon. That, I took it for granted, would have body to it. The preacher rose, at last, with his sermon in his hand. I looked at it. It was a neat essay, on note-paper, giltedged, and perfumed, I verily believe. I know it was tied with a delicately shaded ribbon, and he gracefully read the dainty document through in just fifteen minutes; and that seemed to me too much for it. My sensations were never paralleled except once when, on a moonlight night, I stepped confidently upon what I supposed was a plank, and found it a sluice of muddy water fully knee-deep. Some one asked me what I thought about the sermon. Perhaps my disappointment made me say: “Well, I’ve figured it out, and if there is no mistake in my calculation, it would take eight hundred and seventy nine thousand, three hundred and sixteen years for five hundred seventy-eight thousand, three hundred and fourteen such sermons to reach one soul, and then they would make no more impression on it than a cloud of thistledown blown by human breath against the granite face of Mont Blanc. I think it might safely pass through Texas from Sabine Pass to El Paso, and no Baptist, if all the General Convention were out hunting for a sermon, would fire a shot at it.” But usually the preacher fails most in loyalty to God’s interests, both local and general, when fears about the payment of his own salary, and cowardly deference to local pressure induce him to isolate his church from cooperation with sister churches in general denominational enterprises, when he shuts off from his people that information of general affairs and those appeals which are necessary to education and intelligent co-operation. The church thus isolated becomes narrow and selfish in policy to a degree that is destructive of its own spirituality and prosperity. God’s cause is one, whether in town or in country, at home or abroad. The city churches should never fail to be represented in the district Associations. They should bind the country churches to them with indissoluble bonds of fraternity and reciprocity. It is weakness to yield to the selfish cry: “Too many collections, too many agents.” It is easy to be silent when he should cry aloud and spare not. But his tower of strength is honeycombed in its foundation when he allows a perverted sensitiveness in the church or the world to put a padlock on his lips. Let me emphasize a sentence: In the general denominational enterprises, everything depends on the preachers. They are the bishops who direct and oversee the labors of the churches. If they are silent, the churches will be silent. If you ever make a canvass for a general denominational interest, as I have done, you will know that as is the preacher, so is the church. You will find, whether you canvass for home, foreign or Sunday school missions, or education or orphanage, that your greatest obstacle is preachers, and your greatest help preachers. How can a stranger, who respects the sanctity of the pastoral office, do anything to advantage in a sovereign Baptist church if the pastor is even apathetic, much less adverse? I say now to you all, every one of you, charged with a general work by the State Convention or the Southern Baptist Convention, that where the local preacher loves your work and honors you in your devotion to it, where he prayerfully, lovingly, tenderly, and with all his might, supports you, there you will succeed. Not elsewere to any great extent. If he leaves out the interest you represent, the church will let him leave it out. There is a spiritual sensitiveness that has keener and swifter perception than intuition, which informs every agent of a general work whether the preacher is for him or against him. I repeat, everything depends on the preachers, even quarrels and divisions. When was there ever a division of a church or Association or Convention, and a preacher not in it? Who knows of even one! Oh, if God’s interests be not esteemed by the preacher above his own selfishness or cowardice, above the flattery or growling of the church, above the praise or censure of the world, how can the man magnify his office? How vividly do I recall the crisis of my own pastoral life on

this very point, when called to the responsible charge of Waco Church, twenty-two years ago! I greatly distrusted my fitness for the important position. I was young and inexperienced. The church had great and wise men in it. But fortunately I remembered that God was greater and wiser than all; that my responsibility to Him was supreme. I made up my mind fully, once for all. I told the brethren that perhaps they had made a mistake. Time would show; that I had nothing to say about my own salary then or afterward. They must care for that. That my duty was to preach and teach the necessity of coming up to a high mark on every local and every denominational work. That I would do this at all hazards. That the cord which bound us as pastor and people should be a rope of sand when they wanted it broken, but a cable as long as they desired it to hold. That the hazard of loosing my pastorate should not be regarded as even fine dust in the balance. There is no other safe or righteous course for any pastor. Finally, you may magnify your office by continually renewing your consecration. When you enter this office, and so long as you are in it, over how much of you do you consent that God should write His name and put the obligation of exclusive service? Do you say: “Lord Jesus, Thou hast put me into Thy ministry. I am but a little child. I know not how to go out or to come in. I am unworthy of so great honor. I shall surely fail if Thou art not with me. What I am to do, how I am to do it, and where I go, do Thou choose for me; only be Thou with me. It seems, Good Master, that every part of me has been washed whiter than snow in Thy cleansing blood, every part of me subject of divine grace, every part of me redeemed by Thy power and love and dying groans. But Lord Jesus, if Thou canst find any part of me that the blood has not touched, then write not Thy name on that lost part. But over every part the blood has touched, there write Thy name, whether brain, or eye, or ear, or hand, or heart, or mouth, or foot, over ALL, ALL OVER ALL, write Thy name of authority and ownership forever. Let me be Thy faithful servant in time, and thy welcome servant in eternity.” To illustrate this consecration: At the examination of a candidate for ordination I once heard a deacon ask this question: “In going into this work, have you burned the bridges behind you or only taken up the planks with a view to re-laying them in case you should want to cross back to secular affairs?” I thought it a wonderfully pertinent question that went to the heart of the matter. It is better for the preacher never to even look backward toward the place where the bridge once stood. And never let him seek to please himself as to where he shall preach. Let the Lord of the harvest determine the where as well as the what and how. Turn not a longing eye to big churches and fat salaries. Let the Master say where, whether under burning skies in Africa’s malarial jungles, or where “wolves are howling on lone Onalaska’s shore.” This consecration involves that you fully trust Him for material support and spiritual power. Be not faithless. The Master points you to the lilies and the sparrows. You are more valuable than they. He tells you that “verily you shall be clothed and you shall be fed.” Not a hair of your head shall perish. He will care for your wife and children if you trustingly serve Him. I do not say trust the brethren. That is a broken reed. But to deny that Jesus will keep His promise to you is to deny the veracity of God. Trust Him for your power. Even today I had a talk with a young brother staggering under the responsibility of presenting a great work tomorrow. His eyes were full of tears, as he said “I have no strength at all for this great service.” I laid my hand on him and said: “Let Jesus be your power, Lash yourself with God’s promises to the throne of His omnipotence, and your weakness will become strength.” I have promised to spend much of the night with him praying that the power of God and not of man may rest upon him. Brethren, there is no censoriousness in anything that I have said. Apply as much of it to me as. you will, and then I am ready to confess other, faults and weaknesses that you know not of. But is it not appalling, that

revelation of the statistical secretary: There are nine hundred and eighty-nine preachers in Texas who are not pastors, nor missionaries, nor evangelists, nor teachers, nor denominational agents, nor editors? Indeed, “we have this treasure in earthen vessels.” Oh, how earthen! When I first read of the quarrel between Paul and Barnabas, I said: “Earthen vessels.” And when preachers now quarrel, the bleeding church cries out: “Earthen! Earthen!” I could get down on my knees before God in your presence to make one yearning plea-that you make this Convention one of peace, power and brotherly love. Put relentless hands down into your hearts, and tear out by the roots everything that will not advance the interests of the Redeemer’s kingdom here in this meeting. Tear it out. It depends on you. Let every watchman blow his trumpet at the coming of the sword. Let every sentinel cry out on his post: “To arms! They came! The foe the foe!” Let every leader leap to the front of his battalion and stay to the front in every good work and work, lest there be a retreat while the mournful bugles sound a recall and the dirge of defeat be the music to which we march. I magnify my office, oh, my God, as I get nearer home. I can say more truthfully every year, “I thank God that He put me in this office”; I thank Him that He would not let me have any other; that He shut me up to this glorious work; and when I get home among the blessed on the bank of everlasting deliverance and look back toward time and all of its clouds, and sorrows, and pains, and privations, I expect to stand up and shout for joy that down there in the fog and mists, down there in the dust and in the struggle, God let me be a preacher. I magnify my office in life; I magnify it in death; I magnify it in heaven; I magnify it, whether poor or rich, whether sick or well, whether strong or weak, anywhere, everywhere, among all people, in any crowd. Lord God, I am glad that I am a preacher, that I am a preacher of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ.

# S. And the Child Grew

AND THE CHILD GREW

TEXT: And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him… And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men. - Luke 2:40-52. This one paragraph covers at least twenty-eight years of our Lord's life, and maybe thirty. He began to be about thirty years old when he was baptized. His ministry at the outside calculation lasted between three and four years. As he was declared to be an infant on his return from Egypt, this paragraph of thirteen verses covers all the period of time from his infancy until he was thirty years old, upon which I wish to remark first, the reticence of the Bible. How prurient is human curiosity, how laboriously and even shamefully have men tried to fill up this gap of twenty-eight years with some additional accounts of the childhood of Jesus Christ! The fathers of the church, not indeed the very early fathers, but those of the centuries in which the Christian religion had greatly degenerated, invented histories of the childhood and infancy of Jesus. They are not only manifest forgeries, but ridiculously spurious. Some of them put modesty to blush, and their utter discordance in spirit, style and matter with the inspired Word of God is apparent on every page. When a great man rises up and fills the vision of the people, the reporters begin to look back into his childhood to see what promise there was then of the greatness to which he has attained, and the obscurity that rested over his youthful years is penetrated at every point by a sensational curiosity, in order to drag from the silence and mistiness of past years any little incident of his cradle or schoolboy days that can be paraded as a prophecy of that to which he has attained, and precisely the same method was adopted in the case of Jesus and with about like results. A vast deal of what is genuinely apocryphal can be found in the subsequent histories of the childhood of great men and women. The reticence of the Bible upon this subject draws and maintains a clear and sharp distinction between a God-inspired record and a human record. Next I would have you note the clear teaching of this lesson on the humanity of Jesus Christ as manifested in his development: "The child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom." "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature." In other words, his humanity was not a mere appearance. It was an actual humanity. His mind and body as a child were susceptible of the same development as the minds and bodies of children of the present day, or of any period of the world's history. Very clearly and necessarily does the pure humanity of Jesus Christ appear, so that it may never be forgotten. In thinking about Him as the Messiah, and in dwelling upon that divinity whose wisdom is incapable of addition or diminution, we must not forget that on the score of his humanity there was the same necessity for development in him as in any other child. And it is this very fact that suggests the great lesson today to which your attention has been called. In the case of every child there is a crucial period. It came to Jesus when he was twelve years old. According to the Jewish interpretation of the Law of Moses, this was the turning period in a boy's life. Every male inhabitant was required at this age to go up to Jerusalem to attend the three great annual feasts. The women were not compelled to go. The girls were never compelled to go, but just as soon as a boy reached the age of twelve the interpreter of the Law said to him, "You must go up to Jerusalem. You have

now reached that age when the law must be your life-study. You now become a son of the law. You must learn the significance of the great feasts and the import of the sacrifices," and that is why this visit is recorded. As the Law required his circumcision on the eighth day, his presentation in the Temple as a first-born male on the fortieth day (Leviticus 12:2-6) and his attendance on the annual feasts in his twelfth year, according to the Jewish customs, so this much of his child-life is recorded. Nothing to gratify curiosity, nothing to minister to superstition, but everything to show his complete obedience to every commandment of God. Now this period of twelve years of age leads me to present a theme, as I take it, of wonderful importance. I hear expressions quite frequently to this effect: "Receive no child into the church. They are too inexperienced in life's trials. They are incapable of understanding what it means to join the church." I am not satisfied with the logic of this undue caution nor with its practical effects. It seems to me that it can be shown that what oftentimes happens in the after life of children who early unite with the church need never happen, and that it may safely be attributed to other causes than early church connection. As I understand it, the argument is about this: As at an early period in life the trials of later years cannot be comprehended because of immaturity of mind, nor their temptations realized in the absence of experience, a child who unites with the church will be sure in later years to question the fact of his conversion, when experimentally subject to the attractions of pleasure, wealth and ambition. It is argued that one should wait until these tremendous temptations have had full sway so that it cannot be determined safely just where one is ultimately to be placed with reference to them. I desire to respectfully submit that this position is as untenable as it is plausible. If the argument holds good against a child professing faith in Jesus Christ, it is just as potent at any subsequent period of life from the simple fact that life has not one fixed period of trial, but many, and each succeeding period is a new world to its predecessor. The experience of a married life opens up as wide and unknown territory to a collegian as college days open up to a high school student or as the academy reveals to the lower grades. So parental obligations, the business struggle for existence, the duties of citizenship, the strife of politics present a new world to the happy bridegroom and the blushing bride. That is, if there are difficulties in young manhood and young womanhood that cannot be anticipated by a child ten years old; and if these things which cannot be anticipated are sufficient reasons for not then professing Christianity, then the argument would hold good that there is an equally undiscovered country before the young man and the young woman, and then before the married couple, and then before the business man, and finally after you become thirty-five or forty years old, and even older, there is a dark stretch of country ahead of you as thoroughly unknown to your experience as any past period, and that is the dispensation of God's afflictions. You cannot anticipate it. When it comes, even though you may be fifty, sixty, or seventy years old, you are unprepared to see the wife die, the son die, the daughter die, friends die, acquaintances pass away, to feel the solitude and isolation of being left alone when those who commenced life's journey with you have all gone and to see that the young generation knows nothing about you and cares nothing about you. When you come to any of these you will find the same difficulty of adjustment that embarrassed the ten-year-old child when confronted with the exigencies of young manhood and young womanhood. I say then that if the argument is worth anything it is just as much against avowing and openly professing your faith in Christ at one period as at another. Indeed, the age cuts no figure in the case. Whether the professor is twelve years old or fifty, the only question for consideration is this: Is the profession of faith credible? The main thing I desire to show today is that this lesson in the life of our Lord suggests how one may be well

enough prepared for any new experience of life, whatever it may be, and so well prepared for it when it comes that it need not shake the religious foundation upon which your heart's hopes have rested, and that the peculiar difficulties of each period may, by the power of God, be made valuable to your training and development rather than to your discomfiture. The secret may be told in one sentence: With physical and mental development there should be a corresponding spiritual development. Let us read the text and see: "And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him…. And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature." He not only advanced in stature and intellect, but he advanced in spiritual wisdom. He not only advanced in the favor of men, but he advanced in the favor of God. And where there is this corresponding development of the inner man, then there is nothing to be apprehended from any of the new experiences which come from enlargement of physical stature, or from expansion of mental powers, or from the trials of life's succeeding periods. But no matter how old you are, if there has not been a corresponding enlargement of your spiritual nature, you will be just as helpless to meet the exigencies of your situation as the child may be who, joining the church at ten years of age, is shaken in his faith by the temptations of youth and by the trials of manhood. I say that there is no exemption on account of age as to this, and if the child who is early converted shall be so trained as that the spiritual nature shall enlarge in proportion as the physical and mental nature enlarges, then the fact of early conversion will be largely to his advantage. Instead of being a disadvantage it will be a positive help; and more readily than the one who was converted later in life will he be prepared for life's exigencies, of whatever nature. The Apostle John expresses the true thought when he writes to Gaius, "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper, and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." That is, make as much money as you please. I wish you may make a great deal of it, and have all the health possible. Only, covet neither wealth nor health beyond soul prosperity. Keep your soul on top. That is, if the prosperity of our soul keeps pace with our making of money and with our healthfulness of body and of mind, there is no harm done. It is the law of God that the whole man should be developed in due relation and proportion, and the trouble comes, not from the fact that one was converted and joined the church early, but from a neglect of the inner man. That is the trouble. It becomes necessary to look at this matter somewhat in its detail, in order to see its force. Unquestionably, if the mind of a boy in the public school or in the college is developed more than his soul is developed, then the intellectual predominates over the spiritual. Jesus didn't grow that way. He waxed in physical and mental stature as he increased in spiritual wisdom. But if the conditions under which young professors of religion receive their education are such that the development of the soul is neglected while the mind is cultivated, they will naturally in later years question their conversion. Mental development is a wonderful thing. The mind begins to analyze, it gradually acquires power to examine with thoughtfulness into the most abstruse problems of mathematics.; it enlarges its historical horizon and increases its range of information. It acquaints itself with manners and customs of the different ages and different peoples of the world. And with that intellectual increase, unless there be a co-equal enlargement of the inner man, there comes conceit and pride and that soul is subject to temptation on that ground. In the same way, if a young man, being educated so far as schools accomplish that work for him, goes out into the business of life, whatever that may be-let us suppose that he concludes to be a professional soldier or sailor-and when he has finished his collegiate course and then his course in his special profession at West Point or at Annapolis, there comes into his young heart something entirely new, an experience he has never felt before. There

rises an ambition to excel in his profession. If he be a sailor, feeling the authority conferred upon him as an officer of the United States, and making himself acquainted with the difficult problems of mathematics as they apply to navigation and gunnery and the tremendous power that comes from the mechanical inventions that bear upon armor and upon arms, upon projectiles and explosives, the stirrings of a mighty ambition are in him and he already sees the insignia of an admiral on his shoulder. Now I maintain that such ambition is as new a thing to him and as dangerous as the trials of young maidenhood or young manhood are to the one who joins the church at ten years of age. He is just as liable under these new conditions to make shipwreck of a profession avowed at sixteen as of one avowed at twelve. Only one thing is an effective safeguard a corresponding enlargement of his spiritual nature. Has it kept pace with his intellectual development? Has it grown strong enough to meet the stirrings of ambition in his heart? Is it able to grapple with those inordinate desires after power that are so seductive in their nature to the young heart, and can it place them in subordination to the higher nature? Now I have received this past week a letter that suggested this theme, which by a strange coincidence happens to be the Sunday school lesson today. The letter is from a young member of this church, one who joined the church early, one, who in his youth, while many faltered or fell by the wayside, remained stedfast in his Christian profession, who in all the college period was as steady in his loyalty to Christ as the magnet to the pole; who even passed the period of an early married life still as unshaken as the everlasting rock; but who now writes me that there has come upon him the great crisis of his life. He has met for the first time consciously the temptation of an inordinate ambition, and says, “Pray for me. Send me my church letter. Let me join here. I must not drift away from Christ.” In that letter is shown the clearest perception of the true relation of the inner and outer man that I have seen in twenty years of observation and reading. He has fully recognized what it will mean to him if ambition shall dominate; if even a desire to excel in an honorable profession shall so fill his vision and absorb his attention and divert and distract his mind as that when night comes he shall forget to pray, so he writes: “I need to be in touch with the spiritual influences that will keep me true to my Lord and Saviour.” The attraction of wealth had never touched him. The attraction of pleasure had been of no more power against his Christian armor than were Robin Hood’s arrows against De Bracy’s coat of mail at the storming of Frontde-Boeuf’s castle in Scott’s Ivanhoe. But here ambition comes, that mounting and vaulting devil, and he has met an enemy. Your case may be quite different. You are perhaps just a girl, say of ten years of age, and having learned to love and trust your Saviour, you come with the tears of joy in your eyes and say, “Let me follow my Saviour.” Perhaps the older brethren, knowing that you have not touched that awful boundary which tries a woman’s soul, may shake their heads and say, “you had better wait.” I say, “Don’t wait!” None would say wait if you were sixteen. But beyond sixteen is that maelstrom called society, which may be a greater foe to grace in your case than ambition to a lieutenant in the navy. The seductiveness of its distinctions, its ceaseless rounds and imperious exactions, its all-absorbing worldly-mindedness have turned more religious professions awry among women than ambition has among men. Our lesson from the life of our Lord furnishes the only remedy. Always grow in the inner man as you grow in the outer. There may be here today some Christian boy, whose near future holds a startling temptation, to-wit: The rapidity with which a certain financial venture shall pay a tremendous per cent on the principal invested. Midas had never before touched him with the magic wand of gold. The Elysium of Croesus had been veiled from his sight up to that time. But when an investment of $200 suddenly realizes $2,000, what a glitter the gold takes on, what a sheen the silver, what a

felicitous rustling of the crisp bank notes; how it does make his chest enlarge to feel his heart beat against a big bank account in the book in his breast pocket! And it all at once comes to him with a rower never dreamed of before: “I will be a king on the exchange. I will rule the market.” And a voice that he never heard before is echoing in his heart like the cry of the horse leech’s daughter: “Give, give, give me more, more and yet more!” “And when this craving lust wants more I will take my brain’s brightest thought and give that. I will take my spare moments that I once gave to friendly and pleasant converse with my family and give that. I will take the time that should have been devoted to the instruction of my children and give that. I will even rub off the glow and down of the sweet peach of love and give that. I will coin all the affection of natural relations into money and give that. I will even take my hitherto priceless honor and give that. I will go with no unshrinking foot, as in the past, and stand upon the boundary line of moral questions as to the methods of money-making, but I will only ask one question: Can I do it without being caught? Can I do this and be within the margin of man’s law?” Is not this a young miser on his way to a miser’s doom? If indeed he be a child of God, what is to keep him from the downfall of usefulness? That downfall has not been hastened, but it has been retarded by an early profession of religion. If his life as a Christian is wrecked in its usefulness, it is not because he joined the church when young, but because he has not waxed in spiritual wisdom as he developed in other directions. That is the trouble. Now to bring this matter to a close, I want to put one or two matters very briefly but very clearly before you, that will show you how to guard successfully against the new temptations that arise in the new experiences of life, whatever they may be. We get at these guards by studying the life of Jesus. Listen at His expression: “My Father!” He was not talking about Joseph. “My Father!” What then is the first guard? The guard of true relationship to God. Oh, if the Holy Spirit has ever taught your stammering tongue and trembling lips to say, “Abba, Father”; if that holy and indissoluble spiritual relation is established between your orphaned and outcast soul and the God of Heaven, that is the first guard, the guard of true and genuine relationship to God. Well, what next? The guard of a religious mission “Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?” Now, if though a child of God you have never yourself found out and no one has ever taught you that in connection with that religious relation there is also a religious mission, then there is where your trouble will commence. How was Jesus guarded? Always before Him, as one view which no cloud could shut out from His sight, was this thought: “I have a religious mission in this world. That is why I am here. I came for that. More, ten thousand times more, than any other mission is the mission to glorify God while I live here in this life. ‘Father, Father, I have glorified thee. I came to glorify thee.’” It is to have a religious mission, to feel that the light in your soul, the light of conversion, if it is no brighter than a wax taper, has a mission, that it is the design of the God who kindled its quenchless flame, and though it be only a lowly light, and though it shine only on some low coast point, to yet keep it burning and let it shine, that some poor shipwrecked sailor seeing it may take heart again-that is the glory of a Christian mission. Oh, how defenseless, how like an unwalled city, is that Christian who has never felt that he has a religious mission, who has supposed that the transaction ended by his simply professing religion and joining the church! The Lord have mercy on your misguided soul! How shall you be able to stand when the enemies come in on you like a flood; when the siren of pleasure shall beckon, when the hope of wealth shall gild the skies of your future, when the minarets and turrets of successful ambition’s gorgeous air-castles flash before the sight of your eye? What shall guard your soul if you do not feel that you have a religious mission? Well, what is the next point? With that mission comes the sanctity of its

obligation, embodied in the word, “duty.” “Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?” Only twelve years old, but there is an obligation on me, though just that old. “I must,” and we hear the same “I must” later on in life when He felt the shadows of the dark conflict of crucifixion coming on Him, and He cried out in the same voice: “I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.” A ship may indeed be well built, and master workmen may have laid its keel and stepped its masts, and rigged it with ropes and shrouds, and it may have been cargoed with the choicest luxuries of commerce, but if there be no compass of duty to point out the true course yonder, whither, ah! whither will she drift or drive? There must be a port of destination. Though the sun shine not, though the storms gather, keep your helm steady; and though foes endeavor to cross your path and shift you into lateral seas, duty points with an inflexible finger to your port, “There, there.” I do wish that instead of talking about the folly of avowing your profession of religion, just as soon as you have any to profess, you would take to your heart the obligation that grows out of that mission, “I must, I must. Do not try to beguile me to sleep on flowery beds of ease. Do not invite me to step over the stile because the King’s highway is difficult, and on that other path there is shade and ease. I must keep this narrow way, and I will not turn aside lest I get into Doubting Castle and Giant Despair’s cold grip crush out of my heart the warm love of my first espousal to Jesus.” What next? You must not only feel all the import of the word “duty,” but this word, “food.” When Jesus so stedfastly pursued His way in accordance with His mission and governed by His duty to fulfil that mission, the disciples could not understand how He could hold out physically. They went off to buy provisions and were startled when they came back to find that Jesus was not hungry. Why? He had feasted: “I have meat to eat that ye know not of. It is my meat and drink to do the will of my Father that is in heaven.” It is not only “I must,” but obedience is my nourishment. From it I get my strength. It is my soul’s nutrition. And if I should even lose sight of “must” I cannot forget hunger, soul-hunger. The soul of a truly converted man or woman hungers to do the will of God, and is fed by doing the will of God. Not only food, but more. Life, according to God’s strange constitution of our being, cannot altogether be made up of mission and duty and food. We are strangely constructed with reference to happiness. We want to be happy. It is sweet and pleasant to be happy. The soul cannot uphold itself when only tears and sadness constitute its portion. There must be joy; there must be delight; there must be the thrilling sensation, the heart leaping, the exultation of joy. Well, what is said about Jesus? “I delight to do thy will, O God!” This is not “I must.” This is not “my mission,” but a richer, sweeter thought. It is more than my duty. It is my everlasting joy to serve God. I admit there is a passing fragrance in the flower; that there is an evanescent glory in the rainbow, which vanishes in the storm. I admit that there is some joy, some pleasure in wearing the crown which ambition offers, or in reaping the rewards which fashion bestows on her votaries, but I do deny in the name of the Holy One, that these joys are comparable to the delight that comes to the soul in the service of God. I delight to study thy Book. I delight to walk in the path that has been impressed with the print of the feet of Jesus. I delight, as I go along, to merge and harmonize my experience with the worthies of old-patriarchs, evangelists and martyrs-and as I get nearer home my joy finds its wings enlarging and expanding. There is more power in the pinion and wider sweep in its beat. It can soar higher and sustain itself longer, until like the enraptured eagle who leaves his eyrie on the summit of the loftiest mountain and soars to the sun, at last a dim speck, gilded with the rays of light that wrap him about, he vanishes in a blaze of glory. So they that wait often on the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up as on eagle’s wings; they shall run and not faint; and as each victory

is won and each height attained, and hope ever beckoning, says, “Higher, higher!” from each eminence accomplished, the glad soul looks back and says, “I rejoice. I am happy. I delight. I delight to do thy will, O God!” Sunday school of the First Baptist Church, you had this lesson today of the childhood of Christ. Oh, how I have prayed in the beginning of this new year, that its great lesson might enter your heart. Will you go away and forget the sweet thought of relationship to our Father? Will you go away and forget that every child of the Father must have a religious mission? Will you forget that with that mission comes the obligation, “I must, I must?” And that, with that obligation, performed, there comes food, your meat and drink? And with the assimilation of that spiritual food there comes joy? I delight to do thy will, O God! It makes my soul sad when I see my own children or the children of any of my brethren and sisters showing plainly that they are waxing in physical and intellectual strength out of all proportion to the increase in spiritual stature. We must not forget this lesson. Our thoughts must dwell on it. We must pray about it, and sometime in the grace of God, and by the crowning of His sweet favor, we shall, from the pinnacle of perfection in heaven, look back over the lowlying ground of this warfare, and oh, how much brighter will become heaven’s skies, and how much sweeter heaven’s songs, if we can turn to the dear Lord and say, “Master, we never would have been here, but we kept right in thy path.” His track I see, and I’ll pursue, The narrow way till Him I view. Now, I behold the Lord in righteousness; now have I awaked in His likeness, and I am satisfied.

# S. B.H. Carroll - An Appreciation

1. B. H. CARROLL-AN APPRECIATION By His Son, REV. CHARLES C. CARROLL, D.D. Mr. President, Members of The Faculty, Fellow Students, and Visiting Friends: In expressing the usual salutations of a speaker upon this occasion I would like to have your indulgence in mentioning an unusual appreciation upon my part due to the relationship borne to the Founder of this Seminary in whose memory this day is annually observed. Because your first president was my father in the flesh, and because also, according to Paul's exegesis in 1 Corinthians 4:1-21, he had in Christ begotten me through the Gospel through spiritual travail, I would stifle every impulse of natural and spiritual affection if what I try to say here today should be in any way impersonal or should fail in any particular that last full measure of devotion due him from a doubly filial heart. But from that realm of personal and loving relationship I would jealously banish any insensate thought of saying anything transgressing the extreme bounds of delicacy and good taste, or of unworthily slipping from the decorum of biography into auto-biography. And most sincerely would I avoid the projection of any personal relationship to him as a special privilege except love into the relationships established in either the foundation of this Seminary or its progress both before and after he ceased from his labors. And above all else, while recognizing this institution and the spread of its continued activities to be in a certain sense a cenotaph to its human founder, God forbid that any impious word of mine should ever disturb his own subordination to the institution itself and its real Founder, or blur his devoted expectation that in HIM it might become an eventual part in that city with foundations whose builder and whose maker is God. It was for that cause he wanted to make here on Seminary Hill a citadel of orthodoxy. And being come as your guest, and left at liberty in the courtesy of your invitation to speak, to choose what I might say, and freely accepting all the knightly strictures of that courtesy, I still shall not hesitate to place first the co-operation of all, from the least to the most, who helped to rear this structure. In doing so I am sure I but add my willingness to his. So, if, after this restriction, under the exigencies of the hour he is most my theme, it is due to that temporary exaltation to which you yourselves have raised him. He least of all would have contended for your momentary promotion, but with its advancement his greatest wish would be for this hour to burn with some added fire to warm the iron of your resolution to carry on for Christ. And I, who all my life have coveted his approval, would like to think, if not presumptuous, that "I sat in my musing until the fire burned, and then I spake." Were I to take a text today I think it would be the Messianic summons in the fifty-first chapter of Isaiah combined with the Messianic progress in the forty-sixth Psalm: "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are: digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and to Sarah that bare you; for I called him alone, and blessed him and increased him." "There is a River, the streams whereof shall make glad the City of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High." I would not want the Rock less magnified than Daniel's prophecy of a stone mountain, less vibrant than God's voice at Sinai, less luminous than the scene of the transfiguration, less basic than Peter's exegesis of the foundation stone, less prospective than Pisgah, nor less triumphant than Paul's explanation to the Hebrews of Matthew Zion. Nor would I narrow the River to lessen the proportions of

Ezekiel's vision nor dull its clarification in John's apocalypse. Both Rock and River are part of the imagery of prophecy depicting the character and mission of Jesus Christ. It is in the relationship to Jesus that a man's life is a success or a failure. Especially is this true of a preacher's life. The summation of his life lies in his laying hold of all for which Jesus Christ laid hold of him. The mark of his success is his constant approach to that apprehension. It is hardly necessary to say that an appreciation and seizure of such a mission and purpose demands self-abnegation. It is only when we are dead and our lives are hid in Christ Jesus that we are most alive as preachers. And because I would like to think my being here today is a part of preaching and because I do think a part of preaching is to point to Jesus, as lifted up, drawing all men unto Him, I would like to preach Jesus unto all the nations of men today, seething and striving as they are, as their real desire. National strifes are peculiarly an exhibition of, not so much racial differences, as a common racial covetousness. The essential facts of their warrings are not new. The incitation to their mutual enmity is still the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, and to some of us at least, there still remains the fixed belief in the existence of that Satan under whose methodizations the principalities and powers of world wickedness are arrayed against the testimony of the Son of God and His messengers of Divine love; that Serpent of old, the Slanderer, who is king over all the sons of pride and whose deceptions not only carry the peoples away under the political guidance of idol shepherds, but seduce ecclesiasticisms to a harlotry whose path leads down to death and whose feet take hold on hell; that the accentuation against the Jews has been recently more acute in particular nations and more general in many; that governments have made repudiation of the Bible a way of governmental insistences as to the direction of the lives of their citizenry; that religious intolerance and even persecution begin to find expression in the general political unrest; that the surrender of individualism, the unconditional surrender of individualism, has been demanded everywhere as the foundation of new orders of national existence — all combine to make a world condition that becomes a huger interrogation for the future than the late world war. Everywhere there are voices until the earth has become a tower of Babel, and all clamorous in a world colluctation of sound. The issues are not new but they are more vocal, more multitudinously vociferous. Nor is the answer new. Jesus sat on the Mount of Olives and outlined in prophecy the world condition projected till the end of time, and in His anastrophe at Jerusalem in the Person of the Holy Spirit proclaimed with tongues of fire Himself the gospel for every man's soul. And Pentecost still pleads, and will until God closes the door to eternal life, that every man hear in his own tongue in which he was born, God speaking to him through His Son. And because, as a young man, my father, already embittered, disillusioned, impoverished and on crutches, from an unhealed wound, received at the battle of Mansfield, La., found, after the Civil War, at a Methodist camp meeting, faith to receive Jesus Christ as a personal Lord and Redeemer, he accepted with the gift of God, the Bible as a revelation from God, of God, worded to and by men officially set apart by the Holy Spirit and under His direction into a completed book, the Scriptures of which cannot be broken, as an expression of His wisdom, will, purpose and plan for man and the universe. Because he had found it a living word, able to make him personally wise unto salvation, and because with his sense of redemption and regeneration there had come a conviction that God had chosen him to be a preacher, he dedicated himself to the study and promulgation of the Scriptures. His regeneration not only bound him irrevocably into the household of God in a sonship that was his increasing delight to explore and magnify, but it established his own individual place and purpose in the kingdom of God as a child of the King. There was a joyousness about his

preaching. His regeneration carried with it a revitalization of his interest in people that grew until he died. He was eager to receive from and impart to all men. He loved to preach, and as a “preacher sought to find out words of delight: and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd.” His impulsion to preach, coming as he increasingly believed, as a direct commitment from Jesus Christ, was a constant command to an active life in the ministry. In order to preach a preacher should have a vocabulary. The place to find it was in, the Bible, first, as he saw it. He never doubted but that words have a power of impact on the soul. He never questioned the words of the Bible as the messengers of the Almighty. A sermon to perform its mission must be a chariot of Christ. He believed thoroughly that God has given preaching a positive and distinct place in the affairs of men until the end of time. He saw a continuity of its office work from living men to living men in the laying on of hands by the presbytery. But the presbytery must consist of ordained preachers and the laying on of hands must be officially done by vote of the church after satisfactory examination into the candidate’s personal experience of grace, his assurance of his call to preach as from God and this corroborated by the faith of his brethren that he had been so called, and finally as to his soundness in the faith once for all delivered unto the saints. And since this examination must be doubly satisfactory, or rather triply satisfactory, for lest the candidate himself find himself by the examination unsatisfied as to his fitness or faith, or the presbytery so find him, or the church, he held the examination should take place before the whole church duly assembled, as being the sole authority on earth to defer, refuse or confirm the credentials that would send him forth as a duly authorized minister of the Gospel. And because he held the church to be an assembly of regenerated people, baptized, organized in conformity to New Testament teaching and practice, and that only, and covenanting together to hold in sacred stewardship the manifold grace of God as displayed in all the commitments from Jesus Christ to the assembly as such, and to forward them as so committed so long and so far as He commanded, he held the preaching of a minister authorized by the assembly and faithful to his trust, to be authoritative preaching. He believed it because he held to the New Testament doctrine that such an assembly was baptized by the Holy Spirit and endued with witnessing power, and so he believed in successful preaching. He believed that God in Christ through the Holy Spirit brings the individual man into a participation in the nature of Jesus enabling Jesus to tell His disciples: “Because I live ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.” And just as he believed the assembly of Jesus Christ to be the temple of the Holy Spirit, the Alter Ego of Jesus, so he believed the Holy Spirit accompanies and empowers the preached word of God and by His concomitant work makes the preached word a savor of life unto life or death unto death. The association of heaven and earth appealed to him as an essential of true preaching. The action of God in the gift of His Son was meant to operate in the human life on earth and in heaven in time, and to continue in a new heaven and a new earth in eternity. So nothing employed by Divine Love, Wisdom and Power as a means of conveying the truth, showing the way, or revealing the life, should be confused in significance. When Jesus said “I am the way, the truth and the life,” He revealed the mission of every means, every person, every organization, every agency, every memorial, every ordinance, sent forth, authenticated and established for testimony to Him. To discern the broken body of the Lord and His shed blood for the remission of sins in the memorial of the Lord’s Supper does not require a transubstantiation of the body, soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ from the ground and cooked wheat and the crushed out

fruit of the vine. Both memorial and prophecy unite in the significance of baptism as they do in the Lord's Supper and in the Sabbath-keeping that remains to the children of God. Jesus alone is the great High Priest in that He as the Lamb of God is the propitiation for sin; He as the true mercy seat is the propitiatory or altar upon whom the blood of the eternal Covenant could be offered, and He is the Priest who passed through the heavens into the Holy of Holies of God's presence once as Priest, to offer once and forever, the one offering for sin, that can and does cleanse forever all who believe on His Name. It is not the translation of bread and wine into Deity but the translation by the birth from above in regeneration, of the redeemed and cleansed soul by the precious blood of Christ, into the kingdom of the Son of God's love, and the imputation of His righteousness because of being begotten of God of an incorruptible seed, that provides the atonement. It is only after our hearts have been sprinkled with the blood by Him of an evil conscience and we have been born into the Kingdom that we should have our bodies washed in the baptism which is the figure of His burial and resurrection from the dead, He who was offered for our offenses and raised again for our justification. For if we are planted in the likeness of His death we are raised up in the likeness of His resurrection when we are baptized for the dead. My father unhesitatingly believed that baptism originated in the peculiar mission of John as the herald of the Messiah and that the act and its significance, together with his authority to administer it and the revelation of the subjects of its recipience had the direct definition of the Holy Spirit. When Jesus assumed the authority of the act and committed its perpetuity to the assembly of His own institution, John recognized both the innate and official right of Jesus in the procedure and completed the office work of his own testimony to Jesus by the recognition of the assembly as the bride of Christ and expressed his joy as fulled in the presence of Jesus as the proper. Bridegroom. And as the office of baptism is to reveal Jesus and the content of His relationship to God and man, first to the Jews by John and then to the whole race of man by the Church, neither the act, nor its significance, nor its recipiency, is subject to change. Equally so God's order in the Gospel of His Son leaves the Lord's Supper and the stewardship of its commission not subject to change. Baptism, Church organization, and the Lord's. Supper antedate the cross, the passage of the Great High Priest through the veil of His flesh and on through the heavens to the completion of His offering of blood, and His coming back, to enter the body prepared for Him in His resurrection from the dead, and neither the figure nor the memorial of His sacrificial office, nor the agency established and sent forth by Him to proclaim the power and glory of its consummation could take the place of what He did as the Savior of men. My father believed that what was done to Jesus at Golgotha by men, by angels, by God Himself, and what He did in connection therewith, and the result of all the action involved, constitutes the supreme expression of God's love of the world an expression that was necessary if the world through Him should be saved. I realize this hour has been more particularly set apart to a contemplation of the closing years of my father's ministry, which might best be studied in the light of this city set like Jerusalem of old, upon a hill, and in the practical completion of the Interpretation of the English Bible for which he expressed in his last will and testament his intention of their formulation into a text book for the course in the English Bible. I know he had accepted the task of these two things as a personal direction of Jesus Christ of his labor in the ministry toward the completion of what Jesus wanted him to do as a preacher. One afternoon when his lecture for the day was over and I had listened to him for an hour in a deliverance of what I knew he had spent six hours that day preparing, he took me in his buggy with him and drove over and around Seminary Hill while he told me of the growth of his conviction that God wanted him to

finish his ministry with the Seminary and his Interpretation of the Bible. The idea of such a work was of long standing. He felt that it should be done and wrote to Dr. John A. Broadus suggesting that he, being so eminently fitted to write such an Interpretation, should do so and incorporate it in the body of the instruction a Louisville. In reply Dr. Broadus placed the burden upon him as an expression of his own conviction. He finally came to believe that it was God's will for him to find in actual teaching the development of the Interpretation of the Bible. And he wanted a Bible Department in Baylor University to be the channel of his instruction associated with all that the education of preachers might require, and the department itself in due articulation an co-ordination with the rest of the University departments. It is not my province today to discuss the final eclosion of this Seminary by tracing its history through all its pupa stage, but I do want to recall so long as I live his exposition that afternoon of what he believed to be the Holy Spirit's office work in the production and exhibition of the Scriptures together with His residence in the individual Christian and each particular assembly and His co-ordination of their martyrdom into the co-operation which under His guidance and power would in the appointed times and seasons accomplish the purpose of God in Christ Jesus. Counting one phase of the Spirit's work as being the illumination of the Scriptures in an enablement of a preacher to rightly divide the word of truth and in the comparison of spiritual things with spiritual things to find the interpretation of that Holy Book for a presentment of Jesus Christ to lost men as a Savior and to redeemed men as the expansion and extension of their lives into eternal glory, my father told me that afternoon as I watched his face with the evening sun upon it, "I believe God has given me a gift of interpretation." There is a rough ashlar over a grave in a cemetery at Baltimore under which rest the ashes of Sidney Lanier and on the stone a metal marker on which is the sun displayed and the words, "I Am Lit With The Sun." And to me the very granite seems to glow with the vision and burn with the warmth of Lanier's memory of sunrise over the Marshes of Glynn, as dying he wrote his last poem in the mountains of North Carolina. And once at eventide I saw from a street in Interlaken, the Yungfrau mountain in majesty of stone and snow clothed with the golden beauty of sunset, and I can understand how the face of Jesus Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration transcended the glory of created light. To preach of Christ and the church when viewed in the light of God's revelation in the face of Jesus becomes the most important thing on earth, especially when coupled with the realization that the message of preaching has the right of eminent domain on earth until the end of time. Speech and the power of words were a constant rapture to my father. It seemed a reasonable thing to him that God in the mystery of His unity and the companionship of His Person should have planned and decreed a universe and brought it into existence by fiat establishing space in immensity and time in eternity. And if in that space veiled in the ordained darkness of genesis the waters should have gushed forth as from the womb of time and over them the Spirit of God in obedience to the Word of God Who had voiced the will of God, should have quivered until the waters became a saturate solution of the atomic dust of the world and instinct with the energy in which was the residence of God's laws of their formation and motion, and if in further continuance of His will the Voice should have called light into existence and the Spirit should have irradiated darkness to the extent of space with the diffusion of created light until the waters in the globed world became a sea mingled with fire, and if the division of the light from the darkness under the nomenclature of God became day and night, and God enumerated the progress of Deity up to that point in the creation as day one, and afterward revealed the matter to the scribes ordained to write the Scriptures, Moses, as the first scribe so ordained, could authoritatively declare that in the beginning God created the heavens

and the earth, and John as the last scribe of revelation could tell how in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and in Him were made all things that were made, and without Him there was not made one thing that was made. And the Spirit, Who in co-operation with the Son as voicing the will of the Father, completed Wisdom's house of creation with its seven pillars, and completed the Tabernacle of Redemption in raising the Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and Who witnesses with the blood and the water and regeneration can irradiate the last shadow of spiritual darkness down to the last descendant of Adam to be born into the Kingdom, and following "the roar of final fire" complete the testimony of the redeemed in the glorification of their bodies. The power of words! Man was made by the Word of God, man was redeemed by the Word of God, and the hour cometh when all that are in their graves shall hear His voice and come forth to acknowledge the justice of His words of judgment. The power of preaching! Because he believed the Scriptures cannot be broken and are assured in their heavenly mission by the judicious exercise of the Holy Spirit, ever present in their proclamation, of their content and power, "I preach," my father declared, "believing that men shall be saved by the preaching, and not merely to bear witness." He believed the entering in of God's Word gives light to the sinful heart and mind and for all who will receive the light and walk in the light while they have the light, God will take away the hearts of stone and give hearts of flesh upon which the tables of His law may be written that with the hearts they may believe unto salvation. The progress in the preached Word of God was inexpressibly beautiful to him in its irradiation of spiritual darkness. I heard him once, thirty-nine years ago, portray in preaching the spread of the gospel from Pentecost to Patmos in that period of evangelism during which the New Testament was written and with its completion the completion of the canon. I had been ordained that day, and had insisted that he preach that night instead of the newly ordained minister. As he explained how the number of witnesses increased and the churches and pastors were multiplied under the power of preaching, he was caught in the narration of it for an inexpressible moment by the splendor of God, and then told us as he spread wide his arms in awed confidence, "It was like the bursting out of stars." I had been teaching English literature and had but recently called attention of my class to the influence of Chapman's Homer on the mind of John Keats, who first looking into it had "felt like some lone watcher of the skies when a new planet swims into his ken," but never before had I seen imperishable flame so float forth in speech and cluster in galaxies of fire. It is a logical thing that the works of God in creation should corroborate the law of the Spirit of life in redemption and the whole creation should travail together in Christ, while the travail of regeneration continues, awaiting the manifestation of the sons of God. And there is a spiritual correspondence between the fire stuff of music, art, architecture and poetry and the flaming tongues of Pentecost. I saw the grave of John Keats at Rome and in spite of the pathos of his epitaph still believe that "A thing of beauty is a joy forever," and that he wrote more than upon water. My father believed genius to be a gift of grace, the recipient of which is due acknowledgment to the Giver. He wrote me once, "I am no great admirer of Walt Whitman. It is a poor return to the Father of Lights and the Giver of human faculties and powers to use these free gifts of grace against the homage due to the Giver. The infidelity which hurts is not so much the outright, blatant assaults of men like Voltaire and Paine, but it is the infidelity that surreptitiously creeps into literary works of genius, and will poison while it beguiles by beauty of expression and thought." It was just a month later he enclosed me a typewritten copy of "The Man with the Hoe," with this inscription on the right hand side of the page, written in his own hand: "Prof. Edwin Markham's poem on Millet's painting: The Man with the Hoe.

Quoted by B. H. Carroll in a Sermon on Christ's Compassion for the Multitude, preached before First Baptist Church, Waco, Sunday, 11 a.m., April 9, 1899," and underneath the poem: "This, my son, is a masterpiece. A gem of richer lustre than has sparkled in literature for 100 years. - B. H. C." Twenty-one years later at the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of Baylor University, when in the long lists of names associated with the memorabilia of the school, no single word of reference appeared to recognize forty years of devoted service, not even the initials of my father's name, I met Prof. Markham and told him of the letter and the sermon preached a fifth of a century before. "I have been hearing about that sermon all over Texas ever since I came into the state," he replied. It was not only in the worded expressions of life, but in the movements of a people in building a city, or the marts of trade, that life expands in the individual. I venture to quote from still another letter out of some seventy I received from my father during the years. This is from one between the two cited above. "Your stay in Chicago, if you thoroughly brace yourself against the evil influences there, will be of incalculable benefit in broadening your views of men and things, and the contacts with large currents of life will necessarily enlarge your own conceptions and perceptions. It was principally with this end in view that I urged you to go to Chicago. There is an education that comes from association and contact with immense vital forces and with various orders of men that, while not exactly definable, or susceptible of being reduced to exact proportions, yet counts much in the life of one who receives it; even more than any learning from text books. After your sojourn in Chicago, you will find it impossible to ever come back down to the plane of thought once occupied. The horizon will have widened, and mere localities and local things will have diminished in size and relative importance." Incidentally I may add very soon after my sojourn in Chicago, he wrote me that it would take me a little while to get down off of my stilts. He knew that in vital relationships Bethlehem can easily be greater than the world metropolis and a nearer approach to the Holy City. Without discussion as to how he came to address the Southern Baptist Convention at Chattanooga when Home Board Evangelism struggled for birth, I well recall his statement that while he did not hear the discussions the day before, he had felt the vibrations of a great movement, and when in pleading to "deny not fins to things that swim, nor feet to things that run, nor wings to things that fly," I knew he had found God's pathway through the seas for His Gospel until the sea gives up the dead; that he had heard the echoing of beautiful feet upon the mountains of the ones bringing glad tidings of great joy, and there had come to him from Patmos the "noise of wings" of an angel flying and carrying the everlasting Gospel. Not a great while before he had written me at Ocala, Florida: "I am also desirous that you cultivate the habit of having on hand always some special, profound study of some great topic or of some book of the Bible, apart from any apparent present need of that study. One who neglects this duty finds himself at last deep and proficient on nothing, the life merely diffused, over the multitudinous things of one's environment. "All my life, I have had under special study either some great theme or some Bible book, even when there seemed no call for it in the round of present things claiming attention. The opportunity for using the results of such study always comes and gives such student great advantage over those who must meet the emergency or seize the opportunity handicapped by only cursory information and impromptu preparation." He told me once that no matter how carefully he prepared an address he always left room for that part of his message which comes in the delivery of the message itself, and that when it came he gave it place regardless of anything else, and if at such time he could catch an answering gleam in the eyes of just one of his hearers, he knew he had his audience with him. And that was his reason for preaching, to win his hearers.

Skyrockets and sheet lightning had no attraction for him in his oratory. He focused his fire believing the lightning flash that found a single heart struck in some way the whole congregation. I am sure his great metaphors were fused largely in such moments. One of his brethren asked me once if his theological concepts were not more the satisfaction of an intellectual desire than anything else. I assured him on the contrary they were the result of humble and reverent research and spiritual approaches for the definite purpose of lovingly knowing and faithfully presenting the being, person, character, nature and mission of our Lord. He wanted to know Him and the power of His resurrection in the fellowship of His suffering and conformity to His death. But he did delight in mental exercise and intellectual explorations. Once he very gravely asked me to name the presidents of the United States in three separate orders giving dates in each instance. First, in the order of their births, second, in the order of their inaugurations and third, in the order of their deaths. I didn't do it. But he did and generously threw in the vice-presidents. It was more than a mere memory test, however. It was principally an expression of knowledge due to his analysis of men in their relationship to times and events. Repeatedly he advised me to read biographies, memoirs, auto-biographies, in connection with a study of history. I have the copy he gave me of the Life and Letters of John A. Broadus, who, as was my mother, was a descendant of Edward Broadus of Caroline County, Va. "Presented to Rev. C. C. Carroll by his father May 10, 1901 - Read - mark - study - follow - " Under this I find a citation of my own as of August 6, 1935, as having marked the greatest name in the book. Among the something more than a thousand volumes which I eventually received from him are the fifty-four with the list written in his own hand which he sent me about two months before I was ordained: Volumes Comprehensive Commentary - Very good and rare 5 Fuller's Works - Very good and rare 3 Notes on Pentateuch - McIntosh - Rich in Spirituality 6 Inspiration - By Manly of S. B. T. Sem. 1 Grounds of Theistic Belief - Fisher (Seminary text book) 1 Philosophy of Plan of Salvation - Walker 1 Light of Nations - Deems - (Deems a Methodist - Good Book) 1 The Argument for Christianity - Lorimer 1 Messages of Today to Men of Tomorrow - Lorimer 1 Needham's Spurgeon 1 Moody and Sankey 1 Life of Reuben Ross 1 Salvation by Christ - Wayland 1 Baptist Principles - Wayland 1 Sermons by B. H. C. 1 Sermons by McNeil 1 Sermons South Church Lectures 1 Sermons Methodist Pulpit South 1 Sermons Ministry of Healing - Gordon 1 Sermons Grace and Glory - Gordon 1 Sermons Bible Difficulties - McArthur 1 Sermons Triumphant Certainties - Maclaren 1 Harmony of Gospels - Broadus 1 Jesus The Nazarene - Bagby 1 Three Reasons - Pendleton 1 Bible Hand - Book - Chambliss 1 Layman's Hand-Book - Venable 1 Baptist Pamphlets 2 N. T. Baptisms - Belcher 1 Immersion - J. T. Christian 1 Pedobaptism - Frost 1 Pencilly & Booth 1 Lord's Supper - Williams 1 How Christ Came to Chruch - Gordon 1 Orthodoxy - Joseph Cook 1 In His Steps - Sheldon 1 Volumes 49 Have ordered to you from Dallas - Systematic Theology by Strong 1 Christian Doctrines - Pendleton 1 Revised O. T. 1 Revised N. T. 1 Harmony of The Acts 1 Total 54 In his accompanying letter he notes: "In box of books is January number Current Literature. Have ordered the other numbers to you direct." The letter is dated January 11, 1900. As my ordination was the first Sunday in the following April, I met him in Shreveport for a conference on the examination which I had already been told he would conduct. Every time I suggested the conference, which was my appointment, not his, he merely said, "We will discuss that later," and we did, but not until I sat before the Presbytery in the presence of the church. Noting one by Dr. Christian in the list above, I am minded of an incident connected with our later association. We were going to Hattiesburg, Miss., where we were both to preach but at different churches, and

enroute I told him how my father asked me one day if I had ever preached on 1 Chronicles 1:1, and added, “I know you haven’t because you don’t even remember what it says ‘Adam, Sheth, Enosh,’” and how I had persuaded him to give me the outline of his own sermon on the text. That night I finished first and went around to hear the close of Dr. Christian’s sermon, and as I went in and sat down, he looked at me and said, “I will now repeat my text, Adam, Sheth, Enosh.” There is another sermon I treasure particularly, one on the Millennium and the final advent of our Lord, preached by my father at Owensboro, Ky., Dec. 12, 1909, which he gave to me as I had it stenographically reported and afterward published in the Green River Baptist. It is possibly the most lucid and triumphant utterance by him on the relationship of these events. There is still another which I heard him preach, on The Love of the Spirit, Romans 15:30, in which he showed the Holy Spirit loving us should be the object of our personal devotion. For thirty-nine years in the ministry I have heard no other sermon on that text. I may be wrong but there may be two reasons for this. One, we preachers lose sight of the Holy Spirit as a Person in the Godhead, and the other that He so lovingly manifests the Son and the Father through the Son to us that their love is shown in the beauty of His own subordination to the Son, as the Son in His kenosis subordinated Himself to the Father and the Spirit. Desiring now to turn for a little while to recalling those earlier associations with my father when in my boyhood days he was, as now, the tallest figure of a man on my horizon, I ask your indulgence to do so through an inscription in a book given to my father by my elder brother, who told me before he died in a confidence which I do not betray now that he is dead, that the most treasured thing that he received as Consul at Venice in the World War was the statement by the Commander of an Italian Brigade which my brother addressed just before they went into battle, “I feel that we have been in the presence of some great evangelist.” The book in reference was the inaugural dissertation in German my brother wrote for his degree at Frederick William University, Berlin, of Philosophiae Doctoris Et Artium Liberalium Magistri, with this inscription in his own hand: “With best love to the Greatest and Best Beloved of all my teachers To my Father” As he had one degree from Baylor, another from the State University of Texas, had been a Fellow in Hebrew at Chicago under Dr. Harper, and had both Theological degrees from Louisville Seminary, I would call it the great tribute. My father gave much personal companionship to his children when we were boys. I remember swimming on his shoulders in the Bosque River, riding behind him horseback to visit Baptist Associational Meetings, hunting with him in forest and field, sitting on a magic carpet of the imagination as in the evenings he told us stories. And once when I carried home a cadet sword he took it in his hand and stretched it forth as though it were a living thing, then turned to me and smiled, saying it was the custom of the Irish Nobles to knight their sons, and struck me on the shoulders and said: “Arise, Sir Charles.” And once when he and my mother were telling us of the Civil War and her seven brothers who saw service, one dying with wounds from Shiloh, he showed us the scar he wore from Mansfield and told us to remember the Confederacy in such terms. And those ties of home where love was law are “dear as remembered kisses after death.” And after he was nearly to the journey’s end, I have the memories of night after night, when insomnia kept him awake, of hearing him expand the great themes he had studied. And when through no volition of my own I became less active in my cherished calling, I have spent some hours in the fascinating study of genealogy, finding in the tracery of ancient records the remnants of the woven threads that held the patterns of family successions. I know genealogy is confessedly inferior in every way to regeneration, but even then it has some place in the magnalia of the saints. In the democracy of the children of God all

genealogies are subject to the adjustments of grace. But genealogy is perhaps a privilege of age, and it may be found useful in an appeal to Caesar, or satisfactory in dealing with the insolence of the Sanhedrin. It may find place in rebuking the cheatery of snobbishness, rebelling against the robberies of special privilege and repudiating the viciousness of bureaucracy behind which mediocrity is wont to sit. And moreover it has ever been accounted a meritorious thing that a man should find in the valorous deed or worth of another, and especially one of his own blood, an example that may become a fax valoris, a torch of some Promethean fire, to augment the glow of his own life's purpose. "For, of illustrious men," says Pericles, "the whole earth is the sepulchre; and not only does the inscription upon columns in their own land point it out, but in that also which is not their own there dwells with every one an unwritten memorial of the heart, rather than of a material monument." Was it not Carlyle who said history is the distillation of biography? And it may be added the incentives to biography are stemmed in genealogy. Of course whoever enters into the research of its records for personal information must remember the discipline of family pride is the realization of the universality of those elements which make for what the world counts greatness and that there is an enforced humility in the comparison of the character and deeds of valiant men and women regardless of tribal, national or geographical distribution. Due to fire, war, migrations, frontier conditions, loss of place and wealth, the ravages of moths and mice, the crumbling of monuments and the decomposition of paper and parchment, and that slow decay in cemeteries "because the lichens of forgetfulness love the stones of remembrance," there are detours in all genealogical research and all too frequently the trail is lost, but the subject is of intense interest. My father's name like so many others as a family name was taken from a surname. Family names in England came into use largely because of the Norman Conquest in 1066, and in Ireland under Brian Boru earlier by nearly three quarters of a century. The apotheosis of all surnames is contained in the prophecy, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus because He will save His people from their sins." All human achievement and resultant pride bow before the cross. The name Carroll, very variously spelled down the years, is an Anglicized old Irish word meaning literally, massacre, which was applied to Tagdh, the grandson of Olliol Ollum, King of Munster, and his wife Sawe, daughter of Conn of the Hundred Battles, because of a battle brightness in his eyes at the battle of Crienna Chin Chumair, about 226 A.D. The first of his descendants to take Cearbhal as a family name under Brian Boru, was slain at the battle of Clontarf, 1014 A.D., when the might of the Danes was broken in Ireland. His son Maonigh called himself ea Cearbhail, and his territory as head of his sept was called Eile from his ancestor Eile Righ Deargh, the red king. The successive tanists of the ea Cearbhals were entitled Princes of Eile until their final dispossession of territory in the plantations following the irruptions of the forces of Cromwell. Many of the name fought in the American Revolution, among whom was Jesse, who obtained land grants along the Six Runs in what is now Sampson County, N. C. He is given in the first U. S. Census as having in 1790, five slaves. He accumulated by grant and purchase some 2,000 acres of land. His wife was Mary Gavin who was the great granddaughter of Charles Gavin who came from Ireland to North Carolina about 1712 and whose descendants were extensive land owners in Duplin and Sampson Counties. Jesse's oldest son, John, married two sisters Elizabeth and Ann Hollingsworth who were great great granddaughters of Valentine Hollingsworth who came to Pennsylvania in 1682 and was a signer of Penn's great charter. John Carroll's second son by his second wife was Benajah who married Mary Eliza Mallard, great grand daughter of George Mallard, and Comfort Woodstock, both of Hugenot French descent. Benajah Carroll had eight

sons and four daughters. He was my father's father. So far as I have been able to find he was the first preacher among the descendants of Jesse Carroll. Whether Jesse Carroll changed from the Episcopal to the Baptist faith as a result of the missionary labors of Lemuel Burkett and his "big book," Commentaries on the New Testament, which prevailed along both sides of Six Runs, and David Thompson of New Jersey whose sermons, prepared largely from Burkett's Commentaries, played such a dominant part from 1737 until his will probated in 1793, left the "big book" to his son, I do not know, but I do know the descendants of him and his wife, a daughter of a vestryman, have their names on record for over a century in the Old Eastern Association of North Carolina; that both Thompson and Burkett had loving namesakes among them, and that from his direct descendants at least ten Baptist preachers have carried the gospel throughout the realms of the Southern Baptist Convention. Benajah Carroll, before leaving North Carolina for Mississippi, organized two Baptist churches, one of which at Magnolia, N. C., celebrated, its centennial in 1935 and the other at Kenansville, in 1937, and though he had died without seeing the conversion of my father, the church at Caldwell, Texas, where he had been pastor, ordained my father to preach. No man knows his eventual audience, or the final scope of his influence, but in the dispersion and intermarriages of families God lays, hereditary foundations for preachers of His Word. That family traits may be changed, corrected, or developed under Grace and energized into action by the personal power of the Holy Spirit for the proclamation of the Gospel has been demonstrated too frequently to be denied or set aside. I met an English preacher in New Orleans who told me he had heard while chaplain in Australia the commander of an American battleship tell his fellow officers he had been baptized by B. H. Carroll of Texas. And how he loved the word, Texas, is of record in all his preaching. Somehow he wanted this mightiest state from the loins of freedom to have this Seminary as a pulpit for the dissemination of civil and religious liberty to the world. He believed beyond measure in the evangelization of the world and through the proclamation of the Gospel. He held that the martyrdom of the followers of Jesus Christ would bring in the millennium, expand the power of voluntary co-operation of the saints among all peoples into the full harvesting of souls in that chiliad of peace and individual development, and by the stamina of their testimony the post-millennial pastors and churches would remain on earth to bear witness against the Man of Sin and witness his destruction by fire at the advent of our Lord. He had the "passion of patience" in looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of our faith, who for the joy set before Him, endured the cross treading down its shame, and is seated upon the right hand of the Majesty on high, in the great expectancy of His reign. I can see my father now as I saw him that day at Hot Springs, Arkansas, after declaring that Texas as was Judah is a lion's whelp, go on to analyze the place of this nation in the progress of the Gospel: "It was the struggle for civil and religious liberty that brought about that voluntary Baptist co-operation, which today enables our independent churches to elicit, combine and direct their resources in behalf of missions, education and fraternity. When they learned to co-operate voluntarily, without an autocratic pope, without a hierarchy, without a cast-iron organization, they settled the question of the ages. They took the Divine precept, Love the Brotherhood, and made it the centripetal force of church independence and the tangential force of individual liberty so as to bring about that circular motion which makes the orbits and preserves the harmony of the heavenly bodies." And as it is in accordance with Divine precept and example that the son should honor the father, I thank you, his co-laborers, for permitting me the freedom of this hour.

# S. CHRIST THE END OF THE LAW

CHRIST THE END OF THE LAW

SCRIPTURE READINGS: How readest thou? Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast answered right - this do, and thou shalt live. - Luke 10:26-28.

I read a passage from the tenth chapter of the letter to the Romans beginning, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

Without taking a text at all tonight, my purpose is to present to you two plans of salvation in the very simplest way that I know how. When you read the Bible, have you not been struck with the difference between the direction given by our Savior as recorded in the paragraph of Luke, and the direction given by the Apostle Paul as recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Acts? A certain lawyer stood up tempting the Savior saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

Jesus said, "What saith the law? How do you read it?" And he quoted the law.

Jesus replied, "This do, and thou shalt live:" But when the jailer propounded the question to the Apostle Paul, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Paul replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

There is a great difference between doing the commandments of God in order to inherit eternal life, and believing on the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved, and the two plans are presented by Paul in the tenth chapter of his letter to the Romans.

Now I want you to listen as carefully as ever you listened to a statement in your life, to certain things which I wish to say on these two plans of salvation. The first statement is that man is a creature, a moral creature, and under law. The law which he is under is expressed briefly in that paragraph in Luke: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy soul and all thy strength and all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Now, in a few words, that is the law.

Mark you that the law takes hold of the disposition, of the affections. Thou shalt love. Thou shalt love God. Thou shalt love thy neighbor. Mark you how comprehensive it is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart; with all thy soul; with all thy strength, with all thy mind." Notice how comprehensive it is in the other: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Now that is the moral law under which a man lives - to which he is subject.

Let us notice in the next place when a man is righteous under this law. Moses describes the righteousness of the law thus: "That they which do these things shall live by them." A man is righteous under the law when he keeps it. He is unrighteous if he does not keep it. That law is the measure, the standard, of our thoughts, imaginations, being, work or words; of all that's in our minds, in our souls, in our strength, in our heart, and to be righteous under that law, you must comply with the requirements of that law.

Let us see what is the scope of that requirement, how far it goes. Let me read a passage on it. The Apostle James says in James 2:1-26 to the twelve tribes, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For He that said, 'Do not commit adultery,' said also, 'Do not kill.' Now if thou commit no adultery, yet thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."

Take another passage: In Galatians 3:1-29, the Apostle Paul discusses the scope of the law, where he says, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." What, then, is the scope of this law? What must you do to be righteous under this law? You must comply not only with every requirement of it, but you must continually comply with every requirement of it. You must not only love God with all your heart, but you must love God with all your heart all the time. Cursed is every man that continueth not, and if he ever violates it in one particular, then he is guilty of breaking the whole law.

What kind of a defense would you call it if a man was indicted before our courts for murder, and when the question was propounded to him by the judge as to what he had to say as to why sentence of death should not be pronounced, he should get up and say, "I admit that I have committed this murder this one time, but I want to call your attention to the fact that it is the only offense I ever committed. I never stole any money, never committed adultery, never bore false witness, and this is the only hour in my life when I have broken the law. Therefore, in view of my conformity to the law all the rest of the days of my life, and in view of the fact that this is the only one of the statutes which I have violated, I think I ought to be acquitted?"

What would the judge say? The judge would tell him that the committing of that crime made him a transgressor, and that when he had complied with the law all the rest of his life he was entitled to no credit for it, for it was what every citizen was required to do.

Now that is what James means when he says, "The same God who said, 'Thou shalt not steal,' said also, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.'" In other words, that part of the law which says "love thy neighbor as thyself" is just as much violated in one of these directions as in the other direction. So that we understand now what is meant by this law under which all the people are subjects. "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength and with all thy mind, and for all the time, and thy neighbor as thyself."

Well, suppose a man violates one of the provisions of this law, either with respect to God or with respect to his fellow man, then what is the penalty? The penalty is declared in two scriptures with great solemnity and plainness, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," and the other scripture which says, "The wages of sin is death."

Now, having gotten these points clearly before your minds, viz: first, that man is under the law; second, the law which he is under; third, the scope of that law; and fourth, the penalty of the

violation of that law-having gone thus far in these statements, let us ask a question: Is there on this earth a righteous man? Would any of you this night stand up before God and lay your hand upon your heart and say, "I am a righteous man; I have never violated that law; I have always with my heart loved God; I have always loved my neighbor as myself; I have never in thought or word or deed, violated at any time any one of the provisions of this moral law under which I live?"

I do not know what answer you would give, but I want to give you some answers that are contained in the Word of God, on that subject, and the first one is a statement made by Solomon at the time the Temple was dedicated. At the dedication of the Temple he made a prayer and the prayer looked to a certain way by which sins committed against God might be forgiven and in that prayer, parenthetically, he says, "For there is not upon the earth a just man that liveth and sinneth not."

Listen to what the Apostle John says: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth it not in us." Again he says, "If we say that we have not sinned, we make God to be a liar." Wherein does it make God to be a liar? Let us read and see, Psalms 14:1-7, as follows: "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy; there is none that doeth good; no not one."

God looked down from heaven to see if there were any. Not occasionally one, -not if all men were doing right, but God looked down from heaven to see if any of them were doing right, and His solemn declaration is that not one of them was found to do right.

Now, take these three declarations of Scripture: That of Solomon that there is not a just man upon the earth that liveth and, sinneth not; the declaration of the Apostle John that if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us, and that if we say we have not sinned we make God to be a liar; and then God looked down from heaven to see if any were doing right, and He found that none were doing right.

Where, then, does this subject ¾ this statement ¾ bring us? To what conclusion have we arrived? That by the deeds of the law shall no man be justified in God’s sight ¾ that is, so far as the righteousness that comes by personal obedience is concerned. All of us are sold under sin ¾ Jew and Gentile. Not one that ever lived upon the earth can be found that kept this law at all times and at all points, and whenever any one of them breaks any point in the law, violates any provision of the law, at that time that soul comes under the condemnation: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."

Therefore, when that lawyer tempted the Savior and put that question, "Master, what good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus answered, "What does the law say? What is required in the law in order that a man may live-may have eternal life?" And the lawyer quoted it. Then Jesus said, "If you want to know what great thing you are to do to inherit eternal life, go and do those things," showing what He wished to bring about that He wanted to shut this man up and show him that he was already condemned, that there was no way by which he could be justified in the sight of God by the law, by his own personal righteousness.

What, then, can be the solidity of the hope that any man has in his heart of being justified in the sight of God by selfrighteousness? Take any kind of a. man. I am not talking about the worst classes of men ¾ the out-breaking sinners-men who are confirmed drunkards or red-handed

murderers. I am not even talking about the good citizen merely, but I mean that you may take the loveliest and purest woman that ever lived upon the earth. You may take the noblest man that ever lived upon the earth, and, with these select specimens, bring them up before this law of God which says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself, and at "all times thou shalt do this," and that woman and that man would come under the condemnation of the law. You know you never saw a woman who could escape under that law. You never saw a man that could. It follows, then, that so far as that plan of getting to eternal life is concerned, if there be no other way than that way, men are lost.

Just here we look at another statement. Jesus comes into the world. God loves this lost world, and He so loves it as to give His Son in its behalf; and when Jesus comes into the world, for whom does He come? We shall let Him answer. He says, "I am come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." He did not expect to find any righteous people. He knew before He left heaven that there were none such. He came after the sinners-transgressors-under the condemnation of the law.

Take it again where He says, "The whole need not a physician," ¾ that is to say, "I did not come to seek well people. My visit to earth was not to find men or women who were spiritually well. I came to find sick people-people whose souls were sick. I came as a physician, but not as a physician to a hospital. I came as a physician into a country over which the pestilence had blown its breath, and you men and women and children in it were subject to that pestilence."

Another scripture: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation" ¾ worthy for you to accept, worthy for me, worthy for your father and mine, worthy for our children. "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation." What is it? "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" Sinners! If He came into the world to save sinners, and the way of salvation is blocked by their own personal conformity to the requirements of the law, how does He propose to save them?

Mark you, these people are condemned. They have been tried. The sentence of death has been pronounced upon them, and the interval of time that intervenes between the pronouncing of the sentence and the executing of the penalty and the fact that they are alive, is evidence only of the forbearance of God in the suspension of the penalty until there shall be submitted unto them another way of life. Now what is that other way of life? There must be in that other way of life some sort of satisfaction to that violated law. Jesus Christ cannot come and save any one of those who have been condemned to death, and allow God’s holiness to remain unsullied unless what they owe He pays-unless the penalty which has fallen upon them, falls upon Him. That leads us to a word. The word is "vicarious" ¾ in the place of another. And when we say Jesus suffered vicariously, we mean that He suffered in the place of somebody else and hence, if Jesus makes an expiation for sin and He not being a sinner, it must be a vicarious expiation; that is, it must be an expiation for somebody else. Now, in order to save those who are under the penalty of the law He must suffer vicariously, in their stead. When did He suffer so?

Now, I want to get you to fix your mind on a certain event ¾ a certain transaction, a definite thing in the life of the Lord Jesus Christ. When was it? By what deed upon His part was this expiation made? Was it when He was born? No. Was it when He worked miracles? No. Was it when He rose from the dead? No. When He ascended into heaven? No.

It was when He died on the cross.

We are to be saved by the death of Christ. If we are to be purchased we are to be purchased by the blood of Christ. But what do the Scriptures say about that? The Apostle Paul says, "The gospel that I preached unto you, how, that according to the Scripture, Christ died for our sins."

How does he express it in his letter to the Romans? "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation for our sins." Set forth. When? What part of the setting forth was efficacious? It was when His blood was shed.

What does Peter say upon that point? He says, "Who bare our sins in His own body on the tree." What does Paul say about it in his letter to the Corinthians the second time? He says, "God made Him to be sin who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." What did Isaiah foresee? He says that "God laid on Him the iniquity of us all," and "by His stripes we are healed."

Now we are coming up to the plan of salvation. We are coming up to that plan that stands over against the first plan presented a while ago. In his letter to the Romans, Paul says, Moses described the righteousness which is of the law that they who do these things shall live by them. That is one plan, but the righteousness, which is of faith-how is that? He says that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth; that the word was nigh them, even in their mouth and in their heart-the word of faith which they preached: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

Now, I want to get before you as a conclusion from what has been presented heretofore the shallowness of the hope upon which any man rests who is trusting to any kind of selfrighteousness as a means of justification when he comes to stand before the bar of God. I know some people that are good people, humanly speaking-good citizens, debt-paying men, outwardly, at least, moral men ¾ who affect to reject the idea of being saved by a vicarious expiation by the righteousness of somebody else, and these men are passing through life, going on toward death and soon will be at death, and after death come to judgment, utterly discarding any hope of eternal life from the righteousness which is in Christ, and they do not feel that they are very great sinners.

Now, I want to quote some scripture to them. The Apostle Peter says, "There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," except the name of Jesus. He means something by such a broad statement as that. Take what our Savior says in a certain parable of His, that whosoever climbeth over the wall and cometh not in by the door of the sheepfold, the same is a thief and a robber, and He says, "I am the door, and whosoever does not come into the sheepfold by the door is a thief and a robber."

Now it is a very difficult matter to make that moral man believe that he is a thief and a robber, but that is just what he is. That is God’s declaration with reference to him that any man who tries to get into the sheepfold in any other way than through Christ as the door is a thief and a robber.

Take this scripture: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha," that is, let him be accursed when Christ shall come. Here is a man that does not love the Lord Jesus Christ as his Savior, a moral man. We look at him and see in him a great many things to

commend him, humanly speaking, and we know he is near death, and after death is the judgment, and that Christ comes at the judgment. Here is the solemn declaration of God's Word that if that man does not love the Lord Jesus Christ he shall be accursed when Christ shall come. He comes to the judgment ¾ to the final judgment ¾ to be accursed. That means to be accursed forever. It means to bear an eternal penalty.

Now hear this scripture: The Apostle Paul says that if we hear an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than this gospel hat Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that we are to be saved by faith in the blood of Jesus, that this is the only way a man can be saved-he says that if an angel from heaven come to this earth and preach any other doctrine that that, that angel would be accursed.

Then take this scripture: Jesus said it himself. He said it upon the memorable occasion just before He ascended into heaven. He had been upon the earth and these are His last words. Listen: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," every one. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned." That is His own declaration.

Then this scripture: "He that sinned under Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the everlasting covenant an unholy thing?"

Now this moral man, this self-righteous man, in assuming to stand upon his own righteousness in the sight of God, has declared that he did not need a Savior-that he was not a sinner, that he did not need a physician. He has trodden under foot the Son of God ¾ he has counted that blood that was shed upon Calvary an unholy thing; he has done despite to the Spirit of grace. And this scripture: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that He hath risen from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

These are the two plans of Life, and it seems to me that the way is so plain that there can be no mistake about it. Here's the law. You cannot deny that it is holy; that it is just; that it is good; that if God made you, you are a moral, dependent creature and under law, and that law says that you are to love God; you admit that law to be holy and just and good, and that you are to love God with all your heart. Certainly you would not leave out a part of your affections that could be fastened with love upon God. And that if you are under obligation to love Him at one time, you are under obligation to love Him at all times and to love Him supremely at all times. And that if you are under obligation to love your neighbor today, you were yesterday and you will be tomorrow, and if you are under obligation to love him at all, you are under obligation to love him as you love yourself, because he is entitled to what you are entitled to, and if you love him you will not hate him at all you will not tell lies on him, nor steal from him, nor bear false witness against him, nor covet anything that he has if you love ,your neighbor as you love yourself you won't do any of those things. Now then, the supreme question for you to answer is, "Have I done this?" Have you complied with this law?

I close with this: With all men, white and black-with all people that you have ever known or heard of or of which this scripture gives any description ¾ there is a sense of right and wrong. They do know some things as right and some things as wrong. But says one, "The heathen that have not

the law, Paul says that their hearts and their consciences convict or acquit them with reference to some things, as to whether they are right or whether they are wrong."

Now it follows that wherever there is a right and a wrong there must be a law which makes one thing right and another thing wrong. And it also follows that where there is a law and a law-maker and subjects of law, there must be responsibility to the law, and wherever there is responsibility to law, and a violator of the law, there must be a judgment. There must be a trial. There must be an arraigning of the guilty before that bar ¾ that tribunal of justice ¾ and when he comes to stand before that bar then the supreme judge is just.

Now what hope has he that he will be acquitted and not condemned? What reasonable hope? What one that can give sleep and rest when he thinks about it? Do you. feel satisfied about it? Why is it that you are disturbed at times with fear and apprehension? If you are satisfied about it, why is it that when you have been alone you have condemned yourself?

"And if our hearts condemn us (and this is the Word of God) God is greater than our hearts."

One question only. Is there any chance for you of escape by way of your own righteousness? Can you come under that plan which says, "Do and live?" Can you stand up before God and claim that you have kept the law and that you are righteous in the sight of the law?

If not, then, I do ask you how do you expect to be acquitted? How do you expect to escape from the penalty, if you reject Jesus Christ? What name under heaven known among men, can you trust, if you reject vicarious expiation ¾ that personal expiation? If you reject Jesus, what can you obtain by faith in another? If you turn away from this, you furnish a righteousness for yourself, but hear the declaration of the Savior, describing the man without the wedding garment at the wedding supper. The man that came in was in his own righteousness and when the king came in he said to him, "Friend, what doest thou here without the wedding garment?" And the man was speechless. The king said, "Take him and bind him hand and foot and cast him forth into outer darkness where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

If my mind ever reached a conclusion, with all the earnestness with which I ever believed in a proposition and with all the assurance with which I ever rested my soul on any foundation, I do rest it upon the declaration that whosoever believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved. That other way is closed. It’s barred. We are lost under that. This is the only way of escape, and now I want to implore you tonight to do what you have never, perhaps, done before in your life. Fasten your mind upon the two roads that open before you. One or the other take. Do you take the road that will make you stand at the last in your own righteousness? Or do you take the road that will make you stand in the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ? Two ways open out before your feet. Death is in both and after death the judgment. May God’s Holy Spirit impress upon you with an impression that can never be effaced the vast importance of a speedy settlement of this question. The Lord says, "Look unto me and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth."

Jesus says that God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son to die for sinners, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. The blood falling from the Cross flows to you ¾ flows in its saving power ¾ and tonight will you count it an unholy thing? Will you tread under foot the Son of God? Will you do despite to the Spirit of, grace?

Let us unite in prayer, that at the parting of these two roads, the way of life and the way of death, every person in this house may decide this question forever.

# S. Christ As Teacher

CHRIST AS A TEACHER TEXT: Never man spake like this man. John 7:46. The theme today is Christ as a teacher. The Sunday schools of Christendom, since the first day of January, have been studying the lessons in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ. The accredited historians of that life are Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul. Mark commences with the public ministry of Christ and closes with His resurrection from the dead. Matthew commences' with the birth of Jesus, tracing His genealogy from Abraham, and closing with the giving of the Great Commission in Galilee after His resurrection. Luke commences with the birth of His forerunner, John the Baptist, giving the genealogy of Jesus and tracing His descent from Adam and closes with His ascension (Acts 1:9-11). John commences with Christ's pre-existent state, before the foundation of the world, and closes with His state in eternity (John 1:1-51 and Revelation 1:1-20). Paul commences after Christ's ascent into heaven, and touches only that part of the life of Christ which relates to His call to the apostleship. These are the historians. It is review day in the Sunday schools. You have reviewed many of the doctrines and of the deeds of Jesus Christ. In harmony with such review, it is my purpose today to show you Christ as a teacher. He stands before us pre-eminently as a teacher upon two special occasions. I am far from saying that on those two occasions we have the sum of his teachings. I mean that they fairly represent Him as a teacher, both as to manner and matter. The scenes of the two teachings were close together. The second one, when He taught in parables, He was in a little boat, pushed out somewhat from the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and the multitude stood around on beach I shall not discuss today the parable feature of Christ's teaching. The first is when He was up on top of the hills, the same hills that look down on that very beach where later He spoke the parables upon the hills that formed the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. There He spoke the Sermon on the Mount. And you may, I say, gather from the parables and the Sermon on the Mount a pretty fair conception of the method and matter of Christ's teaching. His character as a teacher might safely rest on these two. The historians of the Sermon on the Mount are Matthew and Luke, mainly Matthew. The scene of that sermon, as has just been stated, was a level place upon the mountains on the northwestern shore of the Sea of Galilee. The audience consisted of the twelve disciples whom He had just appointed and of a large number of other disciples who had been instructed somewhat in the principles of His kingdom, and of a vast multitude of people from Judea and Samaria and Phoenicia. Oh, it was an immense audience! Luke says: "The company of His disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judea and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon." It was such an audience as you could not put in a house, any kind of a house. And it is a noticeable fact that whenever a great reformation commences, I mean a movement that has life and fire in it, then the reformers take to field preaching. I mean they quit the houses; they go into the street or fields or out in the open somewhere, for only such places as have the skies for a ceiling and the horizon for a boundary can hold the crowds of people that always gather when a deep and fiery movement of the Christian religion is in progress. So with this audience of Jesus. The occasion of the Sermon on the Mount was this: He had just selected, as has been stated, twelve men, commencing the organization of His movement. These twelve men were to share with Him the burden of

responsibility and labor, and it was quite important that they should be thoroughly instructed in the first principles of the kingdom which He announced. It was equally necessary that the larger body of His disciples should understand those fundamental principles, and that the miscellaneous and ever shifting crowd, drawn together by their expectations of a king, and looking to the establishment of an earthly monarchy which would overturn Roman supremacy and give to Judea the sovereignty of the universe, that this mixed rabble should have their misconceptions concerning the nature of the kingdom of Jesus Christ removed, and forever. The setting or background of the sermon must never be overlooked. The multitudes, incited mainly by desires of relief from physical, temporal and external woes, even the better informed and more spiritually minded but dimly recognizing the great spiritual needs-these constituted the occasion of the Sermon on the Mount. The design of it has been partly suggested by the occasion, but we need to erect here a pillar of caution. The design has a negative as well as a positive aspect. First, then, negatively: It was not intended to be, as some have supposed and claimed, an epitome of doctrine and morals, neither of the one nor of the other. It falls very short of being a full synopsis of the doctrines of Jesus Christ. There is not a word in it directly of regeneration. There is nothing in it concerning the doctrine of the vicarious atonement and justification by faith so elaborately set forth both by the Saviour Himself and His apostles. So there are some departments of morals not here inculcated. Hence, one makes a very great mistake when he counts the Sermon on the Mount as a complete standard of life. You hear people say sometimes: “If I live by the Sermon on the Mount that will do.” I say that this sermon is not all of the standard. Positively, then, what was the design of it? The design of it was introductory-an opening or rudimental lecture setting forth the foundation principles of the Messianic kingdom, showing that these principles are internal, spiritual, practical, and not external, ritualistic, theoretical; setting forth first the characteristics, privileges and happiness of the Messianic subjects in the beatitudes. Showing next the importance, influence and responsibility of the Messianic subjects, comparing them to the light of the world and the salt of the earth. Then follows a discussion of the relations of the Messianic kingdom. Relations to what? Relations to the Jewish law, whether ceremonial, civil or moral; to the prophets; to rabbinical traditions; to the world; to practical life, and to destiny. Such was the design of the Sermon on the Mount, intending afterwards, as in fact He did, to unfold, to develop other doctrines related to these and letting His whole life’s teaching present the fulness of His doctrine and of His morality. So the Sermon on the Mount is not a disconnected jumble of fine sayings, but exhibits remarkable unity as a discourse, as you will observe when I briefly state the outline and analysis of it. Indeed, I much question if any speech has ever been delivered more remarkable for unity than the Sermon on the Mount. Next, as to the matter. The matter of this sermon is every bit of it every day matter, but while every day matter, as deep and as important as human life and destiny. One makes a great mistake in supposing that great teaching touches only the strange and exceptional and startling. The best and sublimest teaching upon the earth concerns the every day life, and such is the matter of this sermon. As to its style: These adjectives will convey a description of the style. It is simple, familiar, direct, sententious, paradoxical, startling, illustrative, conversational, practical, authoritative a simple talk, I mean, that every one in the audience could understand. There was no attempt at big words. The language of the common people, as they spoke it and as they understood it, was used by our Saviour. It was familiar in that it was as homely in its phrases as if He were sitting by the fireside or out on the, housetop in the cool of the evening or on the curbing of the street and talking with the passing people. It was not an oration, for there is an utter absence

of declaratory theatrical elocution and rhetoric, as there must be in all great teachers. I mean to say that there is not an indication of a single strained mental effort after rounded phraseology, euphonious diction, rhetorical effect, dramatic gesticulation. It is direct; it does not intend to reach things by cannoning, hitting here and intending by glancing shot to strike out yonder. He moves right straight forward to the accomplishment of His object. The style, I say, is paradoxical. A paradox is something which seems to be contradictory and is not contradictory, as for instance, “happy are the unhappy”; that is, blessed are they that mourn. That is a paradox, but there is nothing contradictory in it. There is a comparison between present unhappiness and future happiness. As Luke keeps bringing it out, “Blessed are ye that hunger now, for ye shall be filled hereafter.” “Woe unto you that are rich now, for ye shall be poor hereafter.” Yes, it is intensely paradoxical. It is illustrative. The illustrations do not have to be explained, as some men’s illustrations. They illustrate. They preach a sermon by themselves; that is, they carry in their familiar imagery their own application. He selects objects that are perfectly well known to the people and so thoroughly familiar that when used as an illustration there can be no misconception as to the meaning. Sometimes He illustrated by a hen and chickens, sometimes by a lily, other times by rocks and thorns and sheep and birds. It is conversational in its style and unquestionably the greatest preachers are preachers who adopt the easy, off-hand, conversational style, like Doctor Broadus. But the distinguishing characteristic in style is that which most impressed His audience-because of its intrinsic power and of its marked dissimilarity to the methods of their ordinary religious teachers-He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes and Pharisees. The style then was authoritative. Just look at the difference. A rabbi would get up before the people and with his eyes cast down would begin to say, “Rabbi Ben Israel says in the Talmud that Rabbi Joseph said that Rabbi Amos said that maybe such is the interpretation of the passage, but Rabbi Issachar quotes Rabbi Ephraim as saying that Rabbi Eleazar thought it might mean a different thing.” It was all indeterminate, uncertain; it did not take any positive shape. The pupil was perplexed by a balancing of conflicting probabilities. One leader doubtfully said, “Lo, here” while another distrustfully said, “Maybe yonder.” But Jesus spoke with authority-authority vested in himself. He leaned on no human buttresses. Did not attempt to defend His doctrine, nor to vindicate it. He spoke as God speaks, and without stopping to give an explanation of His manner and so ought man always to speak who speaks for God. Let him speak as the oracles of God. Now as to the rank of this sermon: Daniel Webster says that no mere man could have produced the Sermon on the Mount. Old age and wisdom bow before the simplicity and sublimity of this incomparable teaching. Little children sweetly imbibe its spirit as if it were milk, and aged saints draw from it the strong meat which supplies their sinews of strength. Babes in Christ by it take their first step in the practical walk of Christian life, while the man or woman in Christ Jesus by it soar on eagles’ wings into the anticipations of the heavenly world. It is peerless, matchless, divine. Now to show you the unity of the Sermon on the Mount, I will give you an outline of it that I think you can carry in your minds, as it consists of only three great heads. First, the characteristics, privileges and happiness of the Messianic subjects as set forth in the beatitudes. Second, the importance, influence, and responsibility of the Messianic subjects, as set forth in the images of salt and light. And third, the relations of the Messianic kingdom or doctrines; that is, its relations to the Jewish law, whether ceremonial, civil or moral; its relations to the rabbinical traditions; its relations to the prophecies; its relations to the outside world in its spirit and maxims and chief good; its relations to human destiny, closing with “Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and

doeth them, he shall be like the man who built his house upon a rock and when the floods came and the storms hurtled, that house stood, for it was founded upon a rock." All through it, in all of its great divisions, is brought out in clearest light that the principles of the Christian religion are internal, spiritual and practical. It is not, "Do this that you may be seen of men." It is not to wash the outside of the cup or platter. It is not a painted sepulcher, holding inside rottenness and dead men's bones. It consists not in meat and drink nor in observances of days and months and seasons. It has not ten thousand ordinances that touch your dress and your manner. Oh, the mass of stuff that has been imposed upon the Christian religion, which in its foundation principles was all spiritual and not ritualistic. All through it is practical, as opposed to theoretic or speculative. There is not a single part of it that is presented to the curious human mind as something calculated to entertain an idle person, not a thing. The whole of it is designated to be not abstract, but concrete, to be incarnated, to be embodied. It is practical, all of it. Now, having presented you that outline of the sermon, I want to illustrate it by considering briefly the first two divisions. First, the characteristics, privileges and happiness of the Messianic subjects, as set forth in what are called the beatitudes, commencing with a few general remarks. First, there are eight of these characteristics with eight corresponding privileges, or eight alternative woes. Every one of the privileges is based on character and every one of the particular measures of happiness is based on a privilege, showing the relation between character and happiness a fixed relation, an indissoluble bond between character and happiness. If a man possess the kingdom of God, if a man is allowed to see God and live with Him, if a man receive a reward from God at the last great day, these privileges are the springs of his happiness, but every privilege is predicated upon character in the man, upon the inside state of the man's soul. As Burns expresses it It is no' in titles, nor in rank; It is no' in wealth like London bank, To purchase peace and rest; If happiness have not her seat And center in the breast We may be wise or rich or great But never can be blest. This sermon explains why Paul, covered with wounds and in prison and at midnight, and with death awaiting him in the morning, could sing praises to God. It explains how it is, as recorded in Hebrews 11:1-40, that the ancient martyrs took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and who, while flames wrapped them about, shouted hallelujahs to God and who leaped for joy that they were counted worthy to suffer for Christ's sake. The beatitudes express the only great philosophy as contrasted with Epicureanism and Stoicism. The Epicurean taught: "You have appetites; if you would be happy, gratify them. Eat, drink and be merry." The Stoic said, "You have appetites; if you would be happy, extirpate them dig them up by the roots." This sermon says, "You have appetites; if you would be happy, regulate them. Neither gratify them immoderately nor suppress them, but divert them from improper channels and fix them upon worthy objects. You want to be rich; that is right, only what kind of riches? You want to live? Yes, but when-now or hereafter? You want great substance? That is all right, but what kind evanescent or that which endures? You would treasure up yes, but where? "Where neither moth nor rust corrupt, nor thieves dig through and steal." You will next observe that these beatitudes are all double. I mean that they have a probable sense and an absolute sense. Take this one. Luke says, "Blessed are the poor." Matthew says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit." The probable sense is always this, that comparing the two estates of poverty and riches, it is more probable that a poor man will get to heaven than that a rich man will. I mean to say that it is hard, very hard, for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven. I mean to say that if your rent roll is one hundred thousand dollars a year, then your chances of heaven are very slim, but that is not the absolute sense. The absolute sense is: Blessed are the poor in spirit.

Again: “Blessed are they that mourn.” The probable sense is that it is, as a rule, better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; that, as a rule, afflicted people are more apt to seek the kingdom of heaven than people who are not afflicted, but its meaning in its absolute sense is not merely to be a mourner, but to mourn in spirit for spiritual things. You may next note generally that each beatitude has a corresponding woe, either expressed or implied. Luke mentions four of them. For instance, when he says “Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of heaven,” he then adds the alternative, “But woe unto you rich, for you have had your consolation.” So with all the beatitudes. Let us examine somewhat particularly the first two. Take the first, “Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” What does that meant I believe in close analysis and clear definition. Now here is the way I would read that: “Happy is the man who in his inner, higher nature (that is, in his spirit) consciously feels his poverty or need of spiritual good from God.” There is poverty, yes, but it is that poverty in spirit which you consciously feel and not that which you have but do not know that you have it. Compare two Scriptures for proof: Isaiah 66:2 “To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.” Revelation 3:17 “Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold,” and so forth. Evidently the blessing is promises, not to the poverty, but to the sense of the poverty the consciousness of the need. It is quite important to observe this distinction. Now in the case of these Laodiceans there was actual poverty in the sphere of the spirit, but there was no recognition of the poverty. On the contrary, they thought themselves to be rich and that they needed nothing. The two states of mind are clearly represented in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican who went up into the temple to pray. The Pharisee had spirit need enough, but he had no consciousness of that need. The publican had the same need and he deeply felt it. He smote upon his heart and said, “God be merciful to me a sinner.” Blessed are the poor in spirit! The prodigal son illustrates both phases of the subject. When he left his father’s house, however much he might have external things, for he was richly endowed, in his inner nature, in his spirit, he was actually poor, but he did not know it. He thought he was rich and great, and was correspondingly proud, but there came a time when he began to be in want when the need of his soul broke in upon his mind, when he said, “I have sinned. I will arise and go to my Father and say to him, Father, I am not worthy to be called thy son. Let me be a servant. I have sinned.” Blessed are the poor in spirit! That means, happy is the man who in the sphere of the spirit (or inner or higher nature) feels his need of good from God, no less, no more. “I need thee every hour, most gracious Lord.” Oh, how sweet that hymn is! Poor in spirit. Oh, I have so few spiritual goods! I need. I need patience, I need strength, I need clearer views of heaven. I need more of the spirit of my Master. Poor, yea, blessed are the poor in spirit. But do not forget the contrast in the now and the hereafter. What do you need, O Dives, at the banquet? “Not a thing in the world. I have a million dollars; have the finest table in the country; every time I walk out on the streets people fawn upon me and say, ‘There goes a millionaire; look at him! Look at him!’ Why, I do not need a thing in the world. You never did see such eating as I have on my table. I am rich.” Rich, purse-proud, feeding upon external things and starving the soul. That is the now. But let me show him to you in the hereafter. You will have to look a long way down, away down into the depths of Hell. Did he take any money with him? Not a cent. Is he thirsty? Hear him: “And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my parched tongue; for I am tormented in

this flame" (Luke 16:24). Do you see that chasm that separates him from God? Do you mark his apprehension that his brethren will come where he is? Do you mark the play of his memory? "But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime received thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and you are tormented" (Luke 16:25). Oh, sublime Teacher! Thou Teacher of the relation of time and eternity! "Blessed are they that mourn." I would rather go to the house of mourning than to the house of laughing. But it refers to the sphere of the spirit. Do you mourn here? Do you mourn on account of sins? Do you mourn on account of your lack of conformity to the image of Jesus Christ? Do you mourn because of the low state of piety in the land? Like Jeremiah, is the source of your grief the fact that the health of the daughter of God's people is not recovered? "Blessed are they that mourn." Oh, you mourners in Zion, I say to you that you shall be comforted, and when your ashes are turned to beauty and your heaviness to the garments of praise, and your anguish to the thrilling joys of heaven, then will your consolation be deep and high and broad, with an "immeasurable" attached to every one of the adjectives. How sweet the song of Tom Moore Come, ye disconsolate, where'er ye languish; Come to the mercy seat, fervently kneel; Here bring your wounded hearts, here tell your anguish, Earth has no sorrow that heaven cannot heal. "Blessed are they that mourn." Oh, mourners, hear the blessed Saviour: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke 4:18-19). We reach the fulness of the promise in heaven, for there are no tears in heaven, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor pain, nor death. Hear the precise words of our Lord: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Revelation 21:4). I shall not refer to any of these other characteristics. There is no time for it. I must pass over them in silence, though they all have a special meaning and each one very sweet. But let us consider somewhat the importance and influence and responsibility of the people who are poor in spirit and mourn, and are meek, and who hunger and thirst after righteousness, and who are merciful, and who are peacemakers, and who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. What is their importance? What their responsibility? Listen: Jesus, in just one verse, answers all of these questions:"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men" (Matthew 5:13). The importance or value of the Messiah's subjects is determined by the emphasis on the pronoun "ye." The verb-ending would in ordinary cases determine the pronoun nominative so it would not have to be expressed. But if, in the Greek you desire to know emphasis on the pronoun, it must be expressed. The Greek verb "este" by itself means "ye are"; that is, without emphasis. But to have it "YE are," capitalizing and emphasizing the pronoun, it must be written "umeis este." How then can I make you hear the emphasis, the deep stress our Saviour placed on that pronoun? YE-YE-YE are the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Do you not see that He meant to deny such importance and influence and responsibility to anything else or to anybody else? First, there is a constat when He says "ye." The emphasis is on the "Ye." Ye are the light of the world. Ye are the salt of the earth. It is as if he had said, If this world is preserved from moral corruption, if this world is wrested from the realms of darkness and bathed in light, ye will have to do it. Ye are the important ones. Oh, think of it, you mourners, you poor in spirit, you merciful ones, you that hunger and thirst after righteousness, you are more important in the sight of God and ten

thousand times more valuable than all the rich, ungodly men that ever trod the face of the earth. I say unto you that not the philosophers (lightning bugs trying to outshine the sun); not the police shall keep the world from corrupting and rotting; not the public school, as the politicians would have you believe. No, you can have good public schools right over the mouth of the pit. And not Cotton Palaces and Fairs that open on Sunday. But ye are the light of the world; these whose characteristics are internal, spiritual, practical; followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. I say if the whole earth is not cracked open today it is because of you. If the cloud does not burst and bolt fall to smite it with universal flame, it is solely because of that “ye.” Ye poor in spirit; ye Christians that are scattered about on the face of the earth, ye and ye alone. Ah, me, if you were taken off of the earth it would rot and stink until heaven would be compelled to burn it! I would, like to know whenever philosophy or secular education or commerce or riches or secular science ever kept a community from morally rotting. Do you know one? Can you put your finger on one city of ancient or modern times? I say today, in, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that but for the humble, God-fearing men and women in any state, in any county, in any town, it would rot. You are the salt of the earth and the light of the world. As the value and importance of God’s people are determined by the emphatic “Ye,” so the character of their influence is determined by the figures, “salt and light.” Salt preserves keeps pure. Light dispels darkness. Heat expels the cold. The salt of the sea is the shore’s barrier against universal disease and death. Without the light and its accompanying heat there could be no life. No plant would germinate. Darkness that could be felt would shroud the earth. More than Arctic cold would ensue. All liquids would solidify and petrify. The rivers-earth’s arteries-would stiffen into blocks of ice. The veins of blood would become like steel wire, harder than man’s bones. What, therefore, salt and light are to the natural world even those that are Christians are to the spiritual world. And as the emphatic “Ye” expresses who are earth’s important ones, and as the “salt and light” express the kind and character of their value, so their responsibility is expressed by “putting the candle on the candlestick.” “Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven” (Matthew 5:15-16). Mark the emphasis on the “so.” It is commonly misunderstood. As the candle once lighted must be put on the candlestick in order to be sufficiently visible, even so when God shines into your heart your conversion must be so positioned as to be visible. It is to position and consequent visibility that “even so” refers. I say that our responsibility is all involved in putting the candle in the right place. God Himself does the lighting. Our part is not to so misplace the light as to hide it. It therefore becomes a supreme question: How do you put it on the candlestick? I do not know how you are prepared to receive some things I am going to say, but I am going to say them with all my heart. First, then, let the divine oracles speak. Hear the Word of God:“I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy lovingkindness and thy truth from the great congregation” (Psalms 40:10). “Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what he hath done for my soul” (Psalms 66:16). “Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven” (Matthew 10:32-33). “The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks that thou sawest are the seven churches” (Revelation 1:20). What then do these Scriptures mean? That we must tell it. Let God’s people hear our Christian experience. Let the whole world know just where

we stand. Unite with the church. On every issue between righteousness and unrighteousness, between light and darkness, between Christ and Belial, take an unmistakable position on the Lord's side. You younger brethren and sisters, it was a joy to me when you put the lamp on the lampstand, when you took the lighted candle and put it on the candlestick. Let it shine there. Put it where men can see it. Do not put it under a bushel. Do not put it under a bed. Do not try to be a secret partner of Jesus Christ, a Nicodemus, who comes to see Him by night. Come out and take a stand. Let the world know your alignment. Put the candle on the candlestick and let the marksman of Hell try to snuff it out. To put it on the candlestick is unquestionably to on the church.? Where do you get that? Why, do you not read inn the Book of Revelation about Jesus moving among the candlesticks, and what are the candlesticks? They are the churches. The seven candlesticks are the seven churches. Why put the light there? Because the Lord Jesus Christ has made the church the pillar and ground of the truth. That is His institution. Now you can organize something, but Jesus organized the church. That is an institution which has the promise of this life and that which is to come. Yea, she it is "that looketh forth as the morning, clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners." Oh, but you say that means the invisible church. How on earth, if it is invisible, is it putting a candle on a candlestick? Do you mean an invisible candlestick? He is not referring to invisibility. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. God lighted the candle and it is eternal, but God says, Make it conspicuous, visible. Put it on the candlestick that everybody can see it shine. Unquestionably. Well, if it gets in the church it shines. How? It will help the church publish the principles of the Messianic kingdom. It will be in the church and shine and the waves of light radiating from the church will go out into the darkened heathen land upon the wings of every sermon and prayer and song. It will help advertise the truth of Jesus. In every sermon preached and prayer offered and song sung, let it be as if upon a ladder of promises it had gone up to the ceiling of the skies and placarded their whole scope with the promises of eternal life. That is the way you shine. You shine in your mission work. You shine in your example at home, in the school, everywhere. And now let me tell you, if your religion is worth a snap of the finger, take it into politics. Do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to have a religious political party, separate from every other, but I do mean, that whatever religion you have, let it be as potent in determining a political question as any other question. Let me give you a sublime illustration: William E. Gladstone was England's prime minister. To be prime minister of England means a vast deal more than to be President of the United States, for under the present British constitution the prime minister is the sovereign, the government of England. The Queen has nothing more to do with it than you have, but the prime minister of England is the Lord of England and her Empire. The British cabinet is not like the cabinet we have here in our country, merely advisers. Now he was prime minister of England, and had attained his premiership by combining the liberal elements of the political party in England and Scotland with the Irish element. The Irish element was led by Charles Stewart Parnell. Parnell was the king and chief of the Irish contingent, and he and Gladstone stood like two brothers, working together for the accomplishment of good for the whole empire. Well, now right in the midst of their great victory, an awful thing developed. A divorce suit was instituted against Mrs. O'Shea by her husband and making Parnell a co-respondent, and the fact brought out a moral depravity of heart in the case of Parnell - oh, such a sickening state of facts that Gladstone said, "If it costs me the prime minister's place I will not stand by the side of Charles Stewart Parnell. I will let the political party go. I am a Christian. I love God. I love God more than I love political party. I will not give this man the hand of

fellowship. Ireland must select another leader." Parnell refused to yield leadership. It divided the Irish vote and lost Gladstone's working majority in parliament. Well, of course, he had to resign, and he is the only man I know that actually preferred to be right than to be prime minister. Why, I tell you, the time sometimes comes when instead of showing you are a Christian by being willing to shake hands with everybody, you must show your Christianity by refusing to take a bad man's hand, even though he pose as a Christian. It may be that you cannot reach him by church discipline. It becomes necessary that he may be made to feel the force of righteous public opinion. I repeat it that there are degrees to which a church member may go in slandering his brethren, in breeding strife, in opposing or clogging the wheels of Christian progress, when to give him Christian recognition is a sin.. Such a man becomes a curse instead of a blessing. What though a man be a Baptist, and what though some church retain him in fellowship, yet he may so go astray in doctrines that this Scripture applies: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (2 John 1:10-11). Paul thus urgently entreats and exhorts the Romans: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" (Romans 16:17-18). He also thus enjoins the Corinthians: "I wrote to you in an epistle not to company with fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat" (1 Corinthians 5:9-11). He also urges Timothy "to turn away from" another class (2 Timothy 3:5). Indeed, there are men so adroit in the use of the forms and technicalities of the law they can, so far as human courts extend,' violate with impunity the spirit of the whole moral law. Such men are to be shunned, avoided, turned from. Let no good man receive them as friends. They are incorrigible. And particularly is this true of a fomenter and breeder of strife among brethren, or one, who like Satan, is a slanderer of his brother. If he is a man that is called a brother, if he claims to be a Christian, and does certain things, turn from him and let the whole world know that you do not claim fellowship with him. Says the Apostle, "Avoid him." If he can make you come up and stand beside him, so that he can say, "We two," and all the time proceed in infamy, all the time reap immoral rottenness, that is all he wants. He will spread the mantle of your Christianity over his vileness. Aaron Burr, for political reasons and from very slight causes, none such as are regarded sufficiently weighty to justify a challenge, forced a duel on Alexander Hamilton although he knew Hamilton would never fire a shot at him, and he murdered Hamilton. Now, it was a sign that the United States was not absolutely rotting, when the public sentiment spoke out as to the crime of dueling, and Burr, though he had been a leading spirit in one of the great political parties of this Union, was not socially recognized. Good people by whom he would sit down would get up and move away somewhere else. Would you have taken the hand of Benedict Arnold or of Judas Iscariot? To a certain extent the public enunciating that thundered over the head of Breckenridge of Kentucky was very Godlike; but when he stood up, and. without extenuation, without denying the facts, but openly confessing them, confessing his sin and asking forgiveness, I confess then there ought to have been mercy shown him. But, I tell you, if the principles of the Christian religion are not carried into society, if they are not carried into business, if they are not carried into politics, if we do not let

the light shine, then the salt has lost its savor and the light is out under a bushel. You are the light of the world and the salt of the earth, says the great Teacher. My own conclusions are never child's play. They are always reached after profound investigation of a subject. I would rather stand up by the side of a half a dozen who were occupying the platform of that Sermon on the Mount than to be one of a million on the opposing side. Oh, put the light on the candlestick! Blessed are the poor in spirit. Blessed are these that mourn on account of sin. Blessed are the meek. Blessed are those that hunger and thirst after righteousness, personal, practical righteousness, mark you, not imputed righteousness. It means absolutely sinless perfection. Such will come after a while. Blessed are the pure in heart. That means the fulness of sanctification, in absolute deliverance from the corruption that is in the world through lust. It, too, will come after a while. It is not all attainable now. But you may move toward it and you will be filled; you will ultimately see God. And now I thank you for having listened to me so long in discussing just two divisions in the Sermon on the Mount, as illustrating the character of the teaching of our blessed Lord. Oh, what teacher is like Jesus? Who of you would come and sit at the feet of Jesus? Who would say, Lord, let me enter thy class? Oh, tell me not how to possess external religion, nor altogether in what rites and ceremonies to profess religion; but, oh, Master, show me how to be right it aide, in the spirit, in my soul. Show me how to let the light so shine that when I die, when I pass away from the world, it may be said: "He was a part of the salt of the earth and of the light of the world."

# S. God Is Faithful

GOD IS FAITHFUL

TEXT: But the Lord is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil. - 2 Thessalonians 3:3. A proposition introduced by the conjunction “but” implies opposition to or contrast with preceding matters: “But the Lord is faithful.” Hence I read the context to show you that a great many people in this world have not faith, that they have not faith because they receive not the love of the truth, and as they will not receive the truth they become the subjects of delusions, the easy prey to the crafty. If a man does not love the truth, let him beware of the snare of the fowler. He can walk in no safe place. He can promise himself no immunity from danger. He can build on no stable foundation. However promising the outset, he cannot expect in the outcome to win, to be saved, to be happy. He will not only, as a natural consequence that is, following inexorable law reap that which he has sown, but above natural law is the decree of God’s just judgment, that a man who turns away his ear from the hearing of the truth, and pulls away his shoulder from the restraining hand of admonition, the man who lends easy credence to whisperings of evil, comes under the judicial condemnation of God,’ and that condemnation is that he shall believe a lie. Now, over against that insecurity, that bad outcome, is the text, “But the Lord is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil,” or to give it a better rendering perhaps, “keep you from the evil one.” There are three thoughts in the text which I wish to elaborate somewhat in discussion. The first is the faithfulness of God in general: “But God is faithful.” The second is the faithfulness of God in this particular, to-wit: Establishing His people, and the third is the faithfulness of God in another particular, to-wit: Keeping His people from evil. The first thought, then, is “The Lord is faithful.” Four or five times in the book of Revelation we have this appellation applied to our Lord, “The faithful and true witness.” The fidelity of God! It is the ground of all of our hope. I hope to be able to make that plain to you. I want you to get close up to the thought, not only to be able to see it and feel it, but embrace it, and receive it into your inmost souls. The faithfulness of God! Let us consider first this expression, “This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.” That presents the faithfulness of God in His tender of salvation to the lost, and in the adequateness of the provisions of that salvation. Some people allow their views concerning election and predestination, with kindred doctrines, to limit their conception of the fidelity of God, in their tender of salvation to all men. But God is faithful in the saying that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners. There is no mental reservation in that statement. It is as broad as the term, “sinners.” Hence when He sends His preachers out He says, “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.” He says, “Go make disciples of all nations.” He says, “I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.” “As I live, saith the Lord, I prefer that they would turn and live.” Now, we must believe that God is faithful in that statement, for in going out to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, if I distrust the fidelity of His offer of love and life to all men, if I circumscribe the scope of His offered mercy, if I narrow down to some cast-iron conception of my own the universality of His tender of salvation to fallen men, then I cannot preach right. And the church that, in its feelings, in its thoughts, in its plans and work, practically excludes

from the domain of possible salvation any race of men, black or white, intellectual, stupid, civilized or barbaric, or any church that circumscribes the influence of salvation within certain social limits, dishonors God and doubts His faithfulness in the saying that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. This is not only a faithful saying, but is worthy of all acceptation. I stand upon the fidelity of God in that statement. Let us notice further His general faithfulness. After you become a child of God and I quote a Scripture “If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” I plead for the acceptance of God’s faithfulness in that statement. There is infidelity in the heart of the backslider who stands aloof and distrusts God’s promise to forgive him if he will confess his sins. If we confess our sins God is faithful to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. A man may be a liar indeed, all men are liars but God is faithful, and when God says that if we confess our sins He will forgive our sins and cleanse us from unrighteousness, let no breath of distrust darken the clear crystal of promise through which shines the fidelity of God. He says that He will forgive you and that He will cleanse you and heal you of that backsliding if you will come to Him and confess it, and though mountains may crumble to a level with the plain, and great glaciers, that have been congealing since creation, may dissolve into the main, yet the Word of God abideth forever. Heaven and earth may fail, but not one jot or one tittle of God’s Word shall fail. When He tells you that if you will confess your sins He will forgive your sins and cleanse you from that unrighteousness, O, remember that God is faithful. Let us take up another instance. In the Letter to the Hebrews, the tenth chapter and the twenty-third verse, we have this language: “Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed in pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, for He is faithful that promised.” The general faithfulness of God then with reference to His promises is expressed in the Scripture: “All the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ Jesus.” You see a Christian disposed to waver, to drop out of line, to lay aside his armor, to cease from doing good, to absent himself from the assembly of God’s people, to become discouraged and demoralized, ready to halt, ready to faint, ready to turn loose, to him like the clarion notes of a trumpet comes the exhortation of this context: “Hold fast the profession of your faith.” Why? Because God is faithful to His promise. In view of which declaration there is no reason in the world for you to turn loose. If, indeed, God has forgotten, if God is asleep, if the Lord said some precious things years ago that have escaped His recollection, if God in any sense is unfaithful, then you do well to turn loose, but I do maintain that as long as God, who promised, is faithful, there is no warrant for any Christian’s turning loose his profession of faith. Notice again, in 2 Timothy 2:13, we have this language: “If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful: He cannot deny Himself.” You may deny yourself, but God cannot deny Himself. That is the reason that the gifts and callings of God are without repentance, that is, without a change of mind. He says, “I am the Lord. I change not. Therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.” You would have been consumed long ago if He had been as changeable as you are. You may not believe, but He abideth faithful, because He cannot deny Himself. “With Him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” “Jesus Christ, yesterday, today and forever the same.” He cannot deny’ Himself. The fidelity of God, His faithfulness, is predicated upon His immutability. God can not lie. God can not change. God is not a man that He should repent, and His word is not dependent upon the ever shifting and fainting fears and hopes, and confidences and despairs of men. Again, in consummating His work He is faithful. Consummate means to make a finish, that is to say, He knew all about the case before He started that good

work. Known unto God was the end as well as the beginning. He commenced that good work in you and He will finish it until the day of Jesus Christ. I want to read you two passages of Scripture bearing upon God's faithfulness in consummating the work that He commences. In 1 Corinthians 1:8-9, we have this statement: "God shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful, by whom ye were called into fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." Yes, God, who calls you is faithful, and "whom He called, them He justified, them He glorified." The Lord will finish His work, and His faithfulness is pledged to the absolute blamelessness of every job that He undertakes. It makes no difference from what pit you were digged. It makes no difference if a Syrian was your father. It makes no difference from what dregs of social outlawry you were rescued by His call to salvation. It makes no difference how feeble is your perception of truth, how slow you are to advance, nor how many thousand enemies obstruct you, nor how many hateful passions struggle in you to defeat the purposes of God, He will finish that work, and when He gets through with you there won't be a spot in you. You will be as white as snow. You will be blameless and faultless before the throne of God. What He commenced in regeneration He will carry on through both departments of sanctification, to-wit: The purification of the spirit and the glorification of the body. Now, this other scripture, in 1 Thessalonians 5:23-24 : "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it." Now that is a very precious scripture. The first part of our text then speaks of the faithfulness of God in general. And that faithfulness is the reason that the outcome of the Christian life is not so disastrous as the outcome of the infidel life. It explains the stability of the foundation resting on this Rock everlasting, and that Rock is Christ. And in Christ are the promises. And the guaranty of the promises is the faithfulness of God. More briefly let us consider the two particulars of God's faithfulness cited in this text, quoting the text again: "But God is faithful, who shall establish you and keep you from evil." "Who shall establish you." A number of scriptures refer to the establishing of God's people. Establishment assumes that when we enter the Christian life we are only babes in Christ, and need to have our faith increased, our Christian character built up. We need to attain to assurance of faith and hope. We need to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. We need to so grow that we shall attain to the stature of a man or woman in Christ Jesus. In other words, there is a Bible doctrine of confirmation not what people teach, that confirmation is a rite, a ceremony, that at a certain time you come up for Episcopal hands to be laid upon you and thereby be confirmed. There is nothing in that figment, but it is a doctrine of God that His people shall be confirmed, that they shall be established, strengthened, rooted, grounded. That is true. The whole matter of it depends on the fact that God is faithful. You remember, some of you, the humorous turn that Bro. W. D. Powell once gave to the doctrine of establishment. A little boy who had been listening to a talk on establishment in Christian faith was asked to explain what he understood by it. "Well" he says, "I think it is like this: My father was going to town the other day, driving in his wagon. There had been a big rain and for a good deal of the way matters were not established. The wagon would move some, some this way and some that way, but finally it got stuck so deep and tight in the mud it was fixed, and dad stood off and said, 'That wagon is established'." Now, that was his idea of it; that is, you may be established in wrong as well as established in good. And I am sure there are some people who started out on the road, the wagon rumbling lightly along, singing jolly songs, full of shouting, who long since have stuck in the mud and have become established. But that is the

establishment of the devil. If I had time, I would like to say a number of things on this, but I pass it to consider the last thought. “The Lord is faithful; He shall establish you and keep you from evil.” Whether you render this, “keep you from the evil one,” or “keep you from evil,” is immaterial to our argument. There is a power of comfort in it either way. My little girl recited to me the other night the Lord’s Player -what is called the Lord’s Prayer-it is our prayer; the Lord told us to pray that, and one of the things that He tells us to pray is, “Deliver us from evil,” or, as the Revised Version has it, “from the evil one.” She asked me what it meant. I read to her its correspondent in our Lord’s own prayer, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John. He uses this expression: “Father, I pray not that they be taken out of the world, but that they be kept from evil,” or “the evil one.” He tells us to pray, “Deliver us from evil.” He Himself prayed, “Father, deliver them from evil.” Now, our text says, “The Lord is faithful, who will keep you from evil,” or “the evil one.” Then I called her attention to the fifth chapter of John’s first letter where he is discussing the outcome of faith and sin, where he says that all unrighteousness is sin-no matter who does it, if it is unrighteousness it is sin-and where he says that all sin is not unto death. “There is a sin which is unto death; I do not say that you should pray for it,” and then adds, “Whoever is born of God sinneth not.” Sinneth not how? “Unto death.” Why? “That evil one toucheth him not.” The Lord is faithful in that He will keep you from the evil one. Oh! many a time since you, heart-broken with sorrow, eloquent in sighs of contrition, turned your first gaze of pleading toward salvation, many a time since then, the devil has wanted to sift you as wheat. He has been near to you. He has walked all around you and considered your case, as he considered Judas Iscariot’s, and you would have been snatched from your place in the church down to the very depths of hell a thousand times if God had not been faithful. But doubtless God said to the evil one, in your case, after the manner of His reply to Satan concerning Job, “For purposes of my own I will let you touch his property, but touch not his life.” The devil shall never touch that eternal life which we find in Christ Jesus. God is faithful in that He will keep us from the evil one. In 1 Corinthians 10:1-33, speaking of the difficulties of the Christian life, the Apostle Paul uses this language, bearing directly upon the point under discussion: “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 you are able.” It is a mistake if you think that you are to be tempted above your ability. You would be if God were not faithful, but God is faithful and He will not suffer you to be tempted above that you are able, but will with the temptation also make a way of escape, that you may be able to bear it. Now, there is an evil that comes, we may say almost directly, if not directly, from the devil, that is called the final calamity of the wicked. I mean when God’s hedges of restraint are all cut down. I mean when God’s restraining Spirit is all withdrawn. I mean when the spirit to pray for those that are in danger is taken out of the hearts of God’s children, when all of the opposing forces that have stayed the coming of the awful calamity upon the lost souls are withdrawn, when all of the props that held up the trembling walls of the doomed house are knocked from under it, when all of the foundations under the fabric where the thoughtless one is sleeping are weakened by withdrawal of restraining grace, then indeed has Satan the power of death. That calamity is instant, final, overwhelming. Now from that death God is faithful to deliver His people. Suppose we look at the case presented in the second letter of Peter and in the second chapter, which is merely a sample: “The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.” That is the general proposition. Then he cites as an instance of it, Sodom and Gomorrah, where He “delivered just Lot,” but He turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes. He also refers to the case of

Noah. He delivered Noah, but overwhelmed the wicked world. So God is faithful in that He will keep you from evil. God was faithful to Noah. Though the flood came; though all the skies were black; though shrouded in impenetrable gloom the whole heaven; though the only ray of light in that darkness is the leaping of the lightning; though the earth is quaking and' yawning to engulf the wicked world; though the foundations of the great deep are surging up to ,meet the down-pouring of the floods from above, which have been kept apart since God separated the waters in the days of ancient chaos; and though millions perish, God is faithful not to let a single one, not one, of His children perish. He knows how to deliver Lot, though he be but one in Sodom and Gomorrah. He knows how to deliver Noah, though only eight of the world are to escape. He knows how to deliver David, the lad. He knows how to deliver Peter, down in chains and guarded by Roman soldiers. He knows how to deliver Paul and Silas when they sing and pray in the Philippian jail. He knows how to send the comfort of the Holy Ghost through the bars of the prison of. John Bunyan and flood that soul with the light of heaven, and fill that brain with the conception of the greatest book, except the Bible, that was ever printed upon the earth, and finally to throw open that prison gate and bring out that man, the tinker, and crown him, and have a statue erected to him by the descendants of his very enemies. He knows how to deliver. God is faithful. Disbelieve what else you will, discredit any statement of man, discount any promise of father or mother, or brother or sister, but remember, as you value the things that make for your peace, that God is faithful in every one of His promises. It is our sure hope. It is granite under trembling feet. It is the green shore of the long expected land to the storm-tossed mariner. It is the harbor of safety to the sinking ship. It is the heaven, that home of light, to the prisoners of hope here on this earth, who have been groaning and travailing in spirit. God is faithful. Tell it to the sick when fever burns them, or rigors chill them: “Sick one, God is faithful.” Tell it to the dying when earth’s shores recede: “Dying one, God is faithful.” Tell it to the lost, without God and without hope in the world: “Lost one, only believe it, God is faithful.” Dear Lord, help this church to stand on this declaration: “God is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil.” Let us pray.

# S. God's Enlargement of a Church

GOD'S ENLARGEMENT OF A CHURCH TEXT: Run, speak to this young man. - Zechariah 2:4. A great many years ago in the city of Waco I heard a distinguished evangelist preach a sermon from this text, and he applied it in this way: That every Christian should take notice of every unconverted man in the city and run and speak to him about the salvation of his soul. He preached a very fine sermon, but not at all from this text, for it has no such application. And you may take it for granted that however good a sermon one may preach from a misconception of a text, there is always a better one to be found in that text, and which should have been the sermon preached. The circumstances of the text are these: A vast deal of interest centered in the Jewish people about the time of their captivity in Babylon, and many of the later books of the Old Testament are expressions of that interest. Much of the books of Jeremiah, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah and others bear upon that captivity or upon the deliverance from it. Now, Zechariah especially was commissioned to prophesy concerning this deliverance and restoration. I have read to you a number of his visions. The first was the vision of a man with a measuring line in his hand, going out on the ground where Jerusalem had stood, just as Chicago looked after it had been burned by fire, the whole city swept away. And the prophet asked this man with the measuring line what he intended to do. He replied that his purpose was to measure the length and the breadth of the Jerusalem to be restored, and mark out the lines where its new walls should be. But before he commenced his measurement, there came another angel from heaven with this word: "Run, speak to this young man," i.e., the man with the measuring line, the man who is laying off such a small space for God's city, and tell him that Jerusalem shall overflow these limits, that it shall go out into the country, that it shall be as an unwalled city that takes in all of the surrounding country, and God will be the wall to it, even as a wall of fire, and God will be the glory of it. The lesson, in a few words, was this: In the beginning of this enterprise, those who could not see with God's sight, and who could not rightly calculate the extent of God's power, nor understand the exceeding greatness of His precious promises, would, if left to themselves, lay off the boundaries of the new city on too small a scale. So my theme tonight is, "God's Enlargement of a Church; and His Glory in That Church." The appropriateness of the theme can be seen in a moment. You commenced an enterprise here some three years ago, with what calculations as to the outcome, I do not know, but I venture to say that those who started it, if everything had been built according to the highest calculation then in mind, would have been compelled by this time to revise that calculation and provide for greater things. The prophecy here primarily relates, as has been stated, to the restoration of the city of Jerusalem, but you do not read far into the book before you see that the prophet's eye is passing on from the literal Jerusalem to the spiritual Jerusalem, the true church of our Lord Jesus Christ. That is evident from the reading of the book. But I will first discuss the subject somewhat in its primary reference. Even in that undertaking there was this danger, that they might measure and lay off the enterprise according to the misfortunes which had come upon them. The whole nation had been subjugated. The city had been destroyed. There was scarcely a vestige of it left. The people had been led into captivity. Consider that condition from its human viewpoint. There would not be hopefulness enough in them to project the enterprise on a

sufficiently broad scale. Each would take counsel of his misfortunes and would gauge what was to be attempted by the magnitude of the reverses and losses that had come upon him in the past. We may safely say that in religious enterprises we should never lay out our work, we should never put the measuring line to the boundaries of our plans, prompted by despondency of heart arising from our past misfortunes. In the next place, those who started that new enterprise would, humanly speaking, be influenced by the poverty of the people who were to engage in it, who had been stripped of all their possessions by the captivity to which they had been subjected. A people that had been in slavery and deprived of the means of making and accumulating riches, going back to that burnt district, going back to rebuild a city, would likely, in laying out the work, look too much at the leanness of their purses, and so in endeavoring to restrict the length and breadth to their means, they would put it upon too infinitesimal a scale. And yet again, they were prompted to narrow the proposed boundaries of their enterprise by reason of their difficulties. Those difficulties assumed the proportions of a vast mountain. It was no small molehill. A huge, impassable granite mountain seemed to stand in their path, and when they saw that this mountain must be gotten out of the way and looked at their resources, the difficulty seemed to them to be insuperable. And so, having made their first calculation in view of these difficulties, it needed to be reconsidered. When a man taking counsel of his fears gazes upon the obstacles in his path, that seem to him to be more than he can possibly remove, and he begins to put down on his chart what, in view of these difficulties, he can accomplish, then he needs to hear the Word of God, “Run, speak to that young man. Drop that measuring line. You are not in the frame of mind to be an architect for God’s work. You lay the work out on too small a scale.” And still again, there were very active human enemies in the way of this enterprise. The Samaritans and other old foes of Israel who had rejoiced in its downfall were still ready enough to obstruct the re-establishment of that power which they dreaded and hated. They gathered themselves together to discourage and discomfit those who were engaged in the work. Now, one who proposed to lay out the boundaries of this work, and turned aside to consider its enemies and hearken to their words and sneers, who would, instead of hearing God, hear only Sanballat and Tobias mocking their feeble wall as they said, “Why, even if a fox should run against it, it would fall,” would make slow progress. Whoever intends to work for God should never go into the camp of the enemy to get advice as to how big a piece of work to undertake. If you consult your cowardice you can always be driven away from any grand, brave and heroic achievement. The man that takes counsel of his fears can never build for God. Yet again, these people looked at the infirmities and blemishes of the human instrumentalities that were to be employed in this work. Their high priest, instead of standing before them in the gorgeous apparel of Aaron, seemed to them to be clothed with filthy rags, and here stood Satan, ready to point at him and say, “Look at him. Behold his rags. See his infirmities. See what a fallible man he is. See his many faults. What can he do?” It is the object of this book to show that the Lord rebuked Satan, and that He commanded the filthy rags to be stripped from Joshua, the high priest, God putting away his iniquity and re-clothing him with the glorious insignia of his, priestly office, and giving power to his feebleness, so that he could accomplish this work. Then when they looked at that mountain that has just been described, the angel caused the prophet to see a golden lamp-stand with seven lamps on it, and an olive tree standing on each side of it, and pipes going from the olive trees and connecting with the bowls of the lamps, and he said, “Do you know what this means?” “No, I don’t know what it means.” “Well, it means this: What art thou, O mountain, before Zerubbabel? It is true that there may not he much oil in these lamps. It is true that they may

be just now shining dimly. But those olive trees are rich with their own fatness, and the pipes from the olive trees connect with the lamp bowls, and while the supply of oil seems low, it shall never entirely cease. It shall be continually fed, and God Himself will supply strength that will compensate for the feebleness and the infirmity of the human agents employed in this work." "Then, as to those enemies, do not look at them. Look up yonder. What is it you see?" "I see a flying book." "That is the book of God's curses, and that book, like a hawk circling in his flight and coming lower and lower, and hovering over his prey, is ready to swoop down upon the foe of God, and that book of curses is ready to light upon the house of the adversary and to be as a consuming fire to it, so that you need have no fear of an enemy when you consider the provision that God has made for their discomfiture." So the leaders of a new church enterprise should never consider the smallness of their monetary resources, nor the magnitude of the difficulties in the way, nor the opposition of the enemies of, God. And more than that, they should never measure a result by the smallness of the beginning. The prophecy goes on here to declare, "Despise not thou the day of small things." A mustard seed is the smallest of all seeds, and yet behold, it grows until it becomes a tree in which the fowls of the air can find shelter. That was a monster image looming up before Nebuchadnezzar the king, a stupendous, towering, colossal image, taller than the Statue of Liberty, taller than the Colossus of Rhodes, higher than the Pyramids, with its head of gold, its breast of silver, its body of brass, its legs and feet of iron, and yet there was cut out of the mountain, and without hands, a little stone, a pebble. What a little thing! But when it started coming down that mountain it increased in size and in momentum and in weight, and as it rolled it gathered solidity and substance and power and impetus and struck that image, and crushed it and pulverized it, and rolled on and swelled as it rolled, and grew larger by rolling until it filled the whole earth. Out on the streets of some crowded city at night, a match may be thrown down and fall upon a single shaving, and it will catch, and burning, curl, and curling, fall over on a pile of shavings, and from the shavings extend to a shed, and from the shed to a house, and from the house through a block, and from the block through a mighty city. A boy walking along the dykes of Holland, those mighty upheavals of earth that constitute the breakwaters of the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean, may notice just a little crack on the top of the levee, through which trickles, drop by drop, a tiny stream. A little child could dam it up with his foot, but it grows, and deepens and widens the channel, until at last through the mighty crevasse an angry ocean pours in and floods a state. Who can forecast the outcome from a small beginning? I say to you, brethren, that in your enterprise you should but consider the following things: First, what has God commanded? Let us lay off our work according to the commandment, and if the commandment is exceedingly broad, we will yet follow that precept, and if we are staggered at the magnitude of what we are commanded to do, then let us look at the promises, and see how large they are, how exceedingly many, and how glorious in the effulgence of their brightness, and so lay off our work by the commandments and promises of God. And not only this, but we should take into account the power of God. It is not, What can I do? Let me not consult my feebleness. But is anything too hard for God to do? Are there any impossible things for Him? And if we forget what He has commanded and what He has promised, and the greatness of His power, and still are troubled by our own infirmities, by our feebleness, by the difficulties, by the dangers, by the sneers and prophecies of evil, oh! then we need in that hour of trembling and of despair that the angel voice shall be heard, "Run, speak to that young man, and tell him that Jerusalem shall be too big for walls to enclose it. It shall grow out into the country. It shall take in the villages, and I will increase it with men like a flock." Perhaps in

every congregation are some who partake in large measure of the pessimistic spirit. They are not equal to great undertakings. As Spurgeon said, in speaking about the ark with its three stories, there are some good souls always anxious to go as steerage passengers; they want to be next to the bilgewater where they can be frightened enough by the sound of the waves striking upon the sides of the vessel. They need to come up where the window is, where they can look out and behold how strong and how mighty God is. So God, wherever He has authorized His people to form a church, has promised them enlargement, and all calculations should be made with reference to that. It may be unsuitable to such a grave theme to refer to a little matter that occurred when I was a young man, but I will state it. I had been but a short tithe in the ministry and with Rev. Martin V. Smith, of Belton, was making a visit to Brenham. He said to me, “I want you to go with me to a certain house today to take dinner. I am authorized to invite you, and you will see the strangest house you ever did see.” Well, when the time came, we went up to this place to take dinner, and as soon as I got in sight of the house I commenced laughing I could not help it. It was indeed the strangest and most composite structure I ever saw. The premises occupied a whole block, and the house had the capacity to front in any direction. It was only one story high, but it was built all over that yard. It was the home of that well known and large hearted Baptist, Charlie Breedlove, who thus explained his habitation: “The truth of the business is, when I first married I didn’t know much. I didn’t have much sense nor much faith, and we built this first room you see here. Then when the first baby was born, we added that room, and when the next baby was born, we added another room, and when the next baby was born, we added still another room, and we have kept on adding a room whenever a baby was born, until now this house covers all the yard.” In other words, his habitation had to be continually reset. The original boundaries never did fit the subsequent conditions of the household. Applying this now to the case before us: There are, as I stated, certain pessimistic people in every congregation. To them the world seems to be growing worse all the time. All of the bright days, are in the past, and all of the good people lived a long time ago. The lights are continually going out and the darkness is continually approaching. In their view of it, the whole kingdom of God is continually narrowing, the flock of God getting smaller and smaller, and the flock of the devil getting bigger and bigger, until they expect at the last day there will be just a handful of God’s people on the earth. But when our Lord speaks on the subject, He speaks in a different way. In the day that Abraham had faith in God, he was told to look up and count the stars in the heavens, and see if he could number them. “I say unto you that your seed shall be more than the stars of heaven. Count the leaves on the trees of the forest. They shall be more than the, leaves. Go down where the ocean kisses and fondles the white sand of the beach, and these shall not sufficiently express the number of the redeemed.” And when our Lord was exalted to the right hand of the- Majesty on High, this special declaration was made: “In the day that thou leadest out thine armies thy young men shall be more multitudinous than the drops of the dew in the dawn of the morning.” And when the outcome was seen by the Apostle John, he says: “I saw a multitude that no man could number, out of every nation and tribe and tongue and kindred; all of them washed whiter than snow; all of them with palm leaves of victory in their hands; all of them with harps of music, upon which to strike with skillful fingers the paeans of praise and of victory; all of them crowned kings and priests unto God.” O young man, measuring the length of Jerusalem, measuring the breadth of Jerusalem, never measure it by your feebleness, your power, your enemies, their prophecies, their sneers. Never measure it by the mountains that rise up in the way. But only measure by God’s command, God’s promise and by God’s power. Very

briefly I refer to the next thought of the text: Jerusalem, like every other city of its day, depended upon its walls and so, when the measure is taken, these walls were built very high, and even when Titus came to besiege that city, they trusted in the height and solidity of their walls. But God had in view a different Jerusalem; a Jerusalem on no such narrow basis; a Jerusalem that would include the entire Gentile world. And He says, “Say to this man with the measuring line that Jerusalem shall not be as a walled city, it shall be as an unwalled country, and if you want a wall, God, who enlarges it, will also defend: He will be a wall of fire around about you to protect you.” The ingenuity of fear has exhausted itself in providing coverts where it can flee in the time of danger, or in providing defensive armor impervious to the arrows and spears and bullets of an adversary, but we may go on multiplying our defenses, and there is no secure defense except the word of God’s promise. If God be between us and our foes, what signify their numbers? If God be upon our side, and we are really carrying out His commands, why stop to talk of the difficulties? And if that injunction does rest on us, why stop to consider the smallness of our crowd? Was there a mighty host with Gideon when with his lamps and his pitchers he went forth to smite the enemy? Were there not just twelve humble men sent out to bombard by their gospel the fortifications of idolatry throughout the heathen world? “It is not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.” And that congregation that will go forth trusting not to numbers, trusting not to wealth, fearing not an adversary, undaunted by any degree of difficulty or obstacle that may intervene in their pathway, and that will lean hard upon the encircling arm of Divine Providence, that congregation will have between them and all the spears and arrows of opposition thick bosses of Jehovah’s buckler, and in God they will conquer. Look now at the last thought of the text: They were very much concerned when they built their temple, because of its inferiority to the temple which Solomon built, and the old men were weakened, “Ah, me! I recall that first temple. Oh, it had gold and jewels and precious stones! It was a glorious building.” God says, “Go, do what I have commanded, and I will be the glory. I will be the glory of this building which you erect.” And then He stated that on account of the presence of the Messiah the glory of the latter temple should exceed the glory of the former temple, so that we look to this as the crowning thought. Now, to summarize: First, enlargement from God; second, protection from God; and third, God the glory of what we do. It was a little tabernacle that Moses erected, that little cube of a place called the “Most Holy Place;” what an insignificant room it was, and yet there was in that room an unquenchable tongue of fire that represented the eternal presence and power of God. God was the glory o at tabernacle, the same glory that filled Solomon’s temp and will fill this prophetic Jerusalem of which the prophet Zechariah is speaking. What signified that typical flame of fire that burned between the cherubim? There was to be a different light, a real luminary, which when it came into the building however infinitesimal, however contemptible in the sight of those who did not favor it, when that luminary descended and filled this house of God, it made it brighter than if you had gathered into one ball of light every star that ever sparkled, and then wound up on your finger every ray of sunshine that ever radiated from that central orb, and had put it all into one great shining ball of fire, brighter than all that. It was the holy spirit of God, and on the day of Pentecost the spiritual Jerusalem that Zechariah saw was filled with that spirit, and that spirit was the glory of it, and where that spirit was, the timid became brave. The Peter that cowered before a maid-servant is now as bold as a lion. The men who despaired having once trusted that this was He that would deliver Israel, now lifted up their heads, which had been hanging down like the bulrushes, and confronted their fellowman, courageous in their faith, undismayed by any combination that could

be brought against them, and under the power and glory of the holy spirit, even when they prayed the ground was shaken where they knelt down. And the work spread and went beyond Jerusalem. The spiritual Jerusalem enlarged and took in Alexandria in Africa, and enlarged and took in ancient Babylon, and still enlarged and took in Ephesus and Tarsus; and still enlarged and went over into Europe and took in Philippi and Corinth and Athens, and still enlarged and took in Rome and Spain and England, and spread its wings and crossed the Atlantic and took in the New World and the Ads of the sea. If, when that great work was being out, some man, near-sighted, unable to see the things that were afar off, some man taking counsel of his fears, had taken up the measuring line and had said, “I will lay off the metes and bounds of God’s Kingdom,” O, run and speak to that young man! Tell him to expect great things and to attempt great things. Tell him to enlarge the place of his tent and lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, and open his heart, and lift up his eyes, as the prophets did, and hear Jerusalem saying: “Who are these? Who are these? Who are these? What means this rush of many pinions, that like doves come flying to my window?” These are the children that God is giving to thee. They come from Arabia. They come from heathen lands. They come from the islands of the sea. And as they come they bring their power and their resources to the City of God. Brethren of the Columbus Street Church, if you have set up a banner for the Lord, if, in your judgment, it is necessary to establish this church, if it yet seems to you that the work of a church should be done here, then let me urge you to beware of little measuring lines. Look at God’s commands. Look at His promises. Look at His power. Do not look at your poverty. Do not look at your fewness. O, be brave, be hopeful, be courageous, and all the time ready to increase and grow in grace, and in numbers and in power! I am sure that enlargement ought to be the destiny of every church established in accordance with the will of God. I have thought it proper, on your third anniversary, to call your attention to these things. I do know that the most deadly virus, the most dangerous poison, that ever entered into the veins of a congregation is the feeling of despondency and discouragement to go and look at the Promised Land, spy it out and say, “It is a fine country, but, oh! those sons of Anak are there, and we are just grasshoppers in their sight, and in our own sight.” It makes no difference about your being a grasshopper in other people’s sight, but whenever you are but a grasshopper in your own sight, then you are whipped already. No man that stands for God and does God’s work ought to count himself less than a giant. He does not represent himself. He represents the cause of the Lord Jesus Christ. I recall, and I close with this declaration, the meetings, many years ago, of our general bodies in this State, to which those who wanted to work would go up heart-broken and urge, “Brethren, are we never going to do anything but quarrel when we meet? Are we never going to move out? Are we never going to send the Gospel to the destitute places in this State? Oh, for mission progress, for some trumpet voice that will wake us up to do what, under God, we are able to do and ought to do.” And now you see when they lay out the plans they lay them out with perfect coolness on a basis of $100,000 a year. It would have frightened the Baptist crowd in Texas half to death, twenty years ago, to have mentioned that much enlargement. I commend the thought, bright enough in my own mind, but so imperfectly presented. I commend it to you in the name and in the fear of God. Measure as God measures, and trust Him and let Him be the wall, and let His be the glory. f2

Chapter 75

# S. IF THINE EYE OFFEND TREE

IF THINE EYE OFFEND THEE

TEXT: If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. - Mark 9:47-48.

What is briefly the meaning of the word, "offend?" If thy hand offend thee, if thine eye offend thee, if thy foot offend thee; what is the meaning of this word? We find it in the English in the word "scandal;" that is, "scandal" is the Anglicised form of the Greek word here used. But the word "scandalize," as used in the English, does not express the thought contained in this text, since that is a modern-derived meaning of the word. Originally it meant the trigger of a trap that trigger which, being touched, caused the trap to fall and catch one ¾ and from its original signification it came to have four well known Bible meanings. An instance of each one of the four meanings, fairly applicable to our text today, will be cited.

First, it means a stumbling-block, that which causes any one to fall, and in its spiritual signification, that which causes any one to fall into sin. If thy hand causeth thee to fall into sin; if thine eye causeth thee to fall into sin; if thy foot causeth thee to fall into sin, cut it off, pluck it out. It is more profitable to enter heaven maimed than to have the body cast into bell. The thought is as you see it in connection with a stumbling block, that you fall unexpectedly into the sin, as if you were going along not looking down and should suddenly stumble over something in your regular path, where you usually walked. Now, if thine eye causeth thee, in the regular walk of life, to put something in that pathway that, when you were not particularly watching, will cause you to stumble and fall into sin ¾ that is the first thought of it. Its second meaning is an obstacle, or obstruction that causes you to stop. You do not fall over this obstacle, but it blocks your way and you stop. You do not fall, but. you do not go on. To illustrate this use of the word, John the Baptist, in prison, finding the progress of his faith stopped by a doubt, sent word to Christ to know, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" evidently showing that some unbelief had crept into his heart that had caused him to stop. He was not going on in the direction that he had been going and hence, when Jesus sent word to John of the demonstrations of His divinity, He added this expression, using this very word, "Blessed is the man who is not offended in me." Blessed is the man who in me does not find an obstacle that stops him. Anything that is an occasion of unbelief fulfills this meaning of the word. If thine eye causes something to be put in thy path that suggests a doubt as to the Christian religion, and by that doubt causeth thee that had been going steadily forward to stop, pluck it out.

Let me give another illustration. In the parable of the sower, our Savior, in expounding why it was that the grain that had fallen upon the rock and came up and seemed to promise well for a while, afterwards, under the hot sun, withered away and perished, says, there are some people that hear the word of God and, for a while seem to accept it, but when tribulation or persecution cometh they are offended ¾ they are stopped. That is the meaning of the word strictly. Persecution and

tribulation cometh and an obstacle is put in their path that causes them to stop.

Now, if thine eye causes an obstacle to be put in thy Christian path, that causeth thee to stop and not to go forward, pluck it out.

Yet another illustration: You remember that our Savior, who had announced a great many doctrines that people could easily understand and accept, suddenly, on one occasion, announced a hard doctrine, very hard, and from that time it is said that many of His disciples followed Him no more. They stopped. Now, there was something in them, in the eye or the hand or the foot, that found an occasion of unbelief in the doctrine He announced, and they stopped.

I remember a very notable instance, where a man, deeply impressed in a meeting, and giving fair promise of having passed from death to life, happened to be present when the scriptural law of the use of money was expounded, and he stopped. He stopped. Some obstacle stretched clear across his path. It was the love of money in his heart. He couldn't recognize God's sovereignty over money. As if he had said,

"If you want me to cry, I will cry; if you want me to join the church, I will join it; if you want me to be baptized, I will be baptized; but if you want me to honor God with my money, I stop."

Now the third use of the word: It is sometimes used to indicate, not something over which you stumble and fall into a sin, and not an obstacle that blocks up your pathway, but in the sense of something that you run up against and hurt yourself and so become foolishly angry. As when one at night, trying to pass out of a dark room, strikes his head against the door, and in a moment flies into a passion. Now, if thine eye causeth thee to run up against an object that when you strike it offends you, makes you mad, pluck it out and cast it from thee.

These three senses of this word have abundant verifications in the classical Greek and a vast number of instances in the Bible, in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. But there is a fourth use of the word to which I will have occasion to refer more particularly at the conclusion of the sermon, in the climax; that is, where the eye has caused a man to turn aside from the right path and to reject the wise counsel of God, and to indulge in sin until God has given him up; then God sets a trap for him right in the path of his besetting sin. In Romans 11:9 you will find that use of the word: "Let their table be made a trap for them." That is to, say that God, after trying to lead a man to do right, if he persists in doing wrong, the particular sin, whatever that may be, whether it be of pride or lust or pleasure, whatever it may be, that particular besetting sin which has caused him to reject God shall be made the occasion of his ruin, and in the track of it God will set the trap, and the man is certain to fall into it and be lost.

Now, these are the four Bible uses of this term, "offend" Greek: skandalon, the noun, and skandalizo, the verb. If thine eye causeth thee to offend, that is, if your eye causes you to put something in your path over which you will unexpectedly fall into a sin; if thine eye causeth thee to put an obstacle clear across your path, so that you stop; if thine eye causeth thee to put some object against which you will unthoughtedly run and hurt yourself and become incensed; if thine eye causeth thee to go into a sin that shall completely alienate you from God, and in the far distant track of which God sets a trap that will be sure to catch your soul, pluck it out. The next thing needing explanation: People who look at the shell of a thing may understand the text to mean mutilation of the body. They forget that the mutilation of the body is simply an illustration of spiritual

things. Take a case that you will understand. One of the most beautiful and sweet-spirited girls in this city, before whom there seemed to stretch a long and bright and happy future, was taken sick, and the illness, whatever the doctors may call it, was in the foot and the blood would not circulate. The doctors could not bring about the circulation and that foot finally threatened the whole body. Then the doctors said, "This foot must be cut off; it must be amputated." And they did amputate it. They amputated it to save her life. They cut off that member because it offered the only possible means of saving the other foot and both hands and the whole body and her life. It was sternness of love, resoluteness of affection, courage of wisdom that sacrificed a limb to save the body. Now using that necessity of amputation as an illustration, our Savior says, "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; if thy foot offend thee, cut it off. If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out." But that He does not mean bodily mutilation is self-evident from this, that if you were to cut off your hand you could not stop the spiritual offense; if you were to pluck out the eye you could not stop the spiritual offense on the inside of the soul; no lopping off of external branches would reach that. But what our Savior means to teach is this: That a wise physician who discovers seated in one member of the body a disease that if allowed to spread will destroy the whole body, in the interest of mercy cuts off that diseased limb so, applying this to spiritual things, whatever causes you to fall into sin, cut loose from it at every cost. One other word needs to be explained-the word Gehenna. I have explained it a number of times, but will explain it very briefly again: It is a little valley next to Jerusalem that once belonged to the sons of Hinnom. It came to pass that in that valley was instituted an idol worship, and there the kings caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch, and because of this iniquity a good king of Israel defiled that valley, made it the dumping ground of all refuse matter from the city. The excrement, the dead things, the foul and corrupt matter were all carried out and put in that valley. And because of the corruption heaped there worms were always there, and because of the burning that had been appointed as a sanitary measure, the fire was always there. That was used as an illustration to indicate the spiritual condition of a lost soul, of a soul that had become entirely separated from God and given up to its own devices; that had become bad through and through; that had become such a slave to passion, or lust or crime that it was incorrigible, and the very nature of the sin which possessed it was like a worm that never dies. There was a gnawing, a ceaseless gnawing going on, referring to the conscience, and there was a burning and a thirst going on. Now those images our Savior selected to represent the thought of hell. Having explained its words now look at the text: "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out." What is the principle involved in that extortion? First, that it is a man’s chief concern to see that he does not miss the mark, that he does not make shipwreck; that he does not ruin himself. That is the chief concern of every boy, of every girl, of every man and woman, to see to it that you do not miss the mark of your being; that you do not shipwreck; that you do not go to utter ruin. The next thought involved in it is that in case you do miss the mark, in case you do make shipwreck, in case your soul is lost, then there is no profit and no compensation to you in anything you ever had. For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? If he misses the main thing, if he makes shipwreck of his own soul, then wherein does the compensation come to him that in his life he had this or that treasure, this pleasure or that, that he was able to attain to this ambition or that; that he for such a while, no matter how long, was on top in society or fashion in the world? What has it profited him if the main thing worthy of supreme concern is lost? The next thought is this: Whatever sacrifice is necessary to the securing of the main thing, that you must make. That is what this text means, and no matter how dear a treasure may be to you; no matter how much you

esteem it, if it be necessary that you should give it up or that your soul should be lost, this text calls on you to give it up. A man may have in a ship a vast amount of money which he idolizes, but in the night he is alarmed by the cry of fire; he rushes upon the deck and he finds that the ship is hopelessly in flames and that the only way of escape is to swim to the shore. Now he stands there for a moment and meditates, "I have here a vast amount of money, in gold. If I try to take this gold with me in this issue in which the main thing, my life, is involved, it will sink me. My life is worth more than this money. O, glittering gold, I leave you! I strike out, stripped of every weight and swim for my life." It means that he ought to leave behind everything that would jeopardize his gaining the shore. A ship has a valuable cargo. It has been acquired by toil and anxiety and industry. It may be that the cargo in itself is perfectly innocent, but in a stress of weather, with a storm raging and with a leak in the vessel rising, it becomes necessary to lighten that ship. Now whatever is necessary to make it float, to keep it above the water, that must be done. If there be anything which, if permitted to remain in that ship will sink it, throw it out. They that do business in great waters know the wisdom of this. Why? It is a question of sacrificing the inferior to the greater and better. The next thought involved in this text is this: Whenever it says,. "If thine eye offend thee pluck it out," I do venture to say that it is a demonstration, by the exhortation addressed to you personally, that if ruin comes to you it comes by your own consent. I mean to say that no matter what is the stress of outside seduction, nor how cunningly the devil may attempt to seduce and beguile you, that all the devils in hell and all the extraneous temptations that may environ a man can never work his shipwreck, if he does not consent.

What is the next point involved in this text? That whenever one does consent to temptation, whenever the ruin comes to him, it comes on account of some internal moral deliquency. Out of the heart are the issues of life. Out of the heart proceed murder, lust, blasphemy and every crime which men commit. I mean to say that as the Bible declares that no murderer shall inherit eternal life, that external incentives to murder amount to nothing unless in him, in the man, in the soul, there be a suspectibility or a liability or moral weakness that shall open the door to the tempter and let in the destroyer.

Now if that be true we come naturally to the next thought in this text, that if God saves a man, and if God can save a man, He must save him in accordance with the laws of his own nature. That is to say, that God must, in order to the salvation of that man, require truth in the inward part; that nothing external will touch the case; that God’s requirements must take hold, not of the long delayed overt act, but of the lust in the heart which preceded the act and made the act. And therefore, while a human court can take jurisdiction only of murder actually committed, God goes inside of the man and says, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." From hate comes murder. If God saves you He must save you from the internal hate. Human law takes hold of a case of adultery. God’s law goes to the eye: "Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart." God requireth truth in the inward part. And I tell you if you are saved you must be saved internally; you must be saved not only from the guilt and penalty of sin, but you must be saved from the love of it and from the dominion of it.

Now, the next point: With that law looking inside, looking at your thoughts, looking at the springs of action, the question comes up, "How shall one keep from making shipwreck? How shall one save his soul? How shall one so attain to the end of his being as that in the main thing he shall not miss the mark?" Well, he has got to look at it as an exceedingly sober question. There is no child’s play

about it. You must not rely upon the quack remedies of philosophers and impostors, or rely upon any external rite, upon joining the church or being baptized, or partaking of the Lord's supper. The awful blasphemy of calling that the way to heaven! God requireth truth in the inward part, and if you are saved, you must be saved inside. As a wise man, having as my chief business to save my soul, I must scrupulously look at every thing with which I come in contact.

Some men's weaknesses are in one direction and some in another, but the chief thing for me is to find out my weakness ¾ what is my besetting sin, where is the weak point in my line of defense, where am I most susceptible to danger, where do I yield most readily? And if I find that the ties of blood are making me lose my soul, I must move out of my own family, and therefore in the Mosaic law, it is expressly said, that "If thine own son, if the wife of, thy bosom, shall cause thee to worship idols and turn away from the true God, thou shalt put thine own hand on the head as first witness, that they may be stoned." Thou shalt not spare. It is a question of your life, and if your family ties are such that they are dragging you down to death, O boy, O girl, I tell you to strike out for your life. And that is why marriage is the most solemn and far-reaching question that ever came up for human decision. More souls are lost right there, more women go into hopeless bondage, more men are shipwrecked by that solemn tie, than by anything else.

Look next at your associates. With whom do you associate? Knowing your weakness, knowing the point upon which you are most easily led astray, what is the moral effect on you of the company you keep? Does it tend to strengthen you against that susceptibility? Suppose your inclinations, your weak point, is distrust of the truth of God. Faith is hard for you. You have to battle on that. Now, as you value the salvation of your soul, turn from the man or from the woman whose influence continually leads you to distrust God and His promises. You ought to move away from that kind of an association if that is, your weakness; if that is your danger point you ought to move away from it sooner than you would move from the edge of a precipice, from a den of rattlesnakes, and as you run stop your ears and cry, "Life, life, life! I am shunning you, O companion, that I may have life."

There are men in this town ¾ I know them and you know them-that have caused hundreds of weak Christians to stumble, to fall into the sin of unbelief, by the eternal suggestions of doubt and cavilings and besmirchings, that they cast upon the holiness of religion, the divinity of Jesus Christ and the uncertainty of hell. A devil to you is such a one, a devil to you.

Consider books! Maybe your tendency is to lust. Maybe you are like a young man that came to me in tears and said, "I am a slave, bound hand and foot, without powers of resistance!" Then in the name of heaven never read one of those foul books that excite lust. Never look on obscene or indecent pictures that beget it.

Never go to dances that suggest it, Stay away, as you value your life. "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out. If thy foot offend thee, cut it off. It is profitable to thee to go into heaven with one eye and one hand and one foot, rather than to lose thy body and soul in hell."

I tell you that a very large proportion of the realistic novels of the present day are written with a view to shipwreck souls. And as a man cannot touch pitch without being defiled, as no man can put fire in his bosom and not be burned, no man can read them without being injured by them. You may think you are too strong, and you may prate about nude art. And yet, if art comes to you in the

guise of a harlot, if art comes to you, for instance, like the Stella of the Cotton Palace, that had been exhibited in saloons as an enticement to death, don't look. It is a matter of life with you, my boy. Your soul's salvation is dependent upon it.

Now it is a desperate case; and it is a desperate remedy that it calls for. I know it is bad to lose the foot or the hand or the eye, but you had better lose all your members and save your soul than to keep your members and go to hell. For into hell you go in that path, as sure as God reigns. There is no hope for you.

Boys, if your business calls upon you to sell whiskey, if your business calls upon you to desecrate God's holy day, then quit the business. Starve rather than live that way. I would no more make money by selling whiskey by which men's souls are lost, I would no more support my family by working on Sunday, than I would by robbery and stealing. "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out." It is a question of life and death with you. That is all there is in it, and you can make your own selection. I tell you, if anything in the ties which bind you, in the comrades which are about you, in your business, in your pleasures, if these games and dances (and you are a good judge on that), if they tend to deaden your moral sensibilities, if they tend to cool your religious fervor, if the trend of them is to lead you away from God, if they are foes to Christ, then in the name of God, turn your back on them or you are lost. That is all there is in it. You are lost.

Here are the things by which the loss generally comes: First; the lust of the flesh. That man makes himself a beast, that is all you can say about him. He counts himself the brute that perishes who is the slave of animal passion. His case is piteous. Oh, to be the slave of such a debasing, rotten thing! I tell you, you are lost, lost, if you cannot by some means effect your freedom. And of all the degrading deaths to die, the idea of a soul dying on account of lust! The next is love of money. Oh, you know and I know, that there are some men on the church book whose love of money raises the question whether they are saved.

You are bound to raise the question, "Is that, can that be a child of God?" Oh, the love of, money! That is a root of all evil. If you hang on to your money, if you let that love of money dominate your soul, it will wreck your soul. That is all there is n it. It is, cut off or die, pluck out or die, one or the other. Desperate case, desperate remedy. The next is the pride of life. Just do look at him. You can see the smirk of conceit on the face. You can see the self-complacency and the evident consciousness of superiority over the lower classes. Pride of life! Proud when morally rotten, proud when the seal of condemnation is on that face; pride of life, when the devil already has your quarters prepared for you. Pride of life, when you go out of this world a bankrupt and when your associate shall be that prince of pride, who himself fell from heaven by pride. The most helpless species of pride is intellectual pride ¾ the pride that comes to a man because he is a philosopher, because he is a scholar, and the pride that will not come down to the humility that is required in the gospel. Oh, how he puffs out his cheeks, how he scorns those that are following after the things that are well enough for women. and children and idiots, but an intellectual man ¾ oh, yes, an intellectual man! Very seldom is such a man ever saved, very seldom indeed.

Now, to close this matter: Right in the track of your besetting sin when you have yielded to it, when you have refused to use the remedy that has been pointed out, right in the track of it God sets His trap. What does He say? "I warned that man. I warned that woman. I showed them plainly that that path led to death and hell, and they would none of my counsel. They turned away from me. I

called: they would not hear." They go on, until at last God says to His Spirit: "Give him up. Give him up to his own devices. Let him eat the fruit of his own way and set a trap that shall catch him right in the track of that besetting sin; you are sure to get him. Now when you get him here is his picture."

I do wish you would listen to Bunyan's Pilgrim:

"The Holy Spirit led Christian into a house and says, 'I will show you a picture.' So He took him by the hand and led him into a very dark room, where there sat a man in an iron cage. The man seemed very sad. He sat with his eyes looking down to the ground. His hands were folded together as if there was no hope. And he sighed as if his heart would break.

"Then says Christian: 'What does this mean, this dark room, this iron cage, these folded hands, these awful sighs of despair? What does it mean?' The Holy Spirit says: 'Ask the man himself.' Christian said: 'What art thou?' 'I am what I once was not.' 'What wert thou once?' 'Once I was a fair and flourishing professor of religion, (mark that) both in my eyes and in the eyes of others. I thought I was fair for the Celestial City and I used to have joy at the thought that I would get there when I died.' 'Well, what are you now?' 'Now I am a man of despair. I am shut up in this iron cage. I cannot get out. O, now I cannot get out.' 'But how did you come into this condition?' 'I left off to watch and be sober. I laid the reins on the neck of my lust. I sinned against the light of God's Word. I sinned against the goodness of God. I have grieved His Spirit and He is gone. He is gone, and I have admitted the devil and he is here. I have provoked God to anger. I have so hardened my heart that I cannot repent.'

"But there is hope; O Holy Spirit, is there no hope for such a man? 'Ask the man,' says the Spirit. 'O man, the Son of God is very merciful. Is there no hope for you?' 'None in the world. I have crucified Him afresh. I have despised His person. I have despised His righteousness. I have counted His blood an unholy thing. I have done despite to the Spirit of Christ. Therefore, God has shut. me up in here. God shut me up in here and there comes to me in here nothing but threatenings and horrible apprehensions and awful memories of what might have been.'

"'For what did you bring yourself into this condition? What did you get by it? What did you have in view to get into such a fix?' 'For the lusts, pleasures and profits of this world, in the enjoyment of which I did then promise myself much delight, but now every one of these things is an undying worm and a tongue of flame.' 'But can't you now turn and repent?' 'God's Word gives me no encouragement. God has given me up to eat of the fruit of my own ways. Oh, eternity, Oh, eternity, Oh, eternity, how shall I spend eternity! Where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched?'"

I do call heaven and earth to witness this day that I put before you life and death. I say you must turn from your sin or you are lost, wholly, absolutely and forever lost. And you ask me what is the remedy? Blessed be God, I can give it to you. I can show you the remedy. There is no use in saying there is no remedy. There is. There is an adequate remedy. What is it? In the first place, settle it right now that the chief thing you have to do in this world is to save your soul, that everything else is subordinate to that, and that whatever tie of family or association, or books, or business, or pleasure, or fashions, God helping you, whatever of them has a tendency to lead you to death on your weak point, turn your back on them for your life. Use every means of grace that God has provided for your escape. Accept now, from the heart, the Lord Jesus Christ as your

righteousness.

Then remember that you cannot cast evil out of the heart and leave it empty. Put something in it. Fill it up! Fill it up! Then these pleasures cannot come back. Fill it up with what? This is the crisis of it, and I stand on this, even if I go to judgment on it. In Galatians 5:16, "Be ye filled with the Spirit and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh." And I say today that God has made .provisions by the power of the Holy Ghost to crucify the lusts of the flesh and the pride of life and the love of money, and everything that is noxious and hurtful and that has a tendency to wreck your soul. Be filled with the Spirit.

I would not risk it by simply saying you will quit sin, quit doing the evil thing. You cannot do it; no, you cannot do it. You cannot with an empty heart keep the devils from coming back. Your last, state will be worse than the first. Fill it up with the Spirit of God. But you say, I have not the Spirit. Ask for Him. Whatever of the Spirit's power is necessary, get that much; get that much; don't stop at less. I do say that it is possible for a man to be so filled with the Spirit of God that, while he cannot be sinlessly perfect in this life, yet sin will not have dominion over him. He will not be the bond slave of it. He will keep his soul on top. He will keep his body under. Ask for it. Ask for it - the blood of Jesus first to wash you, the Spirit of God to fill you and guard you. That is the remedy. Will you take it? Will you accept it? Do you hear anything? Listen! Can you not hear the sound of the breakers on which ships are wrecked? Do you not hear the dash of the waters? Oh, soul bestir thyself! If anybody here is in earnest today ¾ I do not say a word to triflers, not a word-but if anybody here will make his salvation the chief concern, if anybody here regards the whole of the body as more than a part, if anybody here regards eternal life as preferable to eternal death, and you are willing to be in earnest, then close the eventful transaction here today and kneel down, kneel down, not to me, not to an angel; come up and show in the presence of men and angels and devils, your sincerity, and that you are not ashamed, and that you are not afraid, and that you come because God tells you to come. I ask you to kneel down here and pray that God's Spirit may be with you and abide in you. If you are a backslider, under the dominion of sin, come along like any other sinner and ask for that infilling of the Spirit of God that will enable you to pluck out the right eye, to cut off the right hand, to cut off the right foot, if necessary.

# S. Jesus Weeping Over Jerusalem

JESUS WEEPING OVER JERUSALEM

TEXT: And when He drew nigh, He saw the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. Luke 19:41-44. A very profound impression has been made upon my mind by the study of the Sunday school lesson of today, Christ's triumphal procession into Jerusalem. Some months ago I preached to you a sermon on Christ's public visit to Jerusalem, after He had commenced His ministry. This is His last. This closed His ministry. I wish I knew how to get clearly before you the contrast between Christ's triumphal entry and the triumphal entry of the kings of this world. Pick up your Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," and read his graphic descriptions of the triumphs decreed for the general who had accomplished some great object, who had subdued a nation, who had slaughtered a million and led a million into captivity, and mark how that triumphal entry (for it was always celebrated in Rome) was managed in its ceremonies. See the prisoners manacled with irons that were brought from that far-off land to grace the triumph. See the chariot, drawn by four, or six, or ten, or twenty, magnificent, beautiful, snow-white horses. See the ensigns of war carried at the head of the column. Behold the pomp and circumstance and splendor, every step of it prescribed by a master of ceremonies. Who should meet it as it came to a certain point? Where should be the arch of triumph? What distinguished citizens should make speeches at a certain point? And how those speeches were carefully written out and all the rhetorical finish upon them coldly prepared in the study. A Roman triumph! Go and stand under the Arch of Triumph as it once stood in the City of Paris and read on it the inscriptions of the great victories of Napoleon Bonaparte, and study just one triumphal procession as it passed under that arch, and then read how Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords entered into the Holy City. No master of ceremonies; no cold programme of set speeches; no arrangement of the crowd that should come out from the city to meet the crowd that went in, but all of it was the involuntary, instantaneous and unprompted uprising of the souls of the poor, of the people who had been benefited by the work of the Lord Jesus Christ. Not a sword, not a flag, not a war horse, not a chariot, none of the trappings that were usually placed upon the steed that was to bear the conquering hero that came, were seen here. No cloth of gold spread out upon a field of gold, as when earthly kings meet, to impress upon the eyes of the rabble and upon the heart of the rabble, some conception of their earthly dignity. He came riding upon the foal of an ass, without saddle or bridle. Sitting on that untrained colt He rode in, and such branches as the people might pluck from the trees were scattered where gratitude prompted that they should be placed. And if one would spread down his tunic, or outer garment, upon the ground, to signify that a king was coming, that might be done. I do wish you would take into your hearts the difference between Jesus and the spirit of this world. Strauss, who has written as a German, but largely from

the standpoint of Renan, a Frenchman, endeavoring to deny anything supernatural in the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, has asserted that Jesus Himself lost His balance and was temporarily led away by the expressions of applause that greeted Him on this occasion, and that He must have regretted that the popular tide did not have depth and force enough in it to carry Him to the kingdom which He sought. The object of the selection of my theme today partially is to sweep away any such conception, to furnish an absolute demonstration that the Lord Jesus Christ understood the whole situation, in all its present and backward and forward relations. That He was never for one moment deceived by any cry falling from the lips of His humble disciples, or by any questioning or accusation that rose from the malicious hearts of the Pharisees that would smite Him to death; but that He thoroughly comprehended the deep and eternal significance of all of it. Now mark you that this paragraph which I have read immediately follows your lesson. Your lesson closes with, “Hosanna, hosanna, hosanna to the Lamb of God.” Your lesson closes with palm leaves and garments spread before Him. Your lesson closes by giving every demonstration which it is alleged had misled even Jesus Himself. And while they are saying hosanna, and while the colt upon which He rides is walking upon the outspread garments, and upon the scattered palm leaves, their road makes a turn. You can go and stand there now and see where it occurred. The road makes a turn and as it turns the city bursts upon His view. The city of Jerusalem rises up in all of its glorious splendor. And as He saw it a great gasping sob shook Him. It was not that silent weeping, as when He stood at the grave of Lazarus and wept. A different word is used. It is an outcry of grief. It is a lamentation. It is an extorted wail, a dirge like a funeral note of woe that breaks from His pallid lips as a vision bursts upon His sight. And what is that vision? Let us look at the fact first. There is nothing upon this earth that so impresses the human heart as when walking along the pathway of life, all at once, whether you have expected such a thing or not, all at once, by the Providence of God, a curtain is held back and you see over yonder into the future. When from some unclouded summit of vision there bursts upon the eye what shall be in the near future, and the lips speak what the startled heart feels, there is an awful impression, a deep and sublime impression made upon the mind by such a sight. The poets have tried, with all the arts known to the dramatic writer, to grasp this. See how Campbell tries to bring it out when he introduces a seer as meeting Lochiel, “Whose clan is a thousand, whose breast is but one,” when he meets him on the eve of the battle of Culloden and startles him by gathering back the curtain and showing him that bloody field. But you can trace the art all the way through in the expressions of Campbell. It is only when a real vision is seen, only when God’s Providence draws back these curtains and the eye which is opened looks upon actuality, that the voice is natural and that the utterances have tears in them. And such it was then. Just as clearly as men saw the fact forty years later, the Lord Jesus Christ, in the midst of that shouting, in the midst of that waving of palms, saw Titus coming. He saw the Roman armies gathering. He saw the embankments raised around that doomed city. He saw that city shut in on every side. He saw famine in its ghastliness and pestilence in its noisesonneness, and conflagration with its torch of fire, and war with all of its grim and grisly horrors, and civil strife and insurrection, and women eating the bodies of their children - -all of it burst upon His mind at one time. Now let us read it, and I will read, connecting it with your lesson, so as not to make a break: “Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord. Peace in heaven and glory in the highest. And when He drew nigh He saw the city.” Many men who have visited Jerusalem have gone back on the road to Jericho and gotten into that road and followed it slowly and solemnly around, just as if they were in that procession, to make the effect upon them

as they turned that very corner of the mountain side, and to see the city burst upon their view, and have described the impression that it made upon them. “And when He drew nigh He saw the city and He wailed over it,” not wept. He wailed over it: “If thou hadst known in this thy day, even thou, the things which belong unto thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee and compass thee around and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground and thy children with thee. And they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another because thou knewest not the day of thy visitation.” What a deep, significant reason. Forty years after, Titus comes. Forty years before Titus is the cause. There the effect; here the cause. Who will trace out the subtle connections between the downfall of Jerusalem and their rejection of this last offering of our Lord Jesus Christ, this last coming! He had been there before. He had been there often. It had been line upon line and precept upon precept. He is not mistaken. He knows that it means death to Him. He has announced that it means death to Him. And when Mary, who believed His words, who believed He was to die, and the only one who did, when she took her precious alabaster box of ointment and broke it and poured it over His head and over His feet, and wiped His feet with the hair of her head, she knew that the nails would very soon pierce these feet, and Jesus says, “She hath done this beforehand, to prepare me for my burial.” There was no misconception in His mind, but the awful thought on His mind was this: “Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the lost! Oh, how often I would have gathered them, but they would not. How many times before this have I sent my prophets, sent my servants. How tenderly have I pleaded with them. And even now, when I see them on the verge of their final doom; even now when they have turned away from me forever; even now, when blindfolded, the things that make for their peace hidden from their sight, even when they go out of sight down the dark pathway of irreparable disaster, as that pathway closes behind them, I stop and weep over the lost and fallen.” It is a picture of the heart of Jesus. It is an exhibition of the soul, the compassionate soul of the Son of God. He is the express image of the invisible God, of that God whom no man has seen at any time. He was sent in order to make known to men who were despising and misunderstanding and misrepresenting God, a father’s loving heart. Is this a tyrant? Is this a tyrant that stands where the perverse and incorrigible and malicious and murderous and persistent despisers of divine love and compassion have passed by and gone down and gone down forever? Oh, these tears of Jesus, even when He knows that the men He weeps for are lost forever! What a picture of God’s heart! I want to make the application of this in two directions. What occurs in human experience can govern only the individual life in which that experience occurs. I mean to say that the standard for the government of the world is the written word, and that you cannot substitute in place of that word any feeling you have had, any vision you have seen. You may not say, “I, too, have a vision,” and put it in place of what is written. I doubt not that in ways innumerable and with people innumerable, the Lord God does send beforehand impressions that are genuine and correspond to the divine influence that produces them, and that so far as that particular soul is concerned it is as if God had said, “Here at the turn of the road I show you the city. See it from this standpoint. See it from the standpoint of the rejection of Jesus Christ. See it from the standpoint of malice against the principles of His holy religion. Let me show you the city.” And I doubt not men have seen it, but it is not to take the place of what is written. Then this word “nigh.” This is followed by an exclamation point at the end of the sentence. It expresses not only such a thought as, “It might have been,” not only that, but it expresses the sadness of a heart that had so deeply longed that a different thing had been. “If thou hadst known

in this thy day, even thou, the things which belong unto thy peace!" Now here was the last time when it was possible for that city to get a glimpse of the things which made for its peace. God knew it was the last time. Jesus knew it was the last time, and He knew that if they did not see it that day they would never see it. He knew that as that road wound around that mountain, and as it passed a specific point, that at that point there was the last opening, the last vista up which and through which Jerusalem could ever see her peace, and that if that opening was passed, never more would there be any open way through which their sight could reach peace and things which made for their peace. Now you can understand His grief. Just to see that city pass out, and Him looking at it. See the three or four millions of people, see those three or four millions representing the nation. See that nation that has walked from the days of Abraham until now under the direct Providence of God. See that people upon whom the most signal blessings have been bestowed, and that have been the marked recipients of divine favor above all nations in every age of the world up to this time. See them passing without knowing, without seeing, without being conscious of it, the very last place from which they can ever see peace. "Oh, if you could know it today! Even if today, as I come in my procession into Jerusalem, while these people are spreading their palm leaves, while they are shouting hosanna to the Son of God. Oh, if today, the last opportunity, you would look to the things which make for your peace! But they are hidden from your sight." And they are hidden yet. One hundred years is a long time. Eighteen hundred years, oh, what a long time that is! Nineteen hundred years, what a stretch of time! And yet nearly twenty centuries have rolled away since they passed that point. Have they come to a place yet where they could see? Not yet; not yet. Did the Romans come? They came. Was the embankment thrown up? It was. Were they shut in on every side? They were. Were they left to internal strife, fighting among themselves? They were. Did brother grapple brother by the throat? They did. Did women eat their own children in their hunger and their starvation? They did. Did ruin such as the world had never known before come upon them? It did. And is the night on them yet? It is. To me it would be the saddest thing on earth to look at but for one expression in this connection that stretches far over the centuries and takes hold of a time when this nation, that had been scattered and dispersed over the earth, to be a by-word of hissing and reproach, at last it shall turn to the Lord, and Israel shall be saved. That is the only thing that relieves the dark picture to my mind. Now there is a remarkable similarity between a nation of people and an individual. That has struck every student of nations; every man that ever studied history has been impressed with that thought, that as an individual person has his childhood, and as he grows and matures and reaches manhood and after a while passes the zenith and then goes down, so with nations, so with people gathered together. And that student of history is also bound to notice this point, that just as certain as an individual is responsible to God for all departures from the moral law and for lack of conformity thereto, so is the nation. And the nation that forgets God is doomed just as much as the individual that forgets God. The doom cannot be averted. No counsels of men, no precautions of earthly wisdom, no massing of armies, no mustering phalanx or Pretorian Guard, no hitherto invincible regiments of Swiss infantry or Austrian hussars can keep down the doom when it comes upon the nation. There are things which make for our community peace. There are things which make for our State peace. There are things which make for our national peace, and wise are we if they are not hidden from our eyes, and it is a sure token of the manifest judgment of God if we cannot look down some of the openings and discern the things which make for peace. And now let us close with the reference of this matter to the individual. It has always, ever since I have had any religious thoughts on the

subject, been to me a matter of profound concern that education should be in a religious atmosphere, and that mere mental and physical development, without moral and spiritual development, signified nothing in the wide world toward the conservation of public morals, toward the perpetuity and stability of government. And it has also ever been to my mind clear that there is a propitious period; there is a standpoint from which many roads to peace can be walked and many sights of peace can be seen. I refer to young people. How few can tell. These Baylor boys will soon go home. It is true it is a month or two yet until they go, but it is not a month or two until their last opportunity this year for salvation has passed. When did you ever read about anybody being converted in the days that you are preparing for examination-when the mind is diverted by thoughts of going home? Is that a time for conversion? Oh, is there not from where we now stand on this first Sunday in April-is there not a way through which if you look you can find some student hitherto lost who can see and find peace, and that if passed now will be forever passed! Gone! Gone! And gone so that after it is gone you can just look back and say, “Oh, oh, if I had known!” Oh, in view of heaven lost and hell gained; oh, son or daughter, if you had known, even that last time, the things that made for peace! Too late! Too late! I have myself felt my heart almost break as I would stand over a dead child, a dead baby, a dead boy. Oh, it is bitter, it is bitter! But what is that to standing over a dead soul, a soul from which peace is gone forever, yea, forever and forever! Then beyond the student (and, oh, Lord God, let there be nothing in me that would hide peace from their sight!) beyond the student I look at the city. I look at the congregation, I look at the young people here in Waco, and I cannot help it. I have passed through some strange experiences in the last forty-eight hours. I do not present it as a revelation, as gospel; there is no standard but the Word of God. But I have been where I could see and feel the certainty and the nearness of the eternity of heaven and of hell. And there are some that have come often here; some maybe whose fathers died in the faith of the gospel that is preached here; some, it may be, whose mothers, from the spirit world are looking down on this earth; some over whom God’s light has been shining with special brightness; some who have been held under the uplifted prayers of the pious, and whose pillows, even the pillows in their cradles, have been bedewed with the tears and have been surrounded with the watching and prayers of mothers who prayed for them while they were yet in the cradle. And some of these, maybe, are now and forever passing the point where they will never see peace any more, never will again. Who would make a mock of death? I do want to say this to you: There is in the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ a self-evidencing demonstration of its truth. It is true and the soul that rejects Jesus Christ is lost. That soul is lost. And would you be satisfied, after death has come, to say, “Well, we had a magnificent funeral?” Would you be satisfied to say after death has come, “We had flowers put on the grave?” Would you be satisfied because a monument of pure white marble has been erected? Would you be satisfied if a quotation from the Bible and about heaven has been inscribed on that tombstone, if, notwithstanding the flowers, notwithstanding the external indications, that marble monument rests on a breast which once caged a lost soul? To show the foreknowledge of Jesus it is only necessary to note that right in connection with this visit He instituted this very memorial of the supper we celebrate today. If a stranger inquire: “What is that? What is it?” That is intended to represent a shroud, a white shroud. What is under the shroud? The emblems of a dead body. How are they the emblems of a dead body? The body and the blood are separated. And what does it signify? It signifies that the One whom the people greeted with their hosannas, the meek and lowly One, that without pomp or ceremony came into Jerusalem on the day that you have read about in

your lesson-that Jesus put away His personal glory; that Jesus emptied Himself and took upon Himself the form of a slave; that Jesus gave His life for the salvation of the people. Who would sing hosanna? Let no man sing it who has not the spirit of Jesus. Let no man, through a form, celebrate a ritual of Palm Sunday. Oh, yes, all through the ages you read about Palm Sundays. Today is Palm Sunday, as they call it. Read in novels and romances and histories about how they set this day forth. No, keep no such days. “Touch not, taste not, handle not,” said the Apostle Paul, not that way. How then? Oh, in your souls, in your spirits, come up to the Lord Jesus Christ and catch the spirit of humility and of sacrifice that was in Him. That would be a real Palm Sunday. Oh, that would be a triumphant procession of Jesus Christ into Waco. That would do more to recognize Him than to spread a cloth of gold for Him to walk on. Not gold, but hearts, hearts! Bring your souls and place them on the altar today, on this day of the solemn communion that commemorates His death. Oh, if one spark of the light of Christ’s religion is in your heart, if one echo of His precious promises yet faintly sounds in your soul, oh, if there be just one breath in the lungs of your spiritual life that is like the breath in the lungs of the life of Jesus Christ, let us use that today in coming right up to Jesus, right near to Jesus. Mary saw it. She felt it. She never said anything about it, but she gave her choicest and her best. Not in words did she speak, but in actions she said, “Oh, dying Master, I see it! I feel it! I believe it! Let me prepare Thee for Thy burial! Oh, let the odor of the ointment of my sacrifice fill the world.” Mary saw it! Let us pray.

# S. Jesus, the Christ of Prophecy

JESUS, THE CHRIST OF PROPHECY Scripture Readings: Isaiah 7:14; Isaiah 9:1-7; Isaiah 11:1-10; Luke 2:8-14. TEXT: For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace Isaiah 9:6. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. To Him give all the prophets witness. All the Scriptures - the law, the prophets and the psalms testify of Him. And we are fools, and slow of heart to credit adequate testimony when we distrust any part of the inspired evidence. Of the ancient prophets Isaiah was perhaps the most notable witness of the coming Messiah. An orderly combination of his many Messianic utterances amounts to more than a mere sketch indeed, rather to a series of almost life-sized portraits. As a striking background for these successive portraits the prophet discloses the world's need of a Saviour. He shows us the world full of sin and enveloped in gross darkness, whose inhabitants are the lawful captives and prey of the terrible one. Selfishness, greed and oppression crush the helpless. Covetousness joins house to house and lays field to field until the poor have no room for a home. Debauchees rise up early in the morning to follow strong drink and sit up late at night to inflame themselves with wine. Their fame is to be expert in mingling among liquors and to be mighty in drinking them. The wicked draw iniquity with cords of falsehood and sin as with a cart-rope. They reverse the standard of morals and call evil good and good evil. They put darkness for light and light for darkness. Repudiating all modesty and humility for inordinate conceit, they become wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight. Justice, righteousness and equality are outlawed. Hell enlarges its desire and opens its mouth without measure. Even the chosen nation has become a brood of vipers, formalists, hypocrites, thieves and robbers. Chastisement has vainly beaten them. The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint. There is no room to place another stroke. From the sole of the foot even unto the crown of the head there is no soundness in it only wounds and bruises and putrefying sores. The land is desolate, and the people, perishing for lack of knowledge, grope and shudder under the shadow of death. Across this horrible background of gloom the prophet begins to sketch in startling strokes of light the images of a coming Redeemer. First, he delineates Him as a little child born of a Virgin, whose coming is the light of the world. He is outlined on the canvas in lowest humanity and highest divinity "a child born" and yet the "mighty God" and the "everlasting Father." Next the child is grown and has become a teacher. And such a teacher! On Him rests the seven spirits of God -the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. He judges not according to appearances and reproves not according to rumors. With righteousness he judges the poor and reproves with equity in behalf of the meek. His words smite a guilty world like thunderbolts and His very breath slays iniquity. Righteousness and faithfulness are his girdle. He uplifts an infallible standard of morals. Then succeeds on the prophetic canvas a miracle-worker. In His presence the desert blossoms as a rose and springs burst out of dry ground. The banks of the Jordan rejoice. The lame man leaps like an hart, the dumb sing and the blind behold visions. A sadder portrait follows: We see a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. His visage is so marred it startles, all nations. He is a vicarious sacrifice. The chastisement of the

peace of others is on Him. The iniquity of others is put on Him. It pleases the Father to bruise Him until He has poured out His soul unto death as an offering for sin. Finally we behold an avenger. He comes out of Edom with dyed garments from Bozra. All his raiment is stained with the blood of his enemies whom he has trampled in his vengeance as grapes are crushed in the wine-vat. Then under the prophet's graphic pencil or glowing brush we behold the establishment and growth of His kingdom unlike all other kingdoms, a kingdom within men. A kingdom whose principles are justice, righteousness and equity and whose graces are faith, hope, love and joy, an undying and ever-growing kingdom. Its prevalence is like the rising waters of Noah's flood "And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; … And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered." So this kingdom grows under the brush of the prophetic limner until shores are illimitable. War ceases. Garments rolled in the blood of battle become fuel for fire. Conflagration is quenched. Famine outlawed. Pestilence banished. None are left to molest or make afraid. Peace flows like a river. The wolf dwells with the lamb. The leopard lies down with the kid. The calf and the young lion walk forth together and a little child is leading them. Cow and bear feed in one pasture and their young ones are bedfellows. The sucking child plays safely over the hole of the asp, and weaned children put their hands in the adder's den. In all the holy realm none destroy nor hurt, because the earth is as full of the knowledge of the Lord as the fathomless ocean is full of water. Rapturous vision! Sublime and ineffable consummation! Was it only a dream? But this is Christmas time. Our men today must not aspire to grasp all the panorama of glory that swept before Isaiah's eyes. We have to do with the beginning only. We commemorate the birth of a child. Our text declares: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." The "for" refers to the preceding context, which tells us that she who was under the gloom shall have no more anguish. That the people who walked in darkness behold a great light. That the land of Zebulon and Naphtali on which divine contempt has been poured is now overflowed with blessings. That with light has come liberty, and with liberty peace, and with peace joy, and the joy of harvest and of victory, for this child is born. The coming of this child is assigned as the reason or cause for all this light, this liberty, this peace, this joy. Marvelous child to be the author of such blessings! Humanity is unquestionably here. It is a child, born of an earthly mother. But mere humanity cannot account for such glorious and eternal results. A mere child could not bear up under the government of the world and establish a kingdom of whose increase there should be no end. What is his name? It cannot be Alexander, Caesar or Bonaparte. Their kingdoms were not of peace, and light and joy and liberty. Their kingdoms perished. But what is this child's name? It staggers us to call it His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of Peace! If this be not divinity, words cannot express it. And if it be divinity as certainly as a "child born" expresses humanity, then well may His name be "Wonderful," for He is a God-man. Earth, indeed, furnished His mother, but heaven furnished the Sire. And if we doubt and inquire, "How can these things be?" it must be literally true as revealed and fulfilled later: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore, also that Holy One who shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." But it is far from my purpose today to discuss the import of these names which express the nature and power of the child, and account for His work. I entreat your consideration rather of a lowlier line of thought whose application is designed to be intensely practical and helpful. The New Testament tells us that the light, liberty, peace and joy of the prophecy were fulfilled in the land of Zebulon and Naphtali when Jesus and His disciples came

among the people dwelling around the Sea of Galilee, and preached His gospel and healed their sick and delivered their demoniacs; that His gospel was light, a great light. All knowledge is light. Whatsoever maketh manifest is light. And this gospel brought the knowledge of salvation in the remission of their sins. It revealed their relations toward God. It revealed God Himself in the face of Jesus Christ. It discovered their sins and brought contrition and repentance. It revealed a sin-cleansing and sin-pardoning Saviour. Its reception brought peace by justification and brought liberty by dispossession of Satan. And with light, liberty and peace came joy unspeakable. To just as many as received Him came the light, the liberty, the peace, the joy. And this opens the way to the practical line of thought which it is hoped will be helpful to us all. Are we not prone at times to fall into errors of interpretation concerning the Kingdom similar to those which led ancient Israel so far and so harmfully astray concerning the advent of the Messiah? Either we so fill our minds with the sublimity of world redemption as applied to the race in the outcome, so satisfy our hearts with rhetorical splendor in the glowing description of universal dominion that we lose sight of its application to individuals in our day, and the responsibilities arising from the salvation of one man, or we so concentrate our fancy upon the consummation that we forget the progressive element in the development of the Kingdom and the required use of means in carrying on that progress. The former error breeds unprofitable dreamers, the latter promotes skepticism. The preacher is more liable to be led astray by the one, the average church member by the other. Perhaps the most unprofitable of all sermons is the one full of human eloquence and glowing description excited by the great generalities of salvation, and perhaps the most stubborn of all skepticism is that resulting from disappointment in not witnessing and receiving at once the very climax of salvation, both as to the individual and the race. Such a spirit of disappointment finds expression in words like these: “The prophet’s vision is 2,600 years old. Nineteen centuries have elapsed since the child was born. Wars have not ceased. The poor are still oppressed. Justice, equity and righteousness do not prevail. Sorrow, sin and death still reign. And I am worried and burdened and perplexed. My soul is cast down and disquieted within me.” In such cases we need to reconsider the false principles of interpretation which have misled us, and inquire: Have we been fair to the Book and its promises? Will you kindly bear with me while I submit certain carefully considered statements: First of all, the consummation of the Messiah’s kingdom was never promised as an instantaneous result of the birth of the child. The era of universal peace must follow the utter and eternal removal of things and persons that offend. This will be the harvest of the world. Again, this consummation was never promised as an immediate result; that is, without the use of means to be employed by Christ’s people. Yet again, this aggregate consummation approaches only by individual reception of the kingdom and individual progress in sanctification. It is safe to say that the promises have been faithfully fulfilled to just the extent that individuals have received the light, walked in the light and discharged the obligations imposed by the gift of the light. These receptive and obedient ones in every age have experienced life, liberty, peace and joy, and have contributed their part to the ultimate glorious outcome. And this experience in individuals reliably forecasts the ultimate race and world result, and inspires rational hope of its coming. This is a common-sense interpretation. In the light of it our duty is obvious. Our concern should be with our day and our lot and our own case as at present environed. The instances of fulfilment cited by the New Testament illustrate and verify this interpretation, particularly that recorded by Matthew as a fulfilment of our context and other prophecies of Isaiah, in Matthew 4:1-25, Matthew 5:1-48, Matthew 6:1-34, Matthew 7:1-29, Matthew 8:1-34, Matthew 9:1-38, Matthew 10:1-42, Matthew 11:1-30, Matthew 12:1-59, Matthew

13:1-58, inclusive, of his Gospel. What dispassionate mind can read these ten chapters of Matthew, with the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, without conceding fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecies uttered seven centuries before? Here is the shining of a great light, brighter than all the material luminaries in the heavens which declare the glory of God and show His handiwork. This, indeed, is the clean, sure and perfect law of the Lord, converting the soul, making wise the simple, rejoicing the heart, enlightening the eyes, enduring forever, more desirable than gold and sweeter than honey in the honey comb. Here are judgments true and righteous altogether. Here in sermon and similitude the incomparable Teacher discloses the principles and characteristics of a kingdom that unlike anything earthborn must be from heaven. Here is a fixed, faultless, supreme and universal standard of morality. The Teacher not only speaks with authority and wisdom, but evidences divinity by supernatural miracles, signs and wonders. But there is here more than a teacher and wonder-worker. He is a Saviour, a Liberator, a Healer, conferring life, liberty, health, peace and joy. To John's question-John in prison and in doubt-the answer was conclusive that this, indeed, was the One foreshown by the prophets and there was no need to took for another: "Go and tell John the things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And whosoever shall find no occasion for stumbling in me, blessed is he" (Matthew 11:4-6). The special matter here most worthy of our consideration and which ought to sink deep into our hearts is that the kingdom of heaven was not expanded by instantaneous diffusion over a community, a nation, or the world, regardless of human personality, activity, and responsibility in receiving and propagating it, but it took hold of each receptive individual's heart and worked itself out on that line toward the consummation. To as many as received Him to them He gave the power to become the sons of God. These only who walked in the light of the gospel realized the blessings of progressive sanctification. To the sons of peace, peace came as a thrilling reality. From those who preferred darkness to light, who judged themselves unworthy of eternal life, the preferred peace departed, returning to the evangelists who offered it. The poor woman whom Satan had bound for eighteen years experienced no imaginary or figurative release from her bonds (Luke 11:10-16). That other woman, who had sinned much, and who, in grateful humility, washed his feet with tears was not forgiveness real and sweet to her? That blind Bartimeus, who kept crying, "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me" did he not receive real sight? That publican, who stood afar off and beat upon his breast, crying, "God, be merciful to me, the sinner" was he not justified? And when the Galilean disciples went forth in poverty and weakness preaching His gospel, did they not experience the joy of the harvest in beholding the ingathering of souls? And when they saw even demons subject to them through the name of Jesus, was not that the joy of victory as when conquerors divide the spoil? When the stronger than the strong man armed came upon him and bound him, might not our Lord justly say, "As lightning falls from heaven, I saw Satan fall before you?" And just so in our own time. Every conversion brings life, liberty, peace and joy to the redeemed soul. Every advance in a higher and better life attests that rest is found at every upward step in the growth of grace. Every talent or pound rightly employed gains a hundred per cent for the capital invested, and so the individual Christian who looks persistently into the perfect law of liberty, being not a forgetful hearer but a doer of the Word, is blessed in every deed. Willing to do the will of God, and following on to know the Lord, he not only knows the doctrine to be of God, but experimentally goes on from strength to strength, from grace to grace, and is changed into the divine image from glory to glory. In the light of these

personal experiences he understands how the kingdom of God is invincible and doubts not the certain coming of the glorious consummation foreshown in prophecy and graciously extended in the hand of promise. His faith, staggering not through unbelief, takes hold of the invisible and his hope leaps forward to the final recompense of the reward. What I would particularly impress upon your minds is the present and personal interest you all, as heirs of salvation, have in these wonderful blessings coming through the wonderful child. Do take to your own hearts the prophetic announcement: “Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given,” and share with the shepherds the interest of the angelic proclamation: “Be not afraid, for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord.” Let your own lips, singing the heart’s fulness of joy, swell the ascription of praise voiced by angelic multitudes: “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.” Mark the limitation of peace on earth to those who please God. No peace, no life, no liberty, no joy, has ever been promised to the wicked. And now I doubt not there are many Christians here whose hearts are not attuned to praise. You have lost, not salvation, but the joy of it. You are without the true Christmas spirit. Some are perplexed with life’s hard business problems. Some mourn for loved ones taken away. Some cannot be happy because of back-sliding in heart and life. Others are the victims of despondency on account of ill health. Every pleasing prospect is seen through jaundiced eyes. These all say with more or less emphasis: “The child Jesus was announced as the light, liberty, peace and joy of the world. But I am sad; my soul is cast down and disquieted within me. I am in the dark. I hear the lion’s roar. The gloom and horror of the Valley of the shadow of Death make me to quake.” Oh, if I could, by divine help, bring Christmas cheer to these troubled ones! Indeed, our Heavenly Father would have us happy. He remembereth our frame. He knoweth that we are dust. His compassion is infinite. In His Word is the promise to crown the year with goodness. All the privileges of life, light, liberty, peace and joy are secured to us. We may by penitence and faith lay hold of all the riches of His grace. Why not, even now, as a congregation, seek His face? Why not every one confess his sins, and with contrite heart, seek now divine forgiveness for himself, that there may be Christmas cheer in all our souls and homes? Come ye disconsolate, where e’er ye languish, Come to the Mercy Seat, fervently kneel; Here bring your wounded heart, here tell your anguish; Earth hath no sorrow that heaven cannot heal.

# S. Little Christians

LITTLE CHRISTIANS TEXT: Little ones that believe on me. - Matthew 18:6. Perhaps no chapter of the New Testament is more familiar to Baptists than the eighteenth of Matthew. Every paragraph in it has been often cited as decisive upon matters of discipline, church government and authority, terms of membership, methods of reconciliation and the law of forgiveness. In the course of the service today it is purposed to make a running comment on the whole chapter, because it is regarded not as a group of detached and loosely connected precepts, but a logical and well-connected discourse on a single subject. Incidentally its several teachings may admit of just applications to many things wide apart, but primarily the whole chapter in all its parts refers to this one theme: How to treat little Christians. The whole story may be gathered by comparing Matthew's report with the parallel accounts in Mark 9:33-50 and Luke 10:46-50, and with a re-statement of some of its matter on a later occasion recorded in Luke 17:1-4. The scene is Capernaum, probably in Peter's house. The time is about the close of our Lord's great ministry in Galilee. The occasion is a dispute among the disciples on the way from the regions of Caesarea Philippi. The great teacher read their hearts and finally drew from their reluctant lips a statement of the controverted matter in the form of the question: "Who then is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Their views of the kingdom were yet secular, and their concern for prominent places was great. He rebukes their pride and selfishness by an object lesson in the person of a little child, showing that the humblest should be the greatest. From this predicate He passes to the great theme of the chapter: How to treat little ones that believe in Him. Hence our theme today:

LITTLE CHRISTIANS.

There are little Christians. I do not refer to age or physical stature. A child in years and stature may be a big Christian. A much older person, though small in stature like Zaccheus, may be a big Christian. Nor do I refer to a recent convert. In one sense he is a little Christian, because just born into the kingdom-a new born babe in Christ, whatever his age in the world. Nor yet do I refer to one, small in his own esteem, poor in spirit, for he is only apparently little, while in fact the greatest in the kingdom. But I do refer to a child of God who remains undeveloped in Christian graces and character though there have been both sufficient time and instruction for development since conversion. I mean one whose Christianity remains little a spiritual dwarf. Having affirmed the existence of "little Christians" as thus defined, now let Bible proof be submitted of the propriety of using such language, and of the fact affirmed and of the correctness of the definition: First, the propriety of using such language. All thoughtful minds recognize analogies between material things on the one hand and moral or spiritual on the other hand. Because of these evident analogies reputable usage applies to the moral or spiritual terms that commonly describe, compare or measure material things. For example, in saying of one, "He is a little man," we may as properly refer to the "inner man" as to the "outer man." So Paul evidently employs the diminutive term, "little women," (Greek "gunaikaria") in 2 Timothy 3:6, which manifestly has no reference to either age or physical stature, nor implies a recent profession of faith, nor is a diminutive of endearment, nor refers to their humble self-estimate, but does refer to moral character, the internal

nature, and in this instance is a contemptuous expression signifying weak or “silly” women, and is so rendered in our English versions. Paul in the context further expounds his term by showing that “little women” have these distinguishing characteristics: (1) They are “laden with sins,” which may refer to the number and magnitude of their offenses, or perhaps, rather, as Alford suggests, to the felt weight of sin on their consciences acting as an impelling force, driving them in search of ease to the other things mentioned. (2) They are “led away by divers lusts,” i.e., not merely sensual lust, but they itch after new doctrines, new teachers, new fashions, new sensations. Governed by self-gratification rather than by fixed Christian principles, they constantly run after the “lo here” and the “lo there,” momentarily attracted by every novelty in philosophy or worldly pleasure, and by every sensational preacher or startling development in church services. Modern Athenians, every whit. (3) They are “ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,” i.e., a restless and habitual quest for self-gratification, by the very fickleness of desire, which will result in such permanent instability of character as renders truth unattainable. (4) By this very littleness of mind and heart they become the easy victims of any passing imposition. Crafty and designing teachers of any imposture, creeping into houses, looking for weak and silly objects of prey, take them captive at the first venture. Such are “little women.” They are great in nothing. Sometimes they turn from the great and sweet and holy ties of motherhood and wifehood, scorning the sphere of home and its sacred domestic ties, unsex and belittle themselves by unseemly and immodest intrusions into the sphere of men. But for “little women” and men like them, impostors and quacks in spiritual things would have to go out of business. Gullibility invites fraud. Passion solicits slavery. As Bible usage thus properly applies the term “little” to moral stature, so with equal propriety it may be applied to spiritual or Christian stature. One might hastily infer from some expression employed that the “little ones” of our text meant children in a physical sense, or with greater plausibility, “little ones” in their own esteem, humble disciples. But the whole context seems to exclude either interpretation. The disciples evidently did not understand Jesus to refer to either class. While He had distinctly rebuked the littleness of pride and commended the greatness of humility, He applies His lesson to a treatment of little ones. Not children in years and stature, but “little ones that believe.” Not “little” because their own modesty and humility so classified them, but “little” because of their liability to stumble, their too easy susceptibility to sin from external causes and influences. Both Mark and Luke cite a case introduced by John in immediate illustration, which shows how correctly their consciences applied His teaching: “And John answered.” Answered what? The object lesson of the little child. “And said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not with us.” Now this man casting out devils in the name of Jesus was evidently no little child in a fleshly sense, and yet John’s sensitive conscience is rebuked by what Jesus taught about “receiving one such little child” because he forbade this man to cast out devils, on the ground of not following with them. In other words, John counted this unnamed man a “little one.” And his “littleness” in John’s mind consisted in not “following with them.” That is, though a believer in Jesus, and though casting out demons in the name of Jesus, he was not a sufficiently developed disciple to fall into line with the trained apostles. Hence, being “little” he must be permanently stopped in his work. Now, that Jesus counts the fact cited by John’s case in point directly relevant to His preceding instructions and violative of it, appears from two overwhelming proofs: (1) His reply to John: “But Jesus said, forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against me is for me. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong

to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." Mark 9:39-41. (2) His immediate addition of the words of our text: "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in, me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Matthew 18:6. The parallel accounts are strikingly presented in Broadus' Harmony. This man casting out demons was a believer. But he was a "little one." He was ignorant of many things John knew. He was not so well developed. John did not "receive him" because he was little. How well this dovetails into Paul's lesson on the believers who are "weak in the faith." Do carefully study Romans 14:1; Romans 15:1 and 1 Corinthians 8:9 : "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." "We then that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." "But take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak." The context of these several passages shows that the "weak brother" was one liable to stumble through ignorance, infirmity, lack of moral fiber; but though "weak" must be received, his path cleared of stumbling blocks and the strong must bear his infirmities, just as the "little ones" of Matthew 18 must be received, must not be caused to offend, must not be despised, making the cases fairly parallel in import. Paul's "weak brother" then is Jesus' "little one," and is also John's man "casting out demons in the name of Jesus," but who "followed not with" the apostles. Again, in his letter to the Ephesians Paul shows that our Lord gave the ministry to the church that Christians might not remain children, "tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, but attain to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." But that all Christians do not pass as rapidly as they should from childhood in Christ to maturity, is further evident by his complaint against the Hebrews: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Hebrews 5:12-14. Here unquestionably were "little Christians." That is, people who had been Christians long enough to be developed, but remained undeveloped. By this time they ought to be able to eat meat but must yet be fed on milk. They have had both time and opportunity to acquire Christian habits of right thinking and right doing, but they act yet as much from transient impulse as when first converted. Modern little Christians are like them. If they feel like going to prayer meeting or Sunday school or church or conference meeting, they go. Otherwise they stay away. If they feel like making a contribution they make it. Otherwise they let it alone. If they promise to contribute, they seem not to feel bound to pay it. It is all optional. If they pay, it is grace; if they withhold, it is no sin. Doing things from fixed principles, because they are right, and for Christ's sake, whether they feel like it or not, doing them regularly, systematically, habitually, they know nothing about. They have not become veterans. They remain militia and never enter the regular army except for a bounty or when conscripted. You can't trust their discrimination on moral questions. Never "by reason of use have their spiritual senses been exercised to discern both good and evil." Complicate a little any moral question submitted to them and they are just as apt to call white black as anything else. They never look below overt acts of manifest wickedness. They see no harm in pleasures, games, fashions and associations that are peopling hell with victims. They have no definite convictions on -the Sunday question. They go off on Sunday excursions to the shame and reproach of religion. They have time to come down town

for their mail on Sunday and then go to their business offices to answer business letters and post books, but have no time for church or Sunday school. O Lord, what can we do with so many little Christians? How can we war with such an army? The drums beat the call to arms and the bugle sounds the charge, but they think it is only a brass band playing for amusement or entertainment. They ask: What harm is this? What harm is that? O Lord, when shall we hear them say: What good in this? What good in that? When will they inquire for the things which are wholesome, nutritious, calculated to confer spiritual health and strength? When will they turn their feet to the ascending path, however narrow, that leads to usefulness, peace and God? In the best Greek text of John's gospel, John 21:1-25, we have three classes of Christians: (ta arnia mou) "My lambs;" (ta probata mou) "my sheep;" (ta probatia mou) "my little sheep." "Feed my lambs-shepherd my sheep feed my little sheep." "Simon, do YOU love me? Feed my young converts. Simon, do you LOVE me? Shepherd my mature Christians. Simon, do you love ME? Feed my dwarfs." The world over, men care less for the runts than for either lambs or full grown sheep. If any class is neglected or held in slight esteem it is the runt class. A lamb touches our heart. We also have reasonable hope that he will become a big sheep, We are proud of the big sheep. His fleece is heavy and his grade in weight enhances his value. But that stunted runt, what is he good for? It is little wool, little mutton and poor stock to keep. It would seem to call for the highest order of love to feed the "little sheep." Anyhow in the best texts feeding the "little sheep" is the climax of our Savior's test of Peter's love. Many of us have seen persons who, notwithstanding the lapse of years, remain children in body or mind. They were never able to work well or walk much, or their minds continued feeble. Such spectacles excite our pity, it is true, but do they not also excite our contempt? In our conscious knowledge and strength, in our exemption from infirmity, are we not liable to despise them? Before such helplessness, do we not experience sensations quite different from those awakened by the sight of the natural helplessness of infancy? We are not tempted to despise babies. We are liable to despise older people who remain babies in body or mind. Indeed, it is difficult to reverence even old age when it reaches "second childhood," when, in the matchless imagery of Ecclesiastes the period arrives: "In the day when the keepers of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves, and the grinders cease because they are few; and those that look out of the windows be darkened, and the doors shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low; and he shall rise up at the voice of the bird, and all the daughters of music shall be brought low; and when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fears shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail." All women, and most men, occasionally enjoy feeding with a spoon, a laughing, crowing, chubby baby. But it revolts most people, male and female, to feed with a spoon one twenty years old who remains a baby in body and mind. So all Christians delight to instruct a new convert, patiently and lovingly administering the "sincere milk of the word that he may grow thereby." But how few enjoy giving spoon diet to one who has been a church member twenty years. Few of us object to placing a chair across an open window or barricading the head of the stairs or the door of the cellar to keep an adventurous baby from getting a fall, but many of us ungraciously and reluctantly use such precautions in behalf of older people equally ignorant and helpless. Just so in spiritual matters. Just so in regard to "little Christians." A proper treatment of them calls for great grace, patience, love and caution. And as the majority of Christians are "little Christians," how important that we should carefully study and apply the 18th chapter of Matthew, which is a divine discourse on how to treat them. Do then give me your heartfelt attention while I

open this scripture in response to the question:

HOW SHALL I TREAT A LITTLE CHRISTIAN?

First Negatively, in the words of Jesus: “Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones,” or as Paul puts it, “Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not.” It is the tendency of knowledge to puff up. When it inflates one with conceit it is hateful. Spiritual pride is intensely offensive to both God and man. It is prone to institute invidious comparisons with a view to self-complacency. On the other hand all backwardness is acutely sensitive to these very comparisons and resentful of overshadowing. The little Christian, who after lapse of time and perhaps of opportunity and instruction, remains undeveloped, who has never cultivated habits of Christian thinking and doing, who is untrained, never having disciplined himself to walk according to a rule of life, who is yet a bondsman to impulse, whim and caprice, waiting always to feel good before he does anything is yet a Christian. And being a Christian, the question recurs: What are you going to do with him? Take heed, you brethren and sisters who live by principle, that he be not driven away by your very superiority. You are here at prayer meeting. I meet you nearly every Wednesday night. You are here in Sunday school. You attend the business meetings and are informed as to all our plans and methods. You are always ready when a burden oppresses the church to help lift it. You even sleep in line of battle, with armor on, ready to fight when the alarm is sounded. Your leader always knows where to find you and confidently relies upon your watchfulness and fidelity. Indeed, he is proud of you, and glories to head such a column of veterans in any kind of a charge. But are not veterans of the line somewhat prone to despise the irregulars? Indulge me in a homely illustration. You know the peculiar difficulty in the way of an awkward country boy, twenty years old, coming to a city school. Perhaps his opportunities in the past have been few and third rate, and now his greatest dread is that he may be despised on account of his backwardness-his body is so big and his mental culture so slight. Unless the teacher be careful he will despise this boy, and unless the more advanced students be considerate, they will often wound his feelings. Then, keenly sensitive to contempt, whether manifested by teacher or pupil, this big boy may say: “I do not like this school. They have put me in the primary department.” “Well, ought you not to be just there, since you are not prepared for higher grades? “Yes, I know I am not further advanced than that.” “Why then object to your proper classification?” “Oh! It’s not that, it is because they despise me.” Thus many a young man from sensitiveness to the contempt of those more advanced than himself, remains uneducated. And just so, let me assure you, many a little Christian remains little because apprehensive of the scorn of the better developed. On this very point Paul is urgent in exhortation that those who have superior knowledge or gifts must take heed lest their very superiority become a stumbling block over which that weak brother may fall. And this leads us naturally to the next thought. Second We should be careful not to cause little Christians to fall into sin. Their danger is always greatest when they feel that better developed Christians hold them in contempt. It makes them reckless. Not finding in themselves the grace of others and writhing under the sense of scorn and scolding, they will likely conclude that they are not Christians at all and so be tempted to abandon their very profession of faith. Then watching every careless or injudicious or even sinful habit of older church members, they not only make this a justification of their own departures from right living, but arguing badly, as sin ever makes us do, they deduce most illogical and horrible conclusions from the facts gathered, and then following their logic plunge into excesses and run lengths in the

downward direction wholly unwarranted by the premises which started them. It is idle to say that no sane man ought to have stumbled over so small a thing as an inconsistency in older members of the church. The fact is, they do so stumble. For example: Suppose a Sunday school superintendent or teacher should, because of cheap rates, go off on a Sunday excursion, what prevents one more backslidden than himself from drawing the conclusion that the fourth commandment is altogether a Jewish superstition irreconcilable with the “Christian liberty” of the nineteenth century? If his Sunday school teacher can devote one holy day to a pleasure excursion because the fare of travel is so cheap, why may not he, being hard pressed for money, devote all of them to business? Or, if the older church member give card-parties, why may he not gamble? If the one attend the theater, why not the otter the variety theater? If the one patronizes a saloon, why not the other keep a saloon? If the one may hate his brother and refuse to be reconciled to him, why not the other kill a man? Facilis descensus averno! Cain was the author of the proverb: “Am I my brother’s keeper?” Hear these burning and terrible words of Jesus: “But whoso shall cause one of these little ones to stumble, it is profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea. Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling, for it must needs be that the occasion come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!” Third What is our next duty toward them? If the little Christian does go astray, the big Christian must find him and bring him back. On this point our chapter employs a beautiful and touching parable: “How think ye? If any man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine and go into the mountains, and seek that which goeth astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth over it more than over the ninety and nine which have not gone astray.” You remember this same parable is just as appropriately used in Luke 15:1-32, where, however, it refers expressly to unconverted people. Here our Savior applies it to erring Christians little Christians gone astray. What is its solemn lesson to us? It imperatively binds us to go out after the strays. It will not do to say: “He was worth nothing when we had him and is not worth bringing back.” Nor is it enough to ring your church bell he will not come if he hears-it. Nor is it enough to throw open the gates of the fold and say, “Here is protection; let him come in.” He is estranged now and will not enter in. It may be witty but it is not loving for you to mock at his danger by saying: “Any fool sheep that will not come home when called ought to be caught and eaten by wolves.” Our Savior does not say so. He says, “You go after him.” And now we come to one of the most important and least understood and least obeyed precepts in all the Word of God. It is the application of the preceding parable. It tells just how we are to go after stray sheep. It expounds the parable. Do give it your most thoughtful attention: “Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.” (Common version.) Now, I do most seriously and in several important particulars object to this misleading rendering of the original Greek text. I object to “moreover” as the clearest rendering here of the Greek particle, “de.” This particle distinguishes the word or clause connected with it from the preceding statement as either adversative or explanatory. Here none will deny that it is explanatory of what precedes, hence it should be rendered “namely” or “accordingly.” I object to the mild word “trespass” as a rendering of the old-fashioned, ugly word, “sin.” The original is “amartese, ” which means “sin.” Then I object to the limiting clause, “against thee,” because it is not in the text of the most reliable manuscripts. To be explicit, the concurrence of the Vatican, Sinaitic and Alexandrian manuscripts for or against a reading is almost absolutely decisive. In this

case we cannot have the testimony of the Alexandrian, because the first part of it is lost; the extant copy commences only with the middle of Matthew 25:1-46. But the “against thee” is wanting in the other two and is also wanting in all three of them in the subsequent statement of the same precept recorded in Luke 17:3. A scholar may well argue that it means “against thee,” on account of the context, but no scholar can fairly argue that it says “against thee.” Again, I object to the tameness of the “go” and to the “and” altogether in the phrase “go and.” The “and” is not in the text and its use weakens the liveliness of the precept. “Go” should be “Go right along,” i.e., be lively and prompt about it; step off as if you were going after a doctor. Doctor Broadus, in his commentary on the passage, cites as similar in meaning the same word in Matthew 4:10. “Get thee hence, Satan;” and “go thy way” in Matthew 5:24, and the “goeth” of Matthew 13:44, where the man, full of joy at finding a treasure, hastens to sell all he has, that he may buy the field. Yet more seriously do I object to the phrase, “tell him his fault,” as anything like a fair rendering of the one original word. The Greek word “elegson” is nowhere else in the New Testament so rendered. It means “to make one see and feel his fault,” “to convict or convince of wrong.” It is such a conviction as reaches the emotions. Hence, in Homer it means “to shame one,” and in the New Testament “to convince one of wrong and so as to shame him.” Merely to tell one that he has been guilty does not touch the meaning. The same word is used in John 16:8 : “And He (i.e., the holy spirit), when He is come, will convict (elegson) the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.” In the phrase below, “tell it to the church,” the “tell” is a good rendering of an entirely different word. Now, to sum up these objections, remember that the Greek particle “de” denotes that its clause is explanatory of what precedes. But “going after the stray sheep” precedes. Hence, this precept explains’ how to go after the stray sheep. What then is the rendering? “Accordingly if thy brother sin, go right along, convince him of his sin between thee and him alone.” To show the connection more forcibly, let us repeat: “If any man has one hundred sheep and one of them go astray he leaveth the ninety and nine and goeth after the stray. Accordingly, if thy brother sin, go right along convince him of his sin between him and thee alone.” This makes it a substantial equivalent of Galatians 6:1 : “Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself lest thou also be tempted.” You find another equivalent in the Mosiac law: “Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor and not suffer sin upon him.” Leviticus 19:17, which means that you do hate your brother if, seeing sin on him, crushing and defiling him, you do not rid him of its weight and slime by convincing him of its heinousness and leading him to penitence and pardon. So also does it accord with that famous teaching of James: “Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him (that is, turn him back), let him know that he who converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins,” James 5:19-20. It would be difficult to describe my feelings when I first examined the original of Matthew 18:15. I felt that I had lost something valuable. That my most reliable proof text on settling personal difficulties was taken away. But later, I saw clearly that nothing was lost, but something immeasurably great was gained - that God’s way is always the best. Just as much as before it is the law for settling personal offenses. The context here and in Luke 17:14 clearly establishes its application to such cases. But the immeasurable gain is that the true rendering is not limited to personal offenses. It includes that, of course, but it is far more comprehensive. The boundless evil of the old rendering consisted of this: Christians limited the obligation of reclaiming the offender to the one offended. Conscientious church members would say, “If a brother wrongs me, I must go and tell him his

fault. If, however, he wrongs someone else, let the wronged person see to it. If I see him commit the greatest sins, not personally injurious to me or others, let the deacons attend to those cases." In other words, "my responsibility for reclaiming the erring is limited to so much of his wrong as personally injures me." We Baptists distribute offenses into two classes: private and public, or personal and general. If the private or personal offense is against me, I have a duty, not otherwise. The public or general offenses call for no laboring; let the deacons, our ecclesiastical grand jury, return a bill against them. The true rendering of Matthew 18:15, like a deep running plowshare, uproots - and buries out of sight this narrow, noxious construction. It immeasurably widens the horizon of Christian responsibility. All offenses, whether personal or general, public or private, except the sin against the Holy Ghost, call for reclamatory labor. As any man will go out to seek and bring home any of his sheep, gone astray from any cause whatever, "accordingly if thy brother sin," whether against thee or himself, or anyone else, "go right along," whoever sees it, "convince him of his sin, between thee and him alone; if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." I dare any narrow constructionist of this passage to expose his naked heart to the point of this question: "You big Christian, willing to labor with a little Christian if he sins against you, but unwilling to so labor if he only sin against Christ, do you not thereby count yourself more important than Christ? And if only the offended one must seek to reclaim the offender, who will reclaim the man who sins only against himself?" Throw it back into a parable: A flock of sheep are on the range. One wickedly butts another over and runs away. A third witnesses the going astray. The reckoning comes for the witness: "Did you see your brother sheep sin and go astray?" "O yes, I saw it." "Why didn't you try to bring him back?" "It was no concern of mine. If he had butted me over I would have gone after him." Continue the parable: A flock of sheep are on the range. One, from any cause, perhaps because he has hurt himself, begins to drop out of line and separate from the flock in full view of others. He lags farther behind and wanders more and more. He is lost utterly at last and mournfully bleats in his loneliness and peril. The wolf marks his isolation and gloats over his piteous cry, crouching nearer to his victim as night approaches. Yonder, safe in the fold, the rest are being counted. One is missing. The reckoning comes. "Where is thy brother sheep? Who saw him last and where?" A comrade answers: "I saw him limping and beginning to fall behind early this morning near yonder cavernous mountain. By noon he was out of sight, though later even I could faintly hear his far-off cry for help. Towards night I also heard over there the howling of a wolf." "You wicked sheep, false to the tie of brotherhood. You waited until night to report a comrade lost. Why did you not, when you say him begin to go astray, go right along and bring him back? If unable alone, why did you not summon others to help you, and these failing, why did you not make it known to the whole flock?" To return to the literal: You see a brother sin. If you love him you cannot bear to suffer that sin on him. You go after him, not formally, not merely that you may be able to prove that you took the "first step" required in Matthew 18, but because you love him. To comply with the letter of the law in order to gain a technical advantage, while despising its spirit, is a much more heinous offense than not to take "the step" at all. Indeed, one is not far from the unpardonable sin who cunningly contrives to shelter himself under technical compliance with the letter of Christ's law, while at heart violating its spirit. Your object must be to gain your brother. You have a difficult task. Not to tell him or accuse him of wrong; that would be easy. But to so conduct the case as to make him see and feel and renounce the wrong. Your object is to gain him. One cannot be gained except on his own conviction. He is both judge and the accused. You must get a verdict from his own conscience. Therefore, go in meekness. Affected superiority will

prejudice the court whose concurrent judgment you must have. Therefore go alone. Your mission is not to humiliate him. To needlessly wound his self-love will lessen your chances before the court of his heart. Therefore, consider thyself also, lest thou be tempted, i.e., go from the standpoint of any man's liability to fall into sin. These clear and unequivocal prescriptions of what you must do are prescriptions of what you must not do. You are not to get mad at him. You are not to tell his sin to others, not even to your wife, that she may tell your neighbors' wives, nor complain in conference meetings against him. Alone with him you must honestly and earnestly labor to gain him. Oh, how we do trample on Christ's laws - all of us preachers, deacons and all the rest! I do venture to say that more little Christians remain little from the lack of proper treatment than from any other cause. Passing down the street you see a church member enter a saloon and take a drink. Ah! That is an awful, blood-curdling sight. Go right along and seek a private interview. Don't wait. The brother is going astray - he is drifting away on a remorseless tide. Perils are all about him and more somber woes ahead. Speak now, while you may, in hope: "Brother, I love you. I cannot bear to see sin on you. This was wrong. It was against Christ, who died for you, and the Holy Spirit, who sealed you unto the day of redemption. It is against your baptismal vow. Brother, be candid, does not your own heart condemn it? Will you not now and here repent and renounce this sin?" If you fail to gain him, then promptly take with you others, those in whom the offender is likely to have most confidence, and with them seek again to gain him. Let there be no long interval between the endeavors. The three failing, report the case to the next conference meeting, or if necessary, have a meeting called at once. Tell it to the church: "Brethren, my heart is sad. I saw Brother A sin. Tenderly and privately I tried to reclaim him, but without success. I then, while the case was fresh, took with me Brethren B and C, who lovingly added their labors to mine. We all failed; we tried our best. We had his good at heart. But he is still going astray. Oh, Church of Christ, what will you do?" "Is this report correct, Brother A?" "Yes." "Do you corroborate it, Brother B?" "I do." 4. Now, the church officially and as a united body intervenes. "Erring brother, hear the church. Your course is wrong. Will you not confess and forsake this sin?" If he hear not the church, then let him be to thee as an heathen or publican. Withdraw from the one who persists in walking disorderly. It is amazing how little respect some have for church authority. But there are conditions under which a decision of the church is infallible. The conditions have been stated. If every step required by Matthew, 18th chapter, has been complied with in both letter and spirit, then one of two things infallibly follows:

(1) You gain the erring brother, or

(2) you reach the demonstration that he was never a Christian, and so must be put with heathens and publicans. In either alternative the decision is infallible. Do you doubt it? Listen then and tremble, ye that despise church authority. Hear our Savior add these awful words: "Verily, I say unto you, what things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. And what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" i.e., heaven ratifies what the church does on earth in compliance with Christ's law and in the spirit of it. I repeat with awful solemnity that a decision reached by the church in compliance with the letter and spirit of Christ's law is infallible and is ratified in heaven. It is an amazing thing that some who ought to be better informed count a church interposition or a church censure as a matter of little moment. But let us enter deeper into the thought by inquiring into the reason of this infallibility on earth, confirmed by heavenly ratification. What is the philosophy of it? Here is the answer: Jesus promised to be with His people

always unto the end of the world, in their obedience to His will. The abiding Holy Spirit fulfills this promise. Under the prompting of this Spirit if two or three agree as touching any request, the Father grants it. And when two or three so assemble there is He in their midst. So when the one saw a brother sin and lovingly sought to bring him back, Jesus went with the one. And when the three so tenderly united for the same end, Jesus went with the three. And when the whole church earnestly sought to reclaim the erring one, Jesus went with the church. Thus three times the delinquent said, “No,” to Jesus Himself. And as he thrice trampled on our Lord’s authority on earth, heaven ratifies the Spirit-prompted decision of the church: “Let him be as a heathen or publican.” This is the scriptural doctrine of infallibility. I am frank to confess, however, that the one and the three and the whole church are most fallible when in letter or spirit they depart from Christ’s law. But think of it if one be a genuine Christian if God ever did for Christ’s sake forgive his sins-if on the altar of his heart there sparkled one ray of the Spirit’s light, surely Christ’s law, faithfully administered, will reclaim him. 5. What must be done with the little Christian when he is so brought to penitence? His heart is broken. His spirit is contrite. He confesses and deplores and renounces his sin. What then? Forgive him fully, freely and forever. Let it be as if he had not gone astray. Put no reproaches on him. Revive no bitter memories. Show him that you love him with the old-time love. I repeat the scriptures: “Be ye kind to him, tender-hearted, forgiving him, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you.” Just here in our chapter Peter propounds a most thoughtful and practical question: “Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times?” Ah! What a searching question! The force of it is evident. This laboring with erring brethren is no light matter. We can very well stand it once and by exceptional grace perhaps seven times. But surely there must be a limit somewhere. How can we devote our lives to hunting up a sheep that is no sooner found than he goes astray again? Brother, brother, bow your head to the Master. Submit to His will. Hear His solemn reply to Peter: “I say not unto thee, until seven times, but until seventy times seven.” This is a staggering doctrine. There is only one standpoint on earth from which you can fully accept it, and that is from a consideration of the number of times God has forgiven you and from the consideration of your infinite sin forgiven in Christ. Yours, brother, is a ten thousand talent case inquiring about a hundred pence case. Hence, the parable which closes the chapter. Do read it. When you have reclaimed and forgiven the erring brother seventy times seven, that is only one hundred pence; but when Jesus sought you out and saved you, that was ten thousand talents. Ah me! In that light not even Peter could ask another question. And now in conclusion I desire to impress on your hearts three most marvelous reasons why we should receive little Christians, however little, and feed them baby-diet until they grow stronger, no matter how long it may be, and not despise them and not cause them to sin, but go right along and reclaim them if they do sin, and forgive them when reclaimed, and keep on reclaiming and forgiving. Here are the reasons: 1. Matthew 18:10 : “In heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.” But how ought this fact to keep us from despising them? Can you not see the argument? One’s importance must be judged by the number and quality of his servants. Angels excel in strength. They are flaming spirits and potentialities. And yet great and glorious and holy as are the angels, they are but ministering spirits to them that are the heirs of salvation. Shall I despise one whose very servants stand before the glorious face of the Almighty? Yes, little Christians, there are angels hovering round you day and night. That little Christian, Jacob, saw them more than once. 2. Jesus died for him. “And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?” 1 Corinthians 8:11. His value must be estimated not

from my opinion of him, but from the price Jesus was willing to pay for him. 3. No matter how little, he shall never perish. Matthew 18:13-14 : “And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more over that sheep than over the ninety and nine which went not, astray. Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish.” Glorious, sublime, uplifting peroration! So far as you are concerned, big Christian, he was left to perish. You even tell how you heard the wolf howling where you abandoned him lost and helpless. But the great Shepherd of the flock, the good Shepherd, also heard the wolf and the bleating of the poor stray sheep. Hear Him: “I give unto him eternal life; and he shall never perish, neither shall any wolf pluck him out of my hand.” John 10:28. How can I despise this deathless one? Oh little sheep, thou shalt live forever! God decrees it. Thou shalt stand on the right hand at the judgment when He separates the sheep from the goats (Matthew 25:31-33), for thou art a sheep. Thy smallness doth not make thee a goat. Thou shalt be whiter than snow, little sheep, washed all white in thy Redeemer’s blood. Oh, my brethren! Are not these incentives? Why will you not understand me? My heart is breaking for a revival of religion! And do you not see the hindrance and how it may be removed? I am not troubled about you mature Christians. You are ready any day or night. Nor do young converts give me concern. Their salvation is fresh in their memory. But oh! The little Christians the great host of the undeveloped ones long ago converted but not grown in grace these these are my problem. As a mother’s heart aches for a long absent and erring child, so aches my heart for the members who for months and years remain astray. Oh! Thou Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, fulfill here in Waco thine own ancient promise: “I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick!”

# S. My Infidelity and What...

MY INFIDELITY AND WHAT BECAME OF IT This account of B. H. Carroll's conversion was first given in an address at Nashville. Tennessee, and by request of J. M. Frost, then Secretary of the Baptist Sunday School Board, was reported for the Teacher of the Southern Baptist Convention Sunday School Series. It later appeared in Doctor Carroll's book with the title, Sermons, published by the American Baptist Publication Society, and through their courtesy is reproduced here. I cannot remember when I began to be an infidel. Certainly at a very early age-even before I knew what infidelity meant. There was nothing in my home life to beget or suggest it. My father was a self-educated Baptist minister, preaching-mainly without compensation -to village or country churches. My mother was a devoted Christian of deep and humble piety. There were no infidel books in our home library, nor in any other accessible to me. My teachers were Christians-generally preachers. There were no infidels of my acquaintance, and no public sentiment in favor of them. My infidelity was never from without, but always from within. I had no precept and no example. When, later in life, I read infidel books, they did not make me an infidel, but because I was an infidel I sought, bought and read them. Even when I read them I was not impressed by new suggestions, but only when occasionally they gave clearer expression of what I had already vaguely felt. No one of them or all of them sounded the depths of my own infidelity or gave an adequate expression of it. They all fell short of the distance in doubt over which my own troubled soul had passed. From unremembered time this skepticism progressed, though the progress was not steady and regular. Sometimes in one hour, as by far-shining flashes of inspiration, there would be more progress in extent and definiteness than in previous months. Moreover, these short periods of huge advances were without preceding intentions or perceptible preparations. They were always sudden and startling. Place and circumstances had but little to do with them. The doubt was seldom germane to the topic under consideration. It always leaped far away to a distant and seemingly disconnected theme, in a way unexplained by the law of the association of ideas. At times I was in the Sunday school or hearing a sermon or bowed with others in family prayer-more frequently when I waked at night after healthful sleep, and still more frequently when rambling alone in the fields or in the woods. To be awake in the stillness of the night while others slept, or to be alone in forest depths, or on boundless prairies, or on mountain heights has always possessed for me a weird fascination. Even to this day there are times when houses and people are unbearable. Frequently have I been intoxicated with thoughts of the immensity of space and the infinity of nature. Now these were the very times when skepticism made such enormous progress. "When I consider thy Heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" Thus, before I knew what infidelity was, I was an infidel. My child-mind was fascinated by strange and sometimes horrible questionings concerning many religious subjects. Long before I had read the experiences of others, I had been borne far beyond sight of any shore, wading and swimming beyond my depth after solutions to such questions as the "philosopher's stone," the "elixir of life," and "the fountain of youth," but mainly the "chief good." I understand now much better than then the character and direction of the questionings of that

early period. By a careful retrospect and analysis of such of them as memory preserves, I now know that I never doubted the being, personality and government of God. I was never an atheist or pantheist. I never doubted the existence and ministry of angels-pure spirits never embodied I could never have been a Sadducee. I never doubted the essential distinction between spirit and matter: I could never have been a materialist. And as to the origin of things, the philosophy of Democritus, developed by Epicurus, more developed by Lucretius, and gone to seed in the unverified hypothesis of modern evolutionists such a godless, materialistic anti-climax of philosophy never had the slightest attraction or temptation for me. The intuitions of humanity preserved me from any ambition to be descended from either beast or protoplasm. The serious reception of such a speculative philosophy was not merely a mental, but mainly a moral impossibility. I never doubted the immortality of the soul and conscious future existence. This conviction antedated any reading of “Plato, thou reasonest well.” I never doubted the final just judgment of the Creator of the world. But my infidelity related to the Bible and its manifest doctrines. I doubted that it was God’s book; that it was an inspired revelation of His will to man. I doubted miracles. I doubted the Divinity of Jesus of Nazareth. But more than all, I doubted His vicarious expiation for the sins of men. I doubted any real power and vitality in the Christian religion. I never doubted that the Scriptures claimed inspiration, nor that they taught unequivocally the divinity and vicarious expiation of Jesus. If the Bible does not teach these, it teaches nothing. The trifling expedient of accepting the Bible as “inspired in spots” never occurred to me. To accept, with Renan, its natural parts and arbitrarily deny its supernatural, or to accept with some the book as from God, and then strike at its heart by a false interpretation that denied the divinity and vicarious expiation of Jesus - these were follies of which I was never guilty-follies for which even now I have never seen or heard a respectable excuse. To me it was always “Aut Caesar, aut nihil.” What anybody wanted, in a religious way, with the shell after the kernel was gone I never could understand. While the beginnings of my infidelity cannot be recalled, by memory I can give the date when it took tangible shape. I do know just when it emerged from chaos and outlined itself in my consciousness with startling distinctness. An event called it out of the mists and shadows into conscious reality. It happened on this wise: There was a protracted meeting in our vicinity. A great and mysterious influence swept over the community. There was much excitement. Many people, old and young, joined the church and were baptized. Doubtless in the beginning of the meeting the conversions were what I would now call genuine. Afterward many merely went with the tide. They went because others were going. Two things surprised me. First, that I did not share the interest or excitement. To me it was only a curious spectacle. The second was that so many people wanted me to join the church. I had manifested no special interest except once or twice mechanically and experimentally. I had no conviction for sin. I had not felt lost and did not feel saved. First one and then another catechized me, and that categorically. Thus “Don’t you believe the Bible?” “Yes.” “Don’t you believe in Jesus Christ?” “Y-e-s.” “Well, doesn’t the Bible say that whoever believes in Jesus Christ is saved?” “Yes.” Now, mark three things: First, this catechizing was by zealous church-members before I presented myself for membership. Second, the answers were historical, Sunday school answers, as from a textbook. Third, I was only thirteen years old. These answers were reported to the preachers somewhat after this fashion: “Here is a lad who believes the Bible, believes in Jesus Christ and believes that he is saved. Ought not such a one to join the church?” Now came the pressure of well-meant but unwise persuasion. I will not describe it. The whole thing would have been exposed if, when I presented myself for membership, I had been asked to tell my

own story without prompting or leading questions. I did not have any to tell and would have told none. But many had joined, the hour was late and a few direct questions elicited the same historical, stereotyped answers. Thus the die was cast. Until after my baptism everything seemed unreal, but walking home from the baptism the revelation came. The vague infidelity of all the past took positive shape, and would not down at my bidding. Truth was naked before me. My answers had been educational. I did not believe that the Bible was God's revelation. I did not believe its miracles and doctrines. I did not believe, in any true sense, in the divinity or vicarious sufferings of Jesus. I had no confidence in professed conversion and regeneration. I had not felt lost, nor did I feel saved. There was no perceptible, radical change in my disposition or affections. What I once loved, I still loved; what I once hated, I still hated. It was no temporary depression of spirit following a previous exaltation, such as I now believe sometimes comes to genuine Christians. This I knew. Joining the church, with its assumption of obligations, was a touchstone. It acted on me like the touch of Ithuriel's spear. I saw my real self. I knew that either I had no religion or it was not worth having. This certainty as to my state had no intermittance. The sensation of actual and positive infidelity was so new to me that I hardly knew what to say about it. I felt a repugnance to parade it. I wanted time and trial for its verification. I knew that its avowal would pain and horrify my family and the church, yet honesty required me to say something. And so I merely asked that the church withdraw from me on the ground that I was not converted. This was not granted because the brethren thought that I mistook temporary mental depression for lack of conversion. They asked me to wait and give it a trial; to read the Bible and pray. I could not make them understand, but from that time on I read the Bible as never before-read it all; read it many times; studied it in the light of my infidelity; marked its contradictions and fallacies, as they seemed to me, from Genesis to Revelation. Two years passed away. In this interval we moved to Texas. In a meeting in Texas, when I was fifteen years old, I was persuaded to retain membership for a further examination. Now came the period of reading Christian apologies and infidel books. What a multitude of them of both kinds! Hume, Paine, Volney, Bolingbroke, Rousseau, Voltaire, Taylor, Gibbon, and others, over against Watson, Nelson, Horn, Calvin, Walker and a host of others. In the meantime I was at college devouring the Greek, Roman and Oriental philosophies. At seventeen, being worn out in body and mind, I joined McCullough's Texas Rangers, the first regiment mustered into the Confederate service, and on the remote, uninhabited frontier pursued the investigation with unabated ardor. But now came another event. I shall not name it. It came from no sin on my part, but it blasted every hope and left me in Egyptian darkness. The battle of life was lost. In seeking the field of war, I sought death. By peremptory demand I had my church connection dissolved and turned utterly away from every semblance of Bible belief. In the hour of my darkness, I turned unreservedly to infidelity. This time I brought it a broken heart and a disappointed life, asking for light and peace and rest. It was now no curious speculation; no tentative intellectual examination. It was a stricken soul, tenderly and anxiously and earnestly seeking light. As I was in the first Confederate regiment, so I was in the last corps that surrendered; but while armies grappled and throttled each other, a darker and deadlier warfare raged within me. I do know this: My quest for the truth was sincere and unintermittent. Happy people whose lives are not blasted may affect infidelity, may appeal to its oracles from a curious, speculative interest, and may minister to their intellectual pride by seeming to be odd. It was not so with me. With all the earnestness of a soul between which and happiness the bridges were burned, I brought a broken and bleeding, but honest heart to every reputed oracle of infidelity. I did not ask life or fame or pleasure. I merely

asked light to shine on the path of right. Once more I viewed the anti-Christian philosophies, no longer to admire them in what they destroyed, but to inquire what they built up, what they offered to a hungry heart and a blasted life. There now came to me a revelation as, awful as when Mokanna, in Moore's "Lalla Rookh," lifted his veil for Zelica. Why had I never seen it before? How could I have been blind to it? These philosophies, one and all, were mere negations. They were destructive, but not constructive. They overturned and overturned and overturned; but, as my soul liveth, they built up nothing under the whole heaven in the place of what they destroyed. I say nothing; I mean nothing. To the unstricken, curious soul, they are as beautiful as the aurora borealis, shining on arctic icebergs. But to me they warmed nothing and melted nothing. No flowers bloomed and no fruit ripened under their cheerless beams. They looked down on my bleeding heart as the cold, distant, pitiless stars have ever looked down on all human suffering. Whoever, in his hour of real need, makes abstract philosophy his pillow, makes cold, hard granite his pillow. Whoever looks trustingly into any of its false faces, looks into the face of a Medusa, and is turned to stone. They are all wells without water, and clouds without rain. I have witnessed a drought in Texas. The earth was iron and the heavens brass. Dust clouded the thoroughfares and choked the travelers. Water courses ran dry, grass scorched and crackled, corn leaves twisted and wilted, stock died around the last water holes, the ground cracked in fissures, and the song of birds died out in parched throats. Men despaired. The whole earth prayed: "Rain, rain, rain! O heaven, send rain!" Suddenly a cloud rises above the horizon and floats into vision like an angel of hope. It spreads a cool shade over the burning and glowing earth. Expectation gives life to desire. The lowing herds look up. The shriveled flowers open their tiny cups. The corn leaves untwist and rustle with gladness. And just when all trusting, suffering life opens her confiding heart to the promise of relief, the cloud, the cheating cloud, like a heartless coquette, gathers her drapery about her and floats scornfully away, leaving the angry sun free to dart his fires of death into the open heart of all suffering life. Such a cloud without rain is any form of infidelity to the soul in its hour of need. Who then can conjure by the name of Voltaire? Of what avail in that hour is Epicurus or Zeno, Huxley or Darwin? Here now was my case: I had turned my back on Christianity, and had found nothing in infidelity; happiness was gone and death would not come. The Civil War had left me a wounded cripple on crutches, utterly poverty-stricken and loaded with debt. The internal war of infidelity, after making me roll hopelessly the ever-falling stone of Sisyphus, vainly climb the revolving wheel of Ixion, and stoop like Tantalus to drink waters that ever receded, or reach out for fruit that could not be grasped, now left me bound like Prometheus on the cold rock, while vultures tore with beak and talons a life that could suffer, but could not die. At this time, two books of the Bible took hold of me with unearthly power. I had not a thought of their inspiration, but I knew from my experience that they were neither fiction nor allegory the Book of Job and the Book of Ecclesiastes. Some soul had walked those paths. They were histories, not dreams and not mere poems. Like Job, I believed in God; and like him had cried: "Oh, that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat! … Behold, I go forward, but he is not there: and backward, but I cannot perceive him: on the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him: he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him: but he knoweth the way that I take." Like Job, I could not find answers in nature to the heart's sorest need and the most important questions; and, like Job, regarding God as my adversary, I had cried out for a revelation: "Oh, that one would hear me! behold, my desire is, that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book. Surely I would take it upon my shoulder, and bind it as a crown to me." Like Job, I felt the

need of a mediator, who as a man could enter into my case, and as divine could enter into God's case; and, like Job, I had complained: "He is not a man as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment. Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both." And thus I approached my twenty-second year. I had sworn never to put my foot in another church. My father had died believing me lost. My mother - when does a mother give up a child? came to me one day and begged, for her sake, that I would attend one more meeting. It was a Methodist camp meeting, held in the fall of 1865. I had not an atom of interest in it. I liked the singing, but the preaching did not touch me. But one day I shall never forget. It was Sunday at eleven o'clock. The great, wooden shed was crowded. I stood on the outskirts, leaning on my crutches, wearily and somewhat scornfully enduring. The preacher made a failure even for him. There was nothing in his sermon. But when he came down, as I supposed to exhort as usual, he startled me not only by not exhorting, but by asking some questions that seemed meant for me. He said: "You that stand aloof from Christianity and scorn us simple folks, what have you got? Answer honestly before God, have you found anything worth having where you are!" My heart answered in a moment "Nothing under the whole heaven; absolutely nothing." As if he had heard my unspoken answer, he continued "Is there anything else out there worth trying, that has any promise in it?" Again my heart answered: "Nothing; absolutely nothing. I have been to the jumping-off place on all these roads. They all lead to a bottomless abyss." "Well, then," he continued, "admitting there's nothing there, if there be a God, mustn't there be a something somewhere? If so, how do you know it is not here? Are you willing to test it? Have you the fairness and courage to try it? I don't ask you to read any book, nor study any evidences, nor make any difficult and tedious pilgrimages; that way is too long and time is too short. Are you willing to try it now; to make a practical, experimental test, you to be the judge of the result?" These cool, calm and pertinent questions hit me with tremendous force, but I didn't understand the test. He continued: "I base my test on these two Scriptures: 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God'; 'Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord.'" For the first time I understood the import of these Scriptures. I had never before heard of such a translation for the first, and had never examined the original text. In our version it says: "If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." But the preacher quoted it: "Whosoever willeth to do the will of God," showing that the knowledge as to whether the doctrine was of God depended not upon external action and not upon exact conformity with God's will, but upon the internal disposition - "whoso-ever willeth or wishes to do God's will." The old translation seemed to make knowledge impossible; the new, impracticable. In the second Scripture was also new light: "Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord," which means that true knowledge follows persistence in the prosecution of it; that is, it comes not to temporary and spasmodic investigation. So, when he invited all who were willing to make an immediate experimental test to come forward and give him their hands, I immediately went forward. I was not prepared for the stir which this action created. My infidelity and my hostile attitude toward Christianity were so well known in the community that such action on my part developed quite a sensation. Some even began to shout. Whereupon, to prevent any misconception, I arose and stated that I was not converted, that perhaps they misunderstood what was meant by my coming forward; that my heart was as cold as ice; my action meant no more than that I was willing to make an experimental test of the truth and power of the Christian religion, and that I was willing to persist in subjection to the test until a true solution could be found. This quieted matters. The meeting closed without any change upon my part. The

last sermon had been preached, the benediction pronounced and the congregation was dispersing. A few ladies only remained, seated near the pulpit and engaged in singing. Feeling that the experiment was ended and the solution not found, I remained to hear them sing. As their last song they sang O land of rest, for thee I sigh, When will the moment come When I shall lay my armor by And dwell in peace at home. The singing made a wonderful impression upon me. Its tones were as soft as the rustling of angels' wings. Suddenly there flashed upon my mind, like a light from heaven, this Scripture: "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." I did not see Jesus with my eye, but I seemed to see him standing before me, looking reproachfully and tenderly and pleadingly, seeming to rebuke me for having gone to all other sources for rest but the right one, and now inviting me to come to Him. In a moment I went, once and forever, casting myself unreservedly and for all time at Christ's feet, and in a moment the rest came, indescribable and unspeakable, and it has remained from that day until now. I gave no public expression of the change which had passed over me, but spent the night in the enjoyment of it and wondering if it would be with me when morning came. When the morning came, it was still with me, brighter than the sunlight and sweeter than the songs of birds, and now, for the first time, I understood the Scripture which I had often heard my mother repeat "Ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands" (Isaiah 55:12). When I reached home, I said nothing about the experience through which I had passed, hiding the righteousness of God in my own heart; but it could not be hidden. As I was walking across the floor on my crutches, an orphan boy whom my mother had raised noticed and called attention to the fact that I was both whistling and crying. I knew that my mother heard him, and to avoid observation, I went at once to my room, lay down on the bed and covered my face with my hands. I heard her coming. She pulled my hands away from my face and gazed long and stedfastly upon me without a word. A light came over her face that made it seem to me as the shining on the face of Stephen; and then, with trembling lips, she said: "My son, you have found the Lord." Her happiness was indescribable. I don't think she slept that night. She seemed to fear that with sleep she might dream and wake to find that the glorious fact was but a vision of the night. I spent the night at her bedside reading Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. I read it all that night, and when I came with the pilgrims to the Beulah Land, from which Doubting Castle could be seen no more forever, and which was within sight of the Heavenly City and within sound of the heavenly music, my soul was filled with such a rapture and such an ecstacy of joy as I had never before experienced. I knew then as well as I know now, that I would preach; that it would be my life work; that I would have no other work.

# S. Objects of the Church

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCH

TEXT: (The text selected combines Ephesians 3:10 and Ephesians 3:21) To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God Unto Him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations forever and ever. Amen.

The letter to the Ephesians is a circular letter-that is, not intended for the church at Ephesus particularly but for that church and a number of others to whom copies of it were sent. It presents to us the following thoughts: That the church as set forth in this letter has a three-fold sense. It has the sense of an institution, as for example, “Upon this Rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” It has, in the second place, the sense of all of the redeemed from the first man saved to the last man saved. In this case it refers to the church in glory and is prospective except as an ideal or conception of the mind. Then it means the particular church in any given place, as the church at Ephesus. In all three of these senses Christ is the head of the church. He is the head of the church as an institution. He is the head of the church in glory. He is the head of each particular church, as the church at Waco. This letter also sets forth the objects of the church, and the objects are those to be accomplished by each particular church or else by the church as an institution. These objects are three-fold. As said by the Apostle Paul in the letter to the Corinthians, the apostles are a spectacle to the angels. Here he uses language common to the show in Rome and in the great Greek cities where a great amphitheatre accommodates the hundreds of thousands of people assembled. There are the spectators; in the arena is the spectacle. The church is said to be a spectacle to the angels.- To get the full grammatic thought of the Apostle, let us conceive of heaven and earth as a great amphitheatre. The earth is the arena; the heavens are the galleries where the angels are looking down upon the church. The second object of the church is to instruct the angels that are so looking down upon it. These angels, while great in knowledge, are not omniscient. They have an intense desire to look into all the workings of the wisdom of God. That curiosity of their, is represented as if to discern the great object of God in the appointment of that mercy seat. These angels regard the unfolding of the wisdom of God as the most worthy thing of angelic knowledge. But this unfolding is not entrusted to them. The unfolding of the much diversified wisdom of God is committed to the church, to the church as an institution and to each particular church. Each church unfolds the much diversified wisdom of God, and as it unfolds, the angels above, the interested spectators, are instructed in the development of that wisdom. The next object of the church is that in thus unfolding God’s wisdom to the angels, they declare the glory of God, and hence the last part of the text, that in the church throughout all ages shall be declared the glory of God. In this connection this letter sets forth the time in which the church is to be a spectacle to angels, the time in which the church is to occupy the position of instructor of angels, the time in which the church shall declare the glory of God and it is to the end of this age, until the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is the mission of the church of Christ. Now, the latter also sets forth what is necessary on the part of the church in order for these

great things to be accomplished. Every member of a particular church must have a vital connection with the Head of the church-a living connection, not a nominal connection. The objects that God had in view in the institution of a church are thwarted just to the extent that there are on the rolls of the church men and women who have no real vital connection with the Head. It is utterly impossible for one who has only a nominal connection with Jesus Christ to declare the glory of God or to unfold His wisdom. The next thing necessary is that there shall also be a vital connection between all of the parts which constitute the church. There must not only be a living connection with Jesus Christ, but there must be a living connection with each other. Therefore, any member of the church who is out of fellowship with his brethren, anyone who from any cause is incapacitated for working with the rest of the members, just by that much he thwarts the object of God in the institution of the church. We must be in touch with each other as well as in vital touch with the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head. The next thing is that the church is to be for a habitation of God through the spirit. The congregation has a house. The church (not the building) is the house of the living God. The One who dwells in this house is the holy spirit. Now any member of a church in whose individual heart there is no indwelling of the spirit is a handicap to the rest of the congregation. He is a drag upon the church. He is a burden to it. They have to carry his share in doing the work which God has given the church to do. The letter then goes on to show that in order to afford the proper spectacle to the angels, and in order that the angels may perceive in the work of the church the unfolding of the much diversiformed wisdom of God, it is necessary that the congregation shall, as a congregation, upbuild. Let us suppose that a congregation for five years of its life has been growing as a congregation in grace and in members, in brotherly love. That far, then, they have been active instructors to the onlooking angels. But there comes a halt in the upbuilding of the church. Things are at a standstill. They exhibit the same old picture lessons to the angels that they have been exhibiting for the last five years. Nothing new is presented to them. There is no changing progress that brings out any new thought of the wisdom of God. The upbuilding of a congregation, then, is absolutely essential to the accomplishment of the object of the institution of the church. But this is incidental. There is a higher object than that. The church best shows to the angels the wisdom of God by the saving power which it exercises upon outsiders. Not merely that there is growth in grace in each individual member and that the bond of unity between the members is continually strengthened, but that the church, as a saving power, is bringing in the lost. So that if within any given period of time, say one year, nobody is converted through the ministration of the church, the spectators in heaven, those angels that hover over the assemblage of God’s people, those angels, intently curious to observe the unfolding of the wisdom of the power of God, how impatient must they become when no progress is made in the unfolding! No sinner is saved. The roll stands just as it was before with no increase except by letter. They have a pastor perhaps, they have a building perhaps, they go through all regular forms of public worship. But in some way their services are of a kind that convicts no sinner of sin and saves nobody. You will see at once that by lack of the exercise of saving power the church defeats the object of God in its establishment. This upbuilding which constitutes the first means by which the church declares the glory of God may be of two kinds. One of the most interesting kinds is in special cases where one who has united with a particular church in some hour of revival power grows from a baby in Christ to a stalwart man or woman in Christ, becomes a character. People observe this remarkable development of practical, individual Christianity. They say of this man, “He is a monument of the grace of God, a monument covered with inscriptions, and any eye may

read the story that the monument tells." In all the history of the church these titles of grace, these colossal developments of individual character and power have challenged the admiration of the world. Now and then you see some layman developed by the power of Christianity within, until everybody that knows him respects him to the full extent that the human heart and mind can entertain respect. They believe in his personal integrity, they believe in his veracity, they believe in his honesty, in his practical piety, and when he passes away, it is as if the lordliest and most wide-branching tree of a forest had fallen. It leaves a vacancy in the sky. The very birds themselves are startled when they fly over an empty space that once had been for them a resting place. This upbuilding, this resting place, constitutes one of the things that the angels admire most. They look at it just as spectators would look at a statue carved by a mighty artist out of hard granite, and as they behold that work taking shape and each outline softened and the marvelous symmetry brought out under the skillful stroke of the mallet and the chisel until that statue seems to live and breathe, they glorify the artist in what he has accomplished. But this upbuilding also looks to a congregational up building. Not merely that one here and there may be so developed by the power of Christianity as to gain the respect and warm love of all who know him, but that the progress of a whole congregation as such may attract the attention of the world. Not merely that, but that this congregation as a congregation may send out the praises of God throughout the whole world by their example, the record that they make so that other churches far off may look at that church and say, "It is a banner church. It is in the lead in the great work of God. When we want to know what is best for a church, we study the example of that church and we see how unselfish, how self-sacrificingly, with what spiritual consecration they do what God would have them to do, in missions, in all other things in which the commands of God rest upon them." In that way this church may be built up and it may teach this lesson to the angels. Now, the Apostle having set forth the idea of a church in its three-fold sense, as an institution, as a particular congregation and as an ultimate body in glory, and having shown that there must be vital connection between each member and the Head and that there must be vital connection between one part and all the rest, and that so knit together and compacted they shall constitute the house in which the Holy Spirit dwells, and that so constituted it becomes the spectacle of angels, the instructor of angels in the manifold wisdom of God and that it displays the glory of God throughout the ages, and having shown that it does this through the upbuilding, the bringing about of exceptional cases of character in individuals and in the general upbuilding of the membership, and also in saving the unconverted with which it comes in touch — having presented all these thoughts and knowing how much that particular church at Ephesus and every other particular church in the world needs some things in order to thus serve God, he offers a prayer. This prayer consists of five petitions, and the first petition is this: "I pray that you may be strengthened with power in the inner man, with power inside." There is no power in external things to a church. If it be a power that can attract the attention, and inform the minds of onlooking angels, it must be an inward power, a power of which the soul is conscious. Jacob had power with God and with man. He is therefore called a priest. That power came to him through prayer, and therefore the Apostle Paul prays that the members of the Ephesian church might be strengthened with power in the inner man. Every individual Christian should take an inventory of his internal powers. One who is devoid of consciousness of internal power can have no confidence in addressing himself to great exploits. He is too timid to undertake them. He feels his incapacity to do such things, but if this power is felt in his heart he is not overawed by any threatening danger. He is not discouraged by any

postponement of success. He is not diverted from a straightforward march to the accomplishment of his object by any sidetracking thing that is presented to seduce his mind and turn him away from his work, if he has this power. Therefore Paul prays that they may have that power. The second thing that he prays for is: That Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith. The dwelling of Christ in the heart can only come through faith in Christ. It is much to be feared that to a great many people Christ is only an occasional visitor, and if He chances to spend an hour with you, you feel like you have a strange company and that you must put on company manners because a certain worthy one is spending an hour with you. But if our faith be strong enough, Christ dwells in the heart; that is His home. He has formed in the heart His image, so that if the heart were opened to the light of Heaven, the first thing that that light would shine on would be the image of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is no other image in any way daring to rival. I believe I told you once of a woman who intensely loved her husband. He had gone to the wars. It was doubtful if he would ever return. Indeed, he never did get back, but every morning she would put his picture on the mantel-piece and stand before it and gaze long at it and say, “Oh, my husband, if you were here today what would you have me to do? What conduct upon my part would please you the most?” Now, his image was in her heart. She had faith in him; he had faith in her. Now Paul prays in order to the accomplishment of the objects, the great and glorious objects of the church, that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith. Third, he prays that we may be rooted and grounded in love. Here are two figures: One is agricultural and the other is architectural. The sending down of the tap root insures the life of the transplanting. You may never count the transplanting a success until the tap root has gone deep down into the ground and touched the hidden source of moisture in the earth. He says, “I pray that you may be rooted in love and that you may be grounded in love.” In building a house, a house that you expect to stand, you dig deep and lay a broad and a very firm foundation. Now he says, I pray that you may have that kind of a foundation in love. It is necessary that you should have it if you are to do these things that God commands you to do. The next petition is that they may comprehend — that means to lay hold of-the dimensions of the love of God. And these dimensions are expressed in the length, breadth, height and depth of the love of God. It is very much to be feared that many of us have made but little progress in laying hold upon the dimensions of the love of God which surpasses all knowledge. We have some conception of God’s love. Every Christian must have some conception of it. But we have not studied the subject. We have not given it profound and continuous thought. We have not given it that heart study, we have not given it that experimental study, as when a man reading in the Bible about God’s love not only intellectually understands the signification of the terms and their grammatical construction, but puts his very heart against that description and feels and then in his life lives so that he will say, “Since my conversion I have been all the time increasing my acquaintance with God’s love.” It was very sweet to my soul when I first found it. I had not tried it much then. I have found as years roll on and as new experiences come and go that God’s love is higher than I thought at first. Oh, it is very much higher than any mountain, any cloud, any sky! I have found out that it is very deep — that it is deeper than any thought of mine can measure, deeper than the earth itself, deeper than the space in which the earth floats, this love of God that reached down to the very depths of hell in order to pluck me as a brand from the burning and has now lifted me up, up, higher, higher, until at last I am by that love to be made a joint heir with the Lord Jesus Christ and to sit with Him on the throne of His glory. And then the length of it and the breadth of it. Go straight forward until you have made the circuit of the earth and the love is there. Go right and left in either direction until you

strike the shores of space itself and the love of God is there. Now he says, “Brethren, if the church is to accomplish its mission of instruction to the angels and is to show forth God’s glory, you ought to lay hold with some kind of a grasp upon the dimensions of God’s love.” Oh, how old it is! It commences before the world was made. Oh, how precious it is! It found me when I was an enemy of God, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel and it changed me from an enemy to a friend. And, oh, how, while revolutions have overtaken earthly governments, and inexorable laws have written change upon every earthly thing, time writes no wrinkle on the brow of the love of God, which as creation’s dawn beheld it, shineth now. Then he prayed that they might be filled with all the fulness of God. There was a time when that statement staggered me. I confess I did not understand it. He evidently isn’t praying for something unattainable. It is an intensely practical prayer. He means they were to get what he asks for, that a church of the Lord Jesus Christ should be filled with all the fulness of God. The thought is this, and in this way a child can understand it: God in the Holy Spirit inhabits every true church. Now the Holy Spirit does not come into a church with only a part of himself. He comes in all the fulness of God, the fulness of His wisdom, the fulness of His power, the fulness of His love. He is there that way. But when the Apostle Paul prays that we may be filled with that fulness the thought is this: That there might come into our hearts a realization of that presence of the Holy Spirit in that power. Now, in order to enable you to step up on the thought, let us make a stepping stone of the great commission. Christ says to His people: “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, making disciples of all nations.” He precedes that statement with, “All power in Heaven and on earth is given unto me and lo, I am with you in the exercise of that power.” That power is there. It is there all the time with that presence. The only thing is, will the church lay hold of it? Will they appropriate it? Very dimly we see it, very feebly we touch it. Sometimes in hours of mighty spiritual power, the thought overwhelms us and we begin to realize that if two or three be gathered in the name of God, the Omnipotence is with the two or three, that no command is impossible, that anything He says do, can be done. Now, the Holy Spirit dwells in this church I doubt it not. It was intended to be a house for Him and He has been living in the house, but we have shut up a good many of the rooms from Him. We have barred Him out of a great part of His mansion. Now, when He prays that we may be filled with the fulness of God, it means that we must open up to Him all the rest of the chambers. Let Him in, not only partially, but altogether. Let Him in, not as limited, but as unlimited. Let Him in, not only as a prevalent love, but as an all prevalent love. That is the exposition of this text.

# S. Observing the Commands of Christ

OBSERVING THE COMMANDS OF CHRIST

TEXT: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. - Matthew 28:20. More than once during the last great meeting your attention was called to this commission of our Saviour, and the first part of it was doubtless sufficiently discussed; that is, to make disciples by repentance and faith, and to baptize the disciples. And now comes the text of today: “Teaching them (that is, the baptized disciples) to observe all things whatsoever” Jesus Christ has commanded. You will do well to note carefully that a baptized disciple has only started. He has complied with the initial commandments. He has learned the rudiments. He has made his heart acquainted with the first principles of the oracles of God. He is a babe in Christ. It is easy to point out the ground over which he has passed. He has repented towards God he has received the Lord Jesus Christ-he has been baptized. He is now a member of the church, entitled to all its privileges and franchises and subject to all its obligations. I ask you next to compare thoughtfully the difficulties of the first teaching with the difficulties of this teaching. In making disciples you deal with the enemies of Jesus Christ, in open revolt against His government. The inveterate and incorrigible depravity of the heart must be subdued; but when a disciple is once made, when the Holy Spirit has breathed upon him and made him a new man; when his heart is full of love to God, then it would seem easy to teach him to do whatever his Saviour has commanded him to do. And my reliance today is upon the fact that you are children of God horn from above penitent believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, created in Him unto good works. I have as the predicate of every instruction I shall give you today, and as the hope of its fulfilment in your life, that you are children of God. Not only this, but I can appeal to your baptism, to which you submitted in the presence of vast throngs of the people, thus publicly obligating yourselves to walk in newness of life according to the resurrection which it showed. Not only this, but the baptism was more than a declaration of your faith in Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords, and divine teacher and divine Saviour; it was also your oath of allegiance to Him. In it you put on His uniform, enlisted in His service, acknowledged His ownership of brain and hand and heart and purse and everything that you had. Therefore, in teaching you, God’s children, you monuments of His mercy, you, on the altar of whose hearts the kindling fire of a new inspiration has been placed, I can with some confidence venture to lay upon you the obligation to do whatever else He has commanded. Now, I am going to so arrange this sermon that you can take hold of it and the different parts of it. I will do this by emphasizing single words. First, is the word “impossible.” By that, I mean that it would be impossible to teach you to do these things Jesus Christ has commanded if you had not been born of the Spirit of God. It would be morally impossible. There are some foolish people who assume to take a raw sinner and whitewash his depravity and baptize him in his unregenerated, his sinful and antagonistic state, and ,then try to teach him to observe all the commandments of Jesus Christ. It is morally impossible. Such teachers will say, “Join the church if you have no more religion than a horse. Join the church and get religion by doing religion.” These very teachers who break down the walls of the sheepfold and

invite in and drive in all the goats who can be persuaded or driven, will then stand at the gate and complain that the fold is full of goats, who will not act like sheep. It is circumstantially impossible to teach the latter part of this commission to those ignorant of the first part. Unless he is converted, unless his soul is made anew, you cannot induce him to attend regularly and systematically, and regular attendance there must be in order to learn and to do what my text speaks about today; and, therefore, circumstantially it would be impossible for this part of the commission of the Lord Jesus Christ to be performed, the other being undone. And it is not only morally and circumstantially impossible, but it is personally impossible, in that you could not, except upon the predicate of the first work done, get the man's consent to be a learner and a doer of these other words of Jesus Christ. And without his consent and co-operation, how can you teach? Therefore, morally, circumstantially and personally, it would be impossible for this latter part of the commission to be carried out if the first part had failed. So when you hear false teachers transpose the order of God's commandments and when you see their deluded followers vainly trying to lead a Christian life without being Christians, you will recall this first emphatic word, "impossible." You will recall God's word in Ezekiel, that when He had cleansed them, when He had taken away their stony hearts, when He had giver them a heart of flesh, when He had put His Spirit within them, "then they would keep his commandments and do them." You will recall the words of Jesus: "First make the tree good and then the fruit will be good." Yes, impossible impossible! My next word is "only." "Teaching them only what he has commanded.' Now, there is a vast deal of both religion and theology in that thought. I do not feel upon my heart as a preacher the slightest obligation to teach to you from this pulpit on this and similar occasions anything except what Jesus has commanded, either by express words or by fair and necessary implication. I will not go back to any authority of councils in dark ages, nor to conventions, nor to resolutions of men, to. find even the shadows of a burden to put on you-not one. Here the law by the expression of one thing excludes every other thing. When the obligation is laid upon us to teach what Jesus has commanded, it means to teach in His name nothing that He has not commanded. I wish you would rivet that, clinch it, and never allow any preacher, your pastor nor any other man's pastor, pope, archbishop, cardinal, deacon, or elder, no matter what his name or what his position, to teach you anything as a religious obligation except what Jesus Christ has commanded. And if Jesus has commanded it you may be sure He has commanded it in words easy to be understood, and the words are a matter of record; therefore, demand that the teacher show you the words. And if he cannot show you the words you say to him, "As a religious teacher you are out of your province. I am not under the slightest obligation to hear you teach that. Give me the precepts and examples from the Word of my Lord." Now I asked you to rivet that so it may abide with you, and I will tell you why. Because thereby you have swept away nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of the so-called religious obligations imposed upon the consciences of men. They are swept away. When teachers with itching ears, or the people themselves would yield to popular demands or customs in other denominations, when they try to impose their Easter days or other festivals or rites of paganism and will-worship on you, remember this word, "only." Only what Jesus has commanded. Remember Paul's injunction, misapplied to the less deadly sin of dram-drinking: "Touch not; taste not; handle not." I will give you a smaller word for the next thought - "All." All. That is in the text. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Now, when it says, "all" it doesn't mean a part. When it says, "all" it doesn't allow us with nicety of conscience to discriminate. It doesn't allow us to say, "This commandment I will teach and I will do; that other

commandment, being less important, I will leave out." You may count the days from the time a churchmember begins to quibble in his discrimination of ordinances until he commits treason. There must be some high ideal of the majesty and dignity and supremacy of law-so high that you will not attempt to palm off upon the ignorant and credulous and superstitious anything as law that is not written, nor amend at your hazard anything that is written. I tremble for a man who begins to extenuate and palliate and apologize for his disregard of the least of the commandments of Jesus Christ. We will come to that "all" again directly. For the present, consider another word "alway". That is in the text. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have comanded you; and lo, I am with you alway." In other words, His continuance with His people is to be commensurate with the obligation to teach and to do what He has commanded, and therefore the obligation is to teach "alway," because He has promised to be with them, "alway." Now let us see what is the first idea in that "alway," and especially when you look at it as it is expressed in the original, "Lo, I am with you all the days, every one of the days, bright or dark; I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world." What then is the first thought in it! Do you know how much you have learned when you receive, not as a sojourner, but as a member of the family, this thought, that no - commandment of Jesus Christ is ever to become antiquated! You will see men in these modern times attitudinizing before an undiscerning public as men of "advanced thought," of high culture, who have gotten beyond some of the old commandments of Jesus. They say, "That was that time; this is now." Never, forever does any commandment of Jesus Christ go out of date. It lies on you as imperious in its obligation as it rested on the hearts and consciences of the men to whom it was originally addressed. Not only that, but there comes right under that thought, which is that as we are to teach only what He has commanded, and all He has commanded, and as we are to teach that alway, and as He so commanded, being omniscient and looking to the end of the world, and foreseeing all future contingencies and developments, therefore, there will never be any need for another revelation. This is the gospel. It is to have no successor. Like an angel, it has no posterity. And like its eternal Priest, it has no successor. The next thought is the tense. Tense refers to time. We say, "present tense, past tense, future tense." Now what tense comes in here? "Teaching them to observe all things I have commanded you." "It is finished." What does that mean? That means that from the day this obligation was placed upon the disciples, Jesus Christ was to reveal no new commandments, but He was to give the Holy Spirit, whose mission it was merely to bring to their remembrance the things that He had done and had taught, so that not even from Christ Himself do we look for another book, another revelation. So that what is contained in the Acts of the Apostles, and referred to in the epistles and in the Apocalypse, are but the unfolding and development of what had occurred when He said, "It is finished." When I come to the next word I think of that old Latin proverb, Hic labor; hoc opus est. Not teaching them all the commandments? Oh, no! Oh, how sad it is when we get the idea of it" But "teaching them to observe all things whatsover I have commanded you" to observe. Hear the story of the Scotch boys, for I do want you to rivet this thought. A Scotch mother had two boys, Jamie and Robbie. Jamie was very bright, but Robbie was very dull; Jamie had a strong, vigorous body, but poor Robbie was a cripple. One day the Scotch mother brought home a chart on which were the Ten Commandments, and hung it up in the room and said, "Now, boys, there is your lesson." Jamie flashed his eyes at it and said, "Why, Mother, I can learn it in half an hour, but it will take Bobby a month." And in half an hour Jamie came and recited every one of them, but poor Bobby could not say one of them. But he had come to his mother and asked her the meaning of this one, "Honour thy father and thy mother." And she

had explained it. Soon after, the mother said, “Jamie, I wish you would run out beyond the hill and drive the cattle home.” And he shrugged his shoulders and said, “Oh, mother, I don’t want to go.” But Bobby hobbled up to his mother and said, “Mother, I will go.” “Ah, Jamie, Robbie is ahead of you in the commandments. You have learned them, but have not learned to observe any of them.” Listen at the scorn of God, the sarcasm of the Almighty, when He speaks to Ezekiel: “Also, thou son of man, the children of thy people still are talking against thee by the walls and in the doors of the houses and speak one to another, every one to his brother, saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And they come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them; for with their mouth they show much love, but their heart goeth after their covetousness. And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice and can play well on an instrument; for they hear thy words, but they do them not.” The Saviour’s grand peroration comes up to emphasize and accentuate the thought. At the close of the Sermon on the Mount, He says, “Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. And everyone that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell and great was the fall of it.” And James says, “But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man, beholding his natural face in a glass: For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.” “Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of, rams.” It is the essence of the law, obedience. “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” We are all like Solomon in one respect; we know more wisdom than we practice. But I do wish-it has been a matter of very grave concern to me in tie last twenty-four hours - I do wish that in your hearts could come this very day a purpose like granite, “God being my helper I will delight to do His will. It shall be more to me than my necessary food. It shall be sweeter to me than the honey-comb.” God, give us the spirit of prompt and loving and continuous obedience! You have slept with a traitor the very night that you have harbored the thought that you could disregard a commandment of Jesus Christ. Let our last emphasis be on a phrase, “I am with you.” “Lo, I am with. you, alway, even unto the end of the world.” That presence! Do you remember the day I preached the sermon here in which the position was taken that you could be as vividly impressed by and as sensibly conscious of the presence of God as you could of the presence of a man, and some thought it a strange doctrine? But since our meeting, I venture to say 250 of you, maybe more, would stand up and say, “I know that now just as well as you do. I know that is true.” You recollect when you felt that presence, when you felt it in this house. Here was His power, here was the Lord Himself. Oh, the sweetness of it! Can succeeding events ever blur the pictures on our hearts of that glorious meeting, when mercy came down, and power and love filled this house full of the glory of God! Now, brethren, I can promise you that presence always if you do what He says. He promises that presence only when we make disciples as He commanded, only when we teach them what He has commanded. But always when we carry out His instructions we may claim and expect that presence. But suppose I teach a substitute for baptism; can I say, “Be thou with me?” Suppose I sidetrack the principal thought in the communion; can I say, “Be thou with

met” Suppose I enjoin a tradition of man as a substitute for the commandment of Jesus Christ; can I say, “Be thou with me?” For that reason, if there were no other reason in this world, I would count it as an obligation which absolutely shut me in, leaving me no alternative. I cannot afford to be without. God’s presence. I want to feel it when I pray, when I preach. When I do anything that is a religious thing, I want the presence of the Holy Spirit. When men corrupt the plain words of the Lord Jesus Christ, it is to step out of the highways which He illumines, which He overshadows, which He guards from uncleanness and peril, to wander in a dismal Okefenokee swamp of tradition, to listen to the bellowing and hooting of alligators and owls, and to dwell with slimy things. I would not have God’s finger write on my brain, “High treason! Thou traitor!” And then I expect to die, and when I come to die, it may be, it will be a time of memories for me; and when my mind goes back over the past, it would be a bitter thing for me to remember that I had taught men in the name of God to do what God had never commanded and that in teaching them to do what God had never commanded I had thereby substituted man’s word for God’s Word. I do not want that memory at such a time. And when I come to die, it will be a time of anticipation. The mind will not only look backward, but it will look forward above the swelling of the Jordan into the misty shores of the beyond into the realms of eternity, in the forefront of which looms up the Great White Throne of God’s judgment. In such anticipation I do not wish to look into the eye of Him whose glance is like lightning, so keen, so hot, that men who could - bear the piercing of the dart and saber and arrow flinch from it as from a spear of fire. I would not, while standing before Him, have to think that I had spent my life teaching men to do contrary to what He had commanded. Finally, what are the things which He has commanded? You cannot even consider them unless you take hold first of this word “church.” I would not have any member of this congregation to be ignorant of what that word means-church. There are questions I want you to be able to answer just as quick as you can put the forefinger of your right hand on the forefinger of your left hand. I want you to be able to turn the leaves of the Book to the proof-texts as fast as you can answer: Who established the church? When did He establish the church? What is the church? What are its ordinances? Who are its officers? What are their duties? What is its worship? What is its discipline? What is its work? Do you know that to be a Baptist there is a greater demand for intelligence and piety than to be anything else in the world? I make that statement boldly and never expect to qualify it unless to make it stronger, and now, I will tell you why, directly. I want you to learn that the Lord Jesus Christ established His church, and not Abraham, nor Mahomet, nor Moses, nor Lord Chesterfield, and that the Lord Jesus Christ established His church, not in His preincarnate state, nor in His ascended state, but in the days of His flesh. In a sermon hereafter I will cite these Scriptures. I would cite them today but for one reason: You left your Bibles at home, and I now ask you, every member of this church, to bring your Bibles next time and note the passages, so that any member of this church can meet any preacher in the world and say, “Here, thus saith the Lord.” I want to answer these questions: Who founded the church? When did He found the church? What is the church? What are its ordinances? Who are its officers? What are their duties? What is its worship? What is its authority? What is its work? What is its mission? A church of Jesus Christ is the purest democracy the world ever saw, and the only one; the only one in the world, the only one the world ever knew anything about. Every member is the full equal of every other member; no master in it, no lord in it. Now I will tell you why it requires more intelligence and more piety and more courage to be a Baptist than to be anything else in the world. In the first place, members of Baptist churches have truer and higher citizenship than any others in the world. Your franchise is broader.

You select your religious teachers you receive your members you are the final earthly judges of doctrine and discipline. Now that calls for intelligence. If these were done for you by others, it would not make any difference whether you had any intelligence or not. If somebody else settled the question for you, if you had the luxury of a pope or a bishop, who could appoint for you teachers of morals and of religion, for you and for your children, why then let him be intelligent and pious. But if you make the election, if God devolves upon you such vast and solemn obligations, you cannot delegate your responsibilities. Whatever may be the case with others, with you there can be no sponsors and no proxies. You, as fellow citizens, elect your preacher, elect your deacons, ordain your preacher and your deacons, and then judge of the soundness of the doctrines which they teach. Therefore, you ought to know the Bible by heart. You ought to learn it, every member of you. I am prouder of you as a congregation in one thing than of any congregation I ever saw, and that is, you do your own thinking. You are indeed fellow citizens, and under God you feel responsibility resting upon you every time you elect a preacher or a deacon, or even appoint a protracted meeting. And I gladly admit you were right in your judgment as to when to commence this last one and your pastor's judgment was at fault. Now, doesn't that call for intelligence and piety and courage? And then to be the judge of doctrine. I want you to be able to prove that from the Bible. I could tell you the Scripture this morning, but you have no Bibles with you and you would not remember it. You, knowing God's Word in the pew, are to be the judges of the soundness of the. truth preached from the pulpit; and if a man brings to you any other gospel than the gospel of Jesus Christ, you are not to receive him. Not only that, but as a member of this congregation, this commonwealth, this pure democracy, you and not the preacher have charge of its discipline, and therefore you ought to be acquainted with the law of the New Testament. Every step of it ought to be as familiar to you as the walk from your house-door to your front-gate sidewalk. Yes, it ought to be that familiar to you. Well, it isn't easy then to be a Baptist. Moreover, upon you, the congregation, upon you has God devolved this solemn charge, to preserve and to observe the ordinances as He delivered them unto you. Then you ought to know all about them. You ought to be able to tell how many of them there are, and where He placed them, and what is to be done and why it is to be done, and to what end. It ought to be just as familiar to you as it is to your pastor. And that means every member of every Baptist church. Not only this, but here is the grand thing, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." O church, ecclesia, the called out, the called out from the, world, the called out to the service of God, the blood-washed congregation of Jesus Christ, on you is devolved this commandment, "making disciples of all nations." What a thought! How stupendously high! How immeasurably deep! How incomprehensibly broad! You are to make disciples here in Waco. You are to make disciples in cooperating with the churches of the association. You are to make disciples in the state, co-operating in the state convention. You are to make disciples in the world, co-operating with the Southern Baptist Convention. And you ought to understand every point of duty and history in these departments of work. You ought to know the name, of every special collector in your church, and you ought to know the object of that collection. You ought to know its end or destination. So then, as a citizen, understanding, piously observing, courageously executing the law of God, you may at last hear, rising above the cold waves of death, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord." O ye children of God, ye converted people, ye called out, ye witnesses, ye lovers of Jesus, ye men and women who stood up here before great throngs and said He is our Saviour, what is your mission herein Waco, here among your neighbors, here where

you live? Make disciples! Carry the gospel! God give us a revolution in Christian work. I pray for this revolution and can tell you the steps of it. How are you going to make disciples here in Waco! You must give yourself to God for service. Now, I am just one, and I do my best. I have six public services every week, and every one of them has to be studied. Who would bring an empty mind before a people, commits a sin. Oftentimes I do not sit down to eat. I am so busy that one of the members of the church suggested that I needed nine days to the week. Then how can I do the visiting in Waco? What can I do in so great a matter? But there are of you over eight hundred. What if you made one visit a day, a religious visit, each one of you! In a week you would make 5,600 religious visits. Did you ever think of that? Will you now think about It? It would breed a revolution. I tell you the science of heaven, as well as of earth, brings the most battalions upon a given point at one time. If you mount only one gun, whose solitary shot is heard only once a week, the Devil will build up three walls while you demolish one. But if you bring up the whole line of God's elect, if you put the commission on the heart of every converted soul, if you let every man of them feel, "Yes, I know how to lead a soul to Jesus," then comes stupendous victory. I know that every man in the world can tell his experience if he has one. Some people cannot tell it because they have not got it. But if you love Jesus you can say that to a sinner. Now, brethren, if each of you bring one sinner here a week, that is a thousand new ones every Sunday. Did you ever think about it? Oh, do think of it! There is the secret; there is the power; there is the revolution. Bring a Bible with you next Sunday and mark the Scriptures I will give you, then study them so that you will know them by heart, and when you sit down by a man you say, "I am your neighbor. I am no preacher. I don't know anything about Greek and Latin, but here is what Jesus said. You read that." Oh, for a working church! And now having given you this exhortation, I will speak a few words of praise. I was gratified exceedingly when the State Superintendent of Missions announced publicly and published it in the Minutes of the Convention, that you did, as a congregation, more mission work for God than any other ten churches in the state. I was glad of that, but I knew we had not done very much after all. But when we come to the true conception of service to Christ, you will hear men get up in this congregation and say, "Here, I have $100 or $500 or $1,000 I would like to invest in the necessary books to put into the hands of the members of the church, that they may learn their duties, and I will give another $100 and let the city missionary take them over the district, wherever you go, and flood the town in every place." Now, here is a proposition: I will agree to it if you will. Here we stand today, fronting each other. I say I will agree to it if you will, that at every public service we hold in this church, at the prayer meeting, Sunday morning or Sunday night service, I will call for sinners to step heavenward if you will get them. here and pray for their present salvation, and so let the Lord bless us until every time this church comes together a soul is converted. Now that is the revolution I seek. Are you willing? I will commence right now. Saviour, make this a great day! To any lost soul here today I do now offer present and eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ. Will you accept it as a gift? Will you take it today? If you do not understand, will you now rise up and come here for… guidance and instruction? Will you come as the publican, praying, "God be merciful to me a sinner"?

Chapter 82

# S. Our Church Covenant and Obligations

OUR CHURCH COVENANT OBLIGATIONS

On Sunday, August 18, Dr. Carroll preached a remarkable sermon on “Little Christians.” Evidently he was aiming at something. He closed by calling a meeting of the deacons and other prominent members. There was a solemn meeting of these leaders on Tuesday. It was followed by a printed, private letter addressed to hundreds of the members. On Saturday there appeared in the city secular papers the following pastoral circular: “Dear Brethren: By order of the church our morning services Sunday, August 25, will be devoted exclusively to a consideration of our covenant obligations. These vows are set forth in the printed manual furnished free on application to any church member. “It is intended that this shall be a family meeting strictly, and hence, at this one service, none but actual members of our church are invited or expected to be present. This invitation is so restricted, however, from no desire or necessity for secrecy. Baptist churches have no secrets. It is not even a meeting for business or discipline. The whole object is stated fairly in the first sentence of this notice. “We desire to make plain to each other and impress suitably on our own hearts what joining the church obligates and how the blessings of church connection depend upon fidelity to these obligations. A sad experience demonstrates that many assume these obligations lightly and esteem them slightly. It is purposed therefore by this meeting to make us all realize the solemnity of uniting with the church, to emphasize both the sanctity and paramount nature of its vows, and to convince all of the great evil of disregarding or despising any religious duty. To this end every member is urged to be present to make sacrifices therefor if necessary indeed, to allow nothing but providential hindrance to prevent attendance. “Very truly your servant, “B. H. CARROLL, Pastor.” Of course, this awakened wide-spread interest. It was the first time that sinners were invited not to come. And of course when the pastor writes that way the church members respond. At 11:00 a.m. the house was full-yes, full of church members. The pastor came down out of the pulpit to get nearer his people. The exercises were profoundly impressive, especially to some who had never witnessed a covenant meeting. After reading Romans 12:1-5; 1 Corinthians 12:12-27; Ephesians 4:16; 1 Timothy 3:14-15, the pastor led in a most earnest and touching prayer. Then came the old-fashioned song, “I Love Thy Kingdom, Lord.” The pastor now rose and said: Brethren, my published circular fully explains the object of this meeting. I need not repeat its statements. We are but following an old-time Baptist custom. We meet to reconsider our covenant vows. To impress them more deeply on our hearts. To renew them today before God and to perform them. It is my part of this day’s program to expound the covenant of this church. This exposition should take the simplest form. And hence I now invite your attention to A CATECHISM ON THE COVENANT OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH AT WACO 1. What is a covenant in general? An agreement or compact between two or more persons or parties. 2. What does it mean in theology? The compact between God and sinners setting forth the terms of salvation; as the Covenant of Works called the “Old Testament,” and the Covenant of Grace, called the “New Testament.” 3. How is the word derived? The Hebrew word means “to cut,” referring to cutting the animal sacrifices in two, and passing between the severed parts for solemn

ratification of the agreement. 4. What is the- ecclesiastical meaning of the word as used by Baptists? It means that agreement between saved individuals by which they associate themselves into a local church, setting forth their mutual engagements as members of one body. It is usually appended to their Articles of Faith because a common belief is a necessary condition of fellowship and cooperation. 5. What is a church of Jesus Christ? A local congregation of baptized believers in Christ united in the belief of His doctrines and covenanting to do what He has commanded. 6. You say “covenanting to do what He has commanded.” Must every church have a covenant? There cannot be an organized association without a covenant expressed or implied. Terms or bonds of agreement are essential to agreement. They constitute not only the basis but the coherence and power of the association. 7. What good purpose is served by a written covenant? Many people have such confused ideas of what “joining the church” means, they are apt to assume its obligations lightly and esteem them slightly. When afterwards admonished, they plead ignorance and deny that they intelligently and voluntarily made such engagements. A covenant promotes a clear understanding at the start and calls attention to the more prominent obligations of church membership. It serves fair notice upon every applicant of what “joining the church” means. What should be the characteristics of a written covenant? First of all, it should be Scriptural throughout. Second, it should be short, embracing only the leading duties essential to church usefulness and prosperity. Third, it should be couched in clear and simple terms, easy to be understood. 8. What is the covenant of this church?

CHURCH COVENANT

Predicate Having been brought, as we trust by divine grace, to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ as our Savior, and having given up ourselves wholly to Him; and as in Him we are dead to sin, the world and the flesh, and have been buried with Him in baptism and raised again, we do now solemnly and joyfully covenant with each other to walk together in newness of life with brotherly love to His glory as our common Lord. We do therefore, in His strength, particularly engage:

First, that we will not forsake the assembling of ourselves together at such times and places as the church may appoint for instruction, prayer, business or evangelizing.

Second, that we will exercise a mutual care, as members one of another, to promote the growth of the whole body in Christian knowledge, holiness and comfort in all the will of God. That we will frequently exhort, and if occasion require, admonish one another (according to Matthew 18:15-17) in the spirit of meekness, considering ourselves lest we also be tempted. Third, that we will cheerfully and according to ability, contribute of our property for the relief of the poor of the church, and for the maintenance of a faithful ministry of the Gospel among us, and for the spread of the Gospel throughout the world. Fourth, that we will not omit closet religion, nor family religion at home, nor allow ourselves to permit the too common neglect of the great duty of religiously training our children and others under our care, with a view to the service of Christ and the enjoyment of heaven. Fifth, that we will walk circumspectly in the world, refraining from such of its games, amusements and, fashions as are foes to spiritual mindedness; and that we will abstain from the use or sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, in order that we may win souls, remembering that God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. And the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the flock, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, make us perfect in every good work; working

in us that which is wellpleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen. 9. Give an analysis of this covenant. It consists of three parts: The predicate, the vows and the invocation. 10. What is the predicate? “Having been brought, as we trust, by divine grace, to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ as our Savior; and having given up ourselves wholly to Him; and as in Him we are dead to sin, the world and the flesh, and have been buried with Him in baptism and raised again.” 11. What two distinct ideas does this language convey as a suitable basis of an agreement to associate? First, that each individual party to the proposed agreement has first been saved by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. Second, that he has given up himself wholly to Christ, which means absolute submission to His authority and acknowledgment of His absolute ownership. In other words A has been saved and belongs to Jesus, his Savior. B has been saved and belongs to Jesus, his Savior. C has been saved and belongs to Jesus, his Savior. Here then are two things common to A, B and C, to-wit: Salvation and complete surrender to the Savior. Hence upon this ground common to the three, they may lawfully and profitably associate, and may agree as associated to do anything that fairly relates to the common ground on which they stand. It would not be a proper basis for association in any work irrelevant to the common ground, for this would make the superstructure broader than the foundation, and unlike it. 12. What then is the nature or character of this basis? First, it is purely spiritual and religious. Second, it concerns the will of Christ alone. Hence, there must be correspondence between the basis and the agreement arising from it. 13. What, in general, is the covenant, based on this common ground? “We do now solemnly and joyfully covenant with each other to walk together in newness of life, with brotherly love to His glory as our common Lord.” 14. Who are the parties to this covenant? All the saved individuals given up wholly to Jesus, who associate themselves, i.e., all who voluntarily “join the church.” 15. What do they agree to do? “Walk together,” i.e., form a company. 16. “Walk together” in what? “In newness of life,” i.e., form a company to walk together in newness of life. 17. How? “With brotherly love,” i.e., form a company of loving brothers to walk together in newness of life. 18. To what end? “To His glory as our common Lord,” i.e., form a company of loving brothers to walk together in newness of life that we may glorify our common Master. 19. As this agreement is very general and broad, what particulars of newness of life does this covenant specify? There are five specifications under the following heads: (1) in the assembly, (2) mutual care, (3) contribution, (4) alone and at home, (5) before the world. 20. Recite the covenant obligation in relation to the assembly. “That we will not forsake the assembling of ourselves together at such times and places as the church may appoint for instruction, prayer, business or evangelizing.” 21. What is intended by the terms “instruction, prayer, business and evangelizing”? By instruction is meant the regular morning and evening services on the Lord’s day and the Sunday school. By business is meant the conference meetings. By evangelizing is meant protracted meetings of days for the revival of the church and the salvation of sinners. 22. What is the importance of the public assembly? A company that never meets is no company. They cannot “walk together” unless they get together. In the public assembly is to be found mainly the means of grace by which they know the will of Christ, grow in that will and make it known to others. He who without providential hindrance forsakes the assembling of God’s people, necessarily violates a fundamental and vital part of his covenant obligation, and necessarily destroys his usefulness and happiness as one of the company of brothers. His frequent absence, unless divinely hindered, is prima facie evidence that he is a back-slider in heart and life, if a real Christian, or that he was never a child of God. It is no excuse to say that he absents himself to promote piety at home. Piety at home measurably fails

when public worship is abandoned: “The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwelling of Jacob.” 23. What is the covenant vow as to “mutual care”? “That we will exercise a mutual care, as members one of another, to promote the growth of the whole body in Christian knowledge, holiness and comfort in all the will of God. And that we will frequently exhort, and if occasion require, admonish one (according to Matthew, 18th chapter), in the spirit of meekness, considering ourselves lest we also be tempted.” 24. What is meant by “members of one another”? There is allusion to the teaching of the Scriptures in Romans 12:4-5; 1 Corinthians 12:12-27; Ephesians 4:15-16, which compares the whole church to a body with many members or parts, of which Christ is the head, and shows the mutual dependence and connection of these several parts. 25. What is meant by admonishing one another according to Matthew 18:1-35? It refers to our Savior’s direction: “Accordingly if thy brother sin, go right along and convince him of (make him see) his sin between thee and him alone.” 26. But ought not that to read, “If thy brother sin against thee,” limiting it to personal offenses? No. The “against thee” is unsupported by the oldest and most reliable Greek manuscripts, both here and in the parallel account in Luke 17:3. Of course, it includes personal offenses, but it is much more comprehensive. If he sins against thee or anybody else, or if he sin at all, though not against any person in particular, go right along-make him see and feel and renounce the sin. The limitation would imply that there is no obligation on me to admonish unless the offense was against myself, which is an unscriptural thought. Those who insist on such limitation ease their consciences by leaving admonition for all but personal offenses to the deacons. If the hand sins against the eye, the whole body feels it and is concerned in it. If the hand sins against itself or in any other way, though not particularly against any member, yet it is the concern of all the members. 27. What is the covenant vow on giving? “That we will cheerfully contribute, according to ability, of our property to the support of the poor of the church, and for the maintenance of a faithful ministry of the Gospel among us, and for the spread of the Gospel throughout the world.” 28. What are the three elements and the three objects of this sacrifice? The three elements are: 1. Honor the Lord with thy substance; 2. Give cheerfully; 3. Give according to ability. The three objects are: 1. The poor of the church; 2. The Gospel at home; 3. The Gospel abroad. 29. To what does the covenant obligate the church member when alone and at home? “That we will not omit closet religion and family religion at home, nor allow ourselves to permit the too common neglect of the great duty of religiously training our children and others under our care, with a view to the service of Christ and the enjoyment of heaven.” 30. What are the three elements of this vow? First, personal, secret devotion; second, a Godly life at home and family worship; third, the religious training of our children and any others whomsoever under our care. 31. What is the true test of personal Christianity? What one is at heart when alone, his secret thoughts and desires. 32. Where is the surest manifestation of it? In his life at home, where the eye of the public is not on him. 33. What is the covenant obligation on the church member when before the world? “That we will walk circumspectly in the world, refraining from such of its games, amusements and fashions as are foes to spiritual mindedness, and that we will abstain from the use or sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage; in order that we may win souls, remembering that God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.” 34. On what Scriptures is this vow founded? “My kingdom is not of this world.” John 18:36. “The fashion of this world passeth away.” 1 Corinthians 7:31. “Love not the world, neither the things in the world.” 1 John 2:15. “The friendship of the world is enmity with God.” James 4:4. “If any man love the world the love of the Father is not in him.” 1 John 2:15. “Be not conformed to this world.” Romans 12:2. “Let

your light so shine before men," etc. Matthew 5:16. "It is good neither to eat flesh (offered to idols), nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Romans 14:21. "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest the bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness." Habakkuk 2:15. "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them! And the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe, and wine, are in their feasts, but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of His hands." Isaiah 5:11-12. "Wine is a mocker and strong drink is raging; whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise." Proverbs 20:1. "Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow? Who hath contentions? Who hath babbling? Who hath wounds? Who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Proverbs 24:29-32. "Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess." Ephesians 5:18. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest which are revellings, and such like: Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Galatians 5:19-21. "In time past ye walked according to the course of this world." Ephesians 2:2. "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world, And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John 2:16-17. 35. Can any member of the church keep these vows of himself No. Nor does he so promise. The words are: "We do engage in His strength." 36. To whom, therefore, does this covenant in its conclusion direct the church member who takes upon himself so great obligations? "And the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the flock, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, make us perfect in every good work; working in us that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen." 37. But as the Scripture says, "it is better not to vow than to vow and not pay," is it right in itself to bind ourselves with such difficult obligations? The Scripture quoted refers to vows concerning optional matters. But the obligations of this covenant inhere in a profession of religion. Their binding force is not optional. They are on you by nature of your relation to Christ. You only sin the more not to acknowledge them. The object of the covenant is to place them clearly before you. "Vow and pay unto the Lord your God." Psalms 76:11. "Thy vows are upon me, O God for thou hast delivered my soul from death." Psalms 56:12. "What shall I render unto the Lord for all His benefits towards me? I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people." Psalms 116:12-14. 38. Do you mean that the obligations of this covenant are binding on every member of this church, and that he is fairly amenable to this law though when he joined the church he was not aware of the existence of such a document? Just that and all of it is meant. He would naturally, as a member of any organization, be bound by its decisions, but the reason here is infinitely higher. The covenant is not a device for making discipline easy, i.e., it was not contrived as a lever or handle by which the church could more readily and expeditiously reach and dispose of cases of discipline. Indeed, one is tried not by the covenant, but the Scriptures. But the covenant is binding because all of its items are but restatements of divine laws previously recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Every one of them is binding on the church member though he may never specifically promise to keep any one of them. These are not optional matters. Their obligation is entirely independent of a man's promises. They

inhere in his relation to Christ, and are inalienable, irrevocable and indissoluble. 39. Will you make this somewhat plainer by particular illustrations? That is quite easy. Your covenant refers to baptism as in itself imposing an obligation. Read carefully Romans 6:14, and it will be manifest that baptism in its burial implies a previous death to sin and in its resurrection obligated to “newness of life,” even though the lips pronounce no vow. Again, the word “debtor” very strongly expresses obligation. The fact that I contract a debt constitutes the obligation and not my after promise to pay it. My veracity only is involved in the latter case, but my honesty in the former. A mere promise to pay does not validate a note of hand. There must appear the valuable consideration which makes a debt. Now apply this well known term “debtor,” and the reasoning given to two very plain passages of Scripture:

First, Romans 8:9-12 shows that the believer in Christ dies to sin and is made alive in the Spirit:

From which facts, independent of any promises whatever, yea, from the nature of the case, the apostle shows that he becomes a “debtor” not to the flesh, but to the Spirit to live after the Spirit.

Second, in Romans 1:14, Paul says: “I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians,” i.e., I am under obligation to give the Gospel to the heathen. In other words, his obligation to aid the foreign mission work did not arise from his promise to aid-did not become operative only after his promise, but his debt was there whether he made promises to pay it or refused to promise.

So none of you can claim exemption from the duty expressed in your covenant to contribute of your property for the spread of the Gospel throughout the world merely because you have not personally and consciously agreed to that covenant. The covenant does not create obligations-it only avows them. Take another case-that covenant promise to give money for the relief of the poor of the church. Can you evade the obligation by refusing to subscribe to the covenant? Read James 2:14-17 : “What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, ‘Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled’? notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.” Yet again, that covenant promise to contribute for the maintenance of a faithful Gospel ministry among us. Can you escape this obligation by saying: “Oh, I never subscribed to the covenant,” or “I never promised the deacons anything.” Does this criminal failure on your part nullify these two divine laws? 1 Corinthians 9:14 : “Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.” Galatians 6:6 : “Let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.” You may thus see the difference between a vow which is optional and whose only obligation lies in the promise, and a vow imposed by our relations to Christ. And now, my brethren, I desire to hear from you. I call not only for expressions but confessions and reformations. It is well known to all of you that many church members seem to regard religious obligations as merely optional. They forsake the assembling of God’s people. They are never seen in the Sunday school and prayer meeting. They contribute nothing to the Gospel at home or abroad. They cherish personal difficulties and refuse to seek or accept reconciliation. They walk disorderly before the world. And those who are spiritual neglect to admonish and restore them. These things ought not to be. They must not be. God our Savior calls upon us to rise from our wicked sleep-to do our duty if it kills us. O come then, and let us not only renew but pay our vows. Try it, brethren! Try it now and faithfully, and see if there will not be

revival grace poured out until there is not room to receive it.

# S. Our Lord's First Visit to Jerusalem

OUR LORD'S FIRST VISIT TO JERUSALEM Scriptures: John 2:13-25; John 3:1-21. TEXT: Jesus went up to Jerusalem. John 2:13. John alone gives the history of our Lord's first visit to Jerusalem after entrance on His public ministry. Indeed, John is the only gospel historian who was an eye witness of the facts narrated. Matthew, Mark and Luke were not yet disciples. So far as the records explicitly testify, only five of the twelve Apostles subsequently ordained have as yet made the acquaintance of Jesus. Nor does it appear that all these five follow Him regularly as yet. So early in His ministry in this visit to Jerusalem you may count on the fingers of one hand all the important events that have yet occurred 1. That wonderful event at His baptism-the visible descent upon Him of the Holy Ghost, which marked Him as the Messiah, Christ, Anointed One, and thereby accredited His mission. "Him hath God the Father sealed." 2. His temptation by the Devil immediately following this bestowment of His credentials. Here the Second Adam, not in a paradise of delight, but fasting in a wilderness, with no companions but wild beasts, triumphs over the conqueror of the first Adam. True, this was but the skirmish before the decisive battle which was fought later in that "hour of the power of darkness," which constituted the only "crisis of this world"; yet was it more than a prelude? It was the promise and pledge of ultimate victory. 3. The witness of Him as the Messiah by John the Baptist, who saw His credentials bestowed (John 1:19-34). 4. The gathering to Himself, as the preliminary step towards permanent organization, His first disciples out of the material made ready for Him by the ministry of the Baptist (John 1:35-51). 5. The manifestation of His glory by His first miracle at the marriage at Cana, of Galilee. These five events, while so few, are all stupendous and significant. To the sight of some they rent from top to bottom the veil of obscurity which years of seclusion had wrapped about the supernatural phenomena of His birth. Never more to these enlightened ones can He be a private man. Retirement and seclusion are ended forever. From henceforward till death drops the curtain He is conspicuously before the public. Each event, in its order, is a revelation whose shining makes Him yet more conspicuous to an ever increasing circle of interested spectators: (a) To John the Baptist when visibly sealed with the Spirit and audibly attested by the Father. (b) To Satan when foiled by Him in the temptation. (c) To the angels who ministered to Him as Satan's conqueror. (d) To the now transferred disciples of the Baptist when John focused on Him all His own "burning and shining light" while bearing the startling and dramatic testimony: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" (e) To His own disciples when He drew them to Himself by supernatural wisdom and bound them faster by supernatural love. (f) To all who witnessed that beginning of His miracles when they saw the instant transmutation of one hundred and thirty-three gallons of water into wine. (g) To His own consciousness as He more and more irrevocably committed Himself to the hazards, labors and responsibilities of so great a mission. To all these He must now ever be the most conspicuous man in the world. But mark how few were yet enlightened, how remote from great centers the scenes of enlightenment. The sealing as Messiah was witnessed by the Baptist only. The temptation was known only by Satan, by Himself and the angels. The wilderness testimony of John identifies only to a very few disciples. The miracle was wrought in an obscure Galilean hamlet. These had not yet brought Him before the nation, much

less the world. But now a decisive hour approaches. The passover is at hand. He must attend this long-famous national feast with the thousands of Israel. He must go up to the Holy City. Jerusalem is not the wilderness, nor yet a Galilean village. There is the temple wrapped in the memories of many centuries. There the Sanhedrin, the supreme civil and ecclesiastical court of the nation. There rabbis, priests, and scribes. There the tribes themselves, by hundreds of thousands, are gathered from the ends of the earth in attendance upon the annual feasts and sacrifices. There, too, are Pilate and his Roman cohorts in the impregnable Tower of Antonio. Moreover, at this time the temper of the people is dangerous. Jerusalem boils like a seething caldron. John's ministry had set the wilderness on fire. All men were musing in their hearts as to the import of this "burning bush in the desert." How profoundly he had stirred the popular heart appears from the fact that the rulers had deemed it expedient to send to him an official deputation to take down his testimony as to himself. "Who art thou? What sayest thou of thyself? That we may give an answer to them that sent us." That deputation had but recently returned, bringing the startling report that while John disclaimed being the Messiah himself, he yet positively affirmed that the Messiah had come. He had seen Him. Had baptized Him. Had witnessed heaven's bestowal on Him of His Holy Ghost credentials. That he, John, great as they might think him, was not worthy even to loose the latchet of the sandals of the one baptized. Who, at such a juncture of expectation, dare to utterly discredit the testimony of such a witness? Are not the people goaded to despair and lashed to fury by Roman insult and oppression? Is not the very air Messianic? Then come these rumors flying on swift wings from the wilderness and from Galilee and filling the Holy City with strange stories of one Jesus! John organized nothing. This young man was an organizer. He already had a devoted following, which was ever increasing. John did no miracle. Report credited this young man with miraculous power. John claimed nothing for himself. This young man made startling claims. He claimed ability to read the heart, of man as an open book. He talked familiarly of God as His Father. He openly avowed a supernatural mission. His bearing was majestic while gentle, winning hearts while imposing respect. He accepted the highest honors as His right. His teaching was simple, direct, heart-convincing, not tortuous, involved and incomprehensible. He speaks with authority and decision, and not as one balancing probabilities and leaning on the crutches of tradition. Who is He, where is He, will He visit the city, what is His attitude toward Pilate, toward Herod? Such were the times. Hence this first visit of our Lord to Jerusalem, after entrance on His public ministry, is one of surpassing interest. The interest then centered in one burning question: "In what character will He introduce Himself and His mission to the Holy City?" To us so long after the event, other questions, equally important, must follow the first, such as (a) Was that particular presentation deliberate? That is, was it predetermined in view of all the possibilities that might have followed a different presentation? In yet other words, was there clearly before Him and rejected by Him another way, as one chooses an alternative? (b) Did later developments of Himself and His doctrines correspond to that introduction? That is, did that first announcement of Himself and His mission forecast all the future, laying down with precision a foundation so exactly broad enough and deep enough in fitting and upholding all subsequent teaching and developments as to furnish a demonstration that from the beginning He built unswervingly in all after life according to a thoughtfully prearranged plan? (c) Finally, were these initial characteristics of His kingdom immutable as well as vital? That is, do they now, after a lapse of two thousand years, best supply the needs of humanity? Are they yet so binding in obligation on those who profess His name that even a modification of them is treason, and such treason as deprives the

traitor of power with men and the favor of God - such treason as nails on His brow God's judgments and burns on His heart God's curse? These are four questions this sermon proposes to answer. These answers, if true, settle forever the question of His divinity and His title to all men's adoration. After earnest pleading for divine help, let us reverently address ourselves to a consideration of the several questions in their order 1. In what character did Jesus of Nazareth introduce Himself on His first visit to Jerusalem after entrance on His public ministry? The whole history of the case is in John's Gospel extending from the thirteenth verse of the second chapter to the twenty-first verse of the third chapter (John 2:13-25; John 3:1-21). Here are only three notable things (a) His purgation of the temple, with the consequent discussion. (b) The working of unspecified miracles, with the effect thereof. (c) The interview with Nicodemus. These events constitute His introduction. Simple as may be the story to any reflecting, philosophical mind, it becomes the more astounding the more it is studied. First, the negative aspects of this introduction, viewed from any standpoint of His mere humanity, are more than startling-they are incomprehensible, inexplicable. It was directly contrary to all popular expectation. It was directly contrary to all popular desire. It was directly contrary to all worldly ambition. There was not a man on the face of the earth wise enough to have anticipated it. It was directly contrary to all human nature. No demagogue, no selfish man, no ambitious man, no mere man as we know man, could have done as He did under the circumstances. He smote the Jew instead of the Roman. He struck the patriot instead of the tyrant, the holy temple instead of the Tower of Antonio. He not only refused to ride into power on a popular wave, but rebuked the tide that would uplift Him. He even refused to commit Himself to the faith His own miracles excited. Second, the positive aspects of this introduction are even more marvelous than the negative. 1. His introduction was strictly according to prophecy, though no contemporary had been spiritually-minded enough to expect the event before its fulfilment. Right where the prophetic lines of light from David, Haggai and Malachi, focus, there He stood illumined. Haggai had foretold the coming of the "Desire of all nations" while the second temple was standing, and had intimated that the glory of this inferior building should be greater than the glory of Solomon's unparalleled and lamented temple, because the Messiah Himself, and not a symbolic cloud, should stand within its courts (Haggai 2:3-9). Malachi had expressly predicted that "the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple." But that His coming should be as a purgation so terrible that none might abide His coming. As gold and silver are purified by fire, so would He refine in the heat of the crucible the sons of Levi and perfect an offering unto the Lord in righteousness. Instead of delivering them from external enemies, he would be "a swift witness," against their inward sins and pollutions. David had foretold that in this work of purification so self-consuming would be His spirit that it would be said: "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up," and "I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother's children." Malachi had connected with this coming of the Lord this marvelous prophecy: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." (See Haggai 2:6-9; Psalms 69:8-9 Malachi 1:11; Malachi 3:1-5.)These are wonderful prophecies. The call for the coming of the Messiah before the destruction of the second temple would constitute its glory. That He would come suddenly. That He would come as a purifier. That His kingdom would be internal and spiritual. That His zeal in the work of purification would be a fire that would consume Himself and alienate His own brothers, the children of His own mother. That the temple would be destroyed. That it would no longer be a sin to offer incense (worship)

elsewhere. That every spot on earth would be a temple. That the whole world-all the Gentiles from the orient to the occident-would magnify His name. It is impossible to read John's short and simple story of His first visit to Jerusalem and the consecutive events, particularly the purgation of the temple and the interview with Nicodemus, and fail to see the wonderful fulfilment. We clearly see also the full answer to the first question: In what character did He introduce Himself and His mission? He introduced Himself as divine, as the messenger of the covenant, as the Lord. He claimed authority to purify that Holy Place. He claimed omnipotent power, the ability to raise the temple in three days. He announced His kingdom as spiritual. A new and heavenly, and spiritual birth was essential even for the most elated Jew to see or enter it. That the human side of this regeneration was simple faith in Him. That as an object of faith He must be lifted on the Cross. That in three days He would rise from the dead. That this resurrection constituted the one great sign of His divinity and Messiahship. That God loved all the world and not the Jews only. That "whosoever," whether Jew or Gentile, accepted Him received eternal life. That whosoever rejected Him received eternal death. That He was light. That no man would refuse to come to the light unless his deeds were evil and he dreaded exposure to the light. That all human destiny and all final judgment turned on man's treatment of Jesus. What an announcement of Himself and His mission! Let us now consider the second question 2. Was this particular presentation of Himself and His mission deliberate? The term "deliberate" implies not only previous thought, but also the judicial weighing of the argument in favor of alternative propositions, and a decision which, while choosing one course, rejects another. Now, that Jesus of Nazareth had so deliberated, had considered all the possibilities that might arise from pursuing a different line of conduct, had been subjected to the force of all possible motives prompting that other course, had peremptorily repelled these motives, had rejected with emphatic decision all overtures in that direction and had predetermined to do just what He did do. This is as clear as sunlight from one single fact - His temptation in the wilderness. The Devil himself, the arch-tempter of man, with all possible tact and seductiveness, had put before Him the self-pleasing and apparently feasible plan of making Himself the hero and leader of that Jewish patriotism, now at white heat, and by easily gathering an aroused nation under His banner, become more than a second Judas Maccabeus or Joshua, overturn the Herod dynasty, repel the Romans, and on the rising wave of conquest advance to universal empire. He showed Him within reach "all the kingdoms of this world and' the glory of them." Just so in the world's history he has often unfolded to vaulting ambition universal monarchy. Assyrian, Persian, Greek and Roman chiefs yielded to his seductions in ancient times. Nimrod, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar and Bonaparte could tell the story of the power of such temptation. It is idle for us to deny that Jesus was so tempted. Vainly may we split hairs in the dispute whether it was a case of "Non posse peccare" or "Posse non peccare." "He was tempted in all points like as we are." He had a genuine humanity. He was susceptible to all human impressions and necessarily liable, as a substitute for His people, as a Second Adam, to all possibilities. The temptations were genuine and forceful. His internal purity and moral and spiritual power of resistance constituted the only breakwater against the threatening flood. He must win as man, or fall. It was no fictitious struggle. It was no painted battle. It was intensely real. Over and over again it brought Him to His knees. And once, later, it brought the "bloody sweat" and wrung from His pallid lips the cry: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and yet later that most awful shriek: "My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" Unquestionably Jesus rejected the temptation to establish an earthly kingdom. Unquestionably he predetermined, before

he entered Jerusalem, to run counter to all popular expectations and desires; counter to all worldly policy, ambition and interest, and pre-determined to let alone Herod and the Romans and to establish a spiritual kingdom with spiritual subjects, a kingdom that should not “consist in meat and drink,” should not consist in earthly pomp and pageantry, but a kingdom within men, a kingdom of “righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,” a kingdom “not of this world,” coming “not with observation,” a kingdom “the weapons of whose warfare were not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.” He has never understood the life of Jesus who has overlooked the deliberate election always made by Him when alternative propositions or alternative lines of conduct were before Him. The decision of Jesus made Him our great exemplar: “Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame.” Let us now approach the third question 3. Did that first presentation of Himself and His mission forecast all the future developments of both? Or did it lay a foundation so exactly broad and deep, fitting and upholding all subsequent teaching as to demonstrate a complete prearranged plan? A young man of thirty years of age may have decision of character. He may deliberately make an election of alternative propositions. We find among the great conquerors of earth decision of character in early life. But this question inquires concerning a matter too far-reaching and comprehensive for any immature mind. An affirmative answer implies a degree of prescience that itself suggests another question: Was this a mere man? What Jew of His circumstances, what man of His times could have at that age formulated such a plan? But leaving such questions to take care of themselves, we look at the facts of His subsequent life and inquire: What later doctrine finds not here its root? What later superstructure, however heavy, broad and high, finds not here a fitting foundation? Here is the announcement of a spiritual kingdom. Here is regeneration as a prerequisite of citizenship. Here is “God so loved the world.” Here is justification by simple faith in Jesus. Here is condemnation through unbelief. Paul’s highest doctrines are here. Here is the forecast of the destruction of the Jewish polity. Here is death on the Cross. Here is resurrection on the third day. Here is that resurrection as the one supreme sign and verification of His Messiahship and divinity. Here is the forecast of the fall of the wall of partition and the ingathering of the Gentiles. When the last apostle laid in the wall of doctrine the last stone of revealed teaching, underneath that stone was this foundation. So there was prescience. So there was a prearranged plan. So the architect had drafted a finished plan before he began to build and provided the exact place and correlation of every stick and stone. What this answer signifies as to the dignity and character of Jesus of Nazareth I leave you to determine. We come now to the last question 4. These initial characteristics of His kingdom, so announced on His first visit to Jerusalem were they immutable? That is to say, now that two thousand years have passed away, do they yet best supply the needs of humanity? Have they waxed old? Has the nineteenth century outgrown them? Have modern culture and criticism provided something better? Is it now treason to modify them somewhat in view of time’s mutations and latter-day progress? This is a serious question every way. Let us get at it by subdivision. And you, O People of Waco, answer each interrogative detail (a) Shall we cease to preach a spiritual kingdom? Shall we go back to the limitations of place and ritualism? Shall we substitute formalism and hypocrisy? (b) Shall we cease to make the New Birth a prerequisite to citizenship? Shall men now find an open door once closed to Nicodemus? (c) Shall we no longer say, “God so loved the world”? (d) Shall we cease to glory in the Cross, “the Son of man lifted up”? Shall we abandon vicarious atonement? (e) Shall we surrender justification by faith? (f) Shall we establish worldly-minded, pleasure-loving, God-forgetting city churches? (g)

Shall we surrender the doctrine of the resurrection? Or in one question: Shall we remodel the gospel? To all these questions this congregation would return a unanimous “No!” Indeed, “the old-time religion is good enough for us.” Never before in this world’s history was there as much spiritual religion as now. Humanity needs just such doctrines as Christ first announced in Jerusalem nearly two thousand years ago. The whole world is hallowed ground. No longer at Jerusalem or Samaria do men confine and localize their worship, but “everywhere incense is offered unto his name” and “from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same his name is great among the Gentiles.” Yes, it would be treason to even modify those initial characteristics of His kingdom. On the brow of every such traitor is nailed the condemnation of God, and in his heart burns God’s curse. And now, gathering up all the details of this discussion, I embody them into one question: Seeing that this Jesus so introduced Himself and His mission to Jerusalem, not forgetting the times and circumstances, and seeing that this introduction was deliberate, having refused an alternative any other man on earth would have accepted, and seeing that thus early He forecast all future developments of Himself and doctrine, and seeing that after nearly two thousand years have rolled away, these initial doctrines yet best supply human needs, then what manner of man was this?

Chapter 84

# S. PAUL'S GOSPEL OF JESUS

PAUL’S GOSPEL OF JESUS TEXT: But I went into Arabia. - Galatians 1:17. The harmonists are accustomed to place in parallel columns what are called the four gospel narratives of the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They ignore the greatest and the completest of the gospels-the Gospel of Paul. No harmony of the life and teachings of our Lord may be regarded as at all complete that does not place parallel with the other gospels what Paul had handed down of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. In comparing these different histories of our Lord we are much impressed with the way in which the several authors received the information which they impart in their respective histories. We know that Matthew and John were eye-witnesses, being of the twelve, being with our Lord for three years of His earthly life. But Mark was not one of the twelve. He can not write as an eye-witness. According to tradition he gets his facts mainly from Peter, and hence, it is called the Gospel of Peter by Mark. Luke, who was not an eye-witness, in the beginning of his history of our Lord is careful to state with what painstaking care he gathered up the historical material from authentic sources and embodied it in his treatise. The Apostle Paul received his gospel, not as Mark did, from Peter’s teachings; he did not know the Lord Jesus Christ in the days of His flesh, and hence can not give His history as Matthew and John gave it. He does not attempt at all to write a history after the method of Luke. But he expressly declares that the gospel which he received from our Lord as to its facts and as to its doctrines was by direct revelation from the risen Lord. No angel, as in the case of the giving of the Law, was the medium of communication.

Matthias was nominated by the other apostles to take the place of Judas, and hence, instrumentally, men had something to do with his being put into the apostolic office. But the Apostle Paul declares that he did not receive his office from men. He did not gather it from histories. He was not taught it as you are taught it. But directly, immediately, face to face with God, he received every fact which he records, and every doctrine which he teaches. Our Lord stated to the twelve just before His crucifixion that it was impossible for Him to give them a complete revelation, because they were not able to receive it. There were many additional things concerning His kingdom that needed to be set forth, but they, in their state of mind, were incapable of appreciating and understanding the full revelation of God to man. It was not a matter of accident, therefore, but of the divine prevision, that the complete revelation of God’s will to man should be made through another and independent apostle. When we read Acts 9:1-43, with that text only before us, the natural impression is made upon the mind that just as soon as Saul of Tarsus was converted he entered into Damascus, and after the three days of darkness and his baptism, he straightway commenced to preach in Damascus. That its the natural impression, but we must compare scripture with scripture, and when we read the first chapter of the letter to the Galatians we are perfectly sure that he did not preach in the city of Damascus until after his return from Arabia. It was three years after his conversion before he began to preach. And why? He had nothing to preach. He was ignorant as yet in every true sense of the matter of the gospel, and wholly unprepared to state it in its final and complete revelation.

We now get at the object of his going into Arabia. As the twelve companied with our Lord Jesus Christ for three years to gather from His lips what He taught and how they must teach it, go it was necessary for Paul to be segregated from his fellows, to go alone in nature's deepest solitude and there meet his Lord, and in lesson after lesson gather by direct revelation what he was to preach.

It was not only necessary that there should be time for the communication of the matter of his ministry, but according to human nature as it is, there must be time for him to assimilate the new doctrine that burst upon his mind with the suddenness of a clap of thunder out of a cloudless sky. He must think through it. He must compare this new revelation with that which had seemed to him to be the very perfection of Law. No man by sudden wrench, by abrupt transition, passes from one state of life into another state of life. He had to receive the discipline from his Master before he could go and preach His gospel to others. But why should he retire into Arabia? He had been, as he tells, a Pharisee of the Pharisees. The most sacred event of Jewish history to him was the giving of the law on Mount Sinai through the ministration of angels; and the highest embodiment of human excellence, in his judgment, was Moses, who received the law and who gave it to the chosen people. No name under heaven had been to him as the name of Moses. The creation of the world itself was regarded as inferior to the giving of the Law. The deluge that swept over the earth in devastating power, was not comparable, in his judgment, to the desolation that would follow the infraction of that law upon Mount Sinai. He saw it now in all its true relations. He saw it as a covenant to which there were two parties ¾ God upon the first part and the children of Israel as a nation upon the second part, and they jointly and severally entered into this covenant, which was announced upon Mount Sinai. This law was not merely a standard of right. It was to them the way of life. They took on themselves its obligations. They admitted that they forfeited its privileges and incurred its penal censure, subjecting themselves to all of the depths of its condemnation, if they failed by one jot or tittle to observe all the things that are written in the law to do.

Now, this man, more than any other man of his own or any preceding or succeeding age, was profoundly convinced that Arabia, on Mount Sinai, while that mountain trembled and smoked and was illumined by the flashes of lightning accompanying the storm that rocked the entire plain, was the scene of earth's greatest transaction. I say that Mount Sinai was to him the most sacred spot on earth. And if an entirely new conception is to enter into his mind; if an entirely new way of life is to be presented, not merely for his acceptance, but that he might preach it to the whole world; if a way of life that disregarded the national distinctions established at Mount Sinai; a way of life that leaps over all barriers of race and caste and custom and age and sex and condition, and touches the whole wide world upon the plane of its simple humanity-if that way of life was to be preached, the place for him to learn was at Mount Sinai.

We hear him saying, "Oh! must I never again preach Moses? Must I go before my own people and tear down the sacred wall of partition that shut out the Gentile world from them, and on whose top they had delighted to stand, wrapping the mantle of their exclusiveness about them, and looking down with scorn upon the 'Gentile dogs' upon the outside? If I must do this, let me go to the very place where the angels came, where Israel stood before God. Let me listen again to the lingering echoes of the mighty thunderings of that eventful day. Let my imagination bring up before me as a living thing the enormous events of that great transaction. And let the Lord Jesus Christ tell me what it all meant "What is the significance of Mount Sinai? What means the law? Wherefore serveth the law? If I must go out and preach a new gospel that overturns every cherished and fond

recollection of my heart, let me see it plainly; let me think it through, and then I will be prepared to preach."

I am just as sure as of my own existence that the Apostle Paul could not, three days after his conversion, have set forth the gospel which he afterwards preached with so much power. There must be a place for the change. There must be a revelation of the matter which he is, to present to the world. When we read through this letter to the Galatians, he tells us some of the lessons that he learned there in Arabia: that Mount Sinai corresponds to Hagar the bondwoman, and that it gendereth to bondage as her condition gave bondage to her children, and that it answereth to the Jerusalem which now is - that Jerusalem in which he had gloried, that Jerusalem whose feasts he had attended, and in whose celebration he had rejoiced, was even then under the impending doom pronounced upon it by the Son of God.

He learned further, that within the lifetime of a man not one stone of its temple would stand upon another; its streets would be ensanguined with the blood of a million of its citizens; desolation would come upon it without any mitigation for age after age; how long he himself could not exactly tell., But he saw all that under Mount Sinai, and that what had seemed to him to be the very perfection of religion was a system designed of God as a transitory matter, as educational in its nature in order to accomplish certain particular things.

It was added because of transgressions; that is, that written law on Mount Sinai was given in order to discover sin, and not merely to discover it, but to develop it, to incite it, to bring out whatever latent force there was in it, lest people looking at the germ only-not considering the extent if its potentiality ¾ might not be aware of the extremes to which it would go when developed to its logical ends and consequences; in order that sin, under the light of the law, might show itself to be not some innocent and beautiful thing, but uncoil and stretch out its long serpentine length, and grow to its full stature and secrete its poison under the fangs of the serpent and glitter in the basilisk eye of that snake, and when it stood out before men in all of its beastly and ghastly and horrible and devilish form, it would be seen to be sin and exceedingly sinful. That was the object of the law: to discover sin, to develop it, and then to condemn it; to pronounce sentence upon it. There was no way of life in it. It gendered to bondage. It gendered to death. What a message to put into this man’s mouth! What a message to carry back to Jerusalem! To say that this Holy City, with all of its services, with its sacred temple, with its feasts and its ceremonies, with its imposing ritual, with its offering up of sacrifices, with its incense going up like clouds to the sky-that the Holy City, the whole of it, and in its most sacred relations, is no more than Hagar, the bondwoman, gendering to bondage, and that it must be cast out, and then it can net bring by any certificate of its own excellence one single child into the true covenant of God - not one.

There never was such a battle fought in the world as Paul fought on that subject. There were those that still clung to the flesh, and now they prided themselves that they had seen the Lord in the days of His flesh! We hear them saying, "We talked with Jesus. We ate with Jesus. We handled Jesus. We had a personal acquaintance with the Son of God as He walked by the shores of the Sea of Galilee, as He traveled through the villages and cities of Samaria, as He stood upon the streets of

Jerusalem, and in its Holy Temple. And here, according to the flesh, is His brother James. Now because he is the brother of the Lord let us make him the bishop of the church at Jerusalem. Let us make him the first pastor in Christianity, and let his be the deciding voice in any conference

concerning the gospel of Jesus Christ." In my judgment there never was a greater danger in the young and rising Christianity than from the pastorate of James at Jerusalem ¾ that James who was the brother of our Lord according to the flesh, and who never did, to the end of his life, get completely out of the Jewish swaddling clothes that wrapped him, who never did see the height of the divine glory of the gospel of his Divine Brother, whom he had never recognized as the Son of God until after His resurrection from the dead.

Now Paul must meet those people and say to them, "I did not know Jesus according to His flesh, and if I had known Him I would forget it. I would put it out of my mind. Henceforth I would no longer know Him according to the flesh. But I have seen my risen Lord. I have seen my glorified Redeemer. I have seen Him no longer with the limitations of Jewish blood, but as crowned King of kings and Lord of lords, and I have received from Him direct the gospel which I preach unto you."

"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you? What wizard with his enchantments has been able to beguile and seduce you so soon from the true gospel of the Son of God, to induce in you desire to stand again under Mount Sinai and cower there as bondmen under a law which can discover and condemn sin, but cannot blot out sin? O foolish Galatians! I marvel, I marvel that so soon you are turned away." An invasion swept from Gaul, what we now call France, over into Rome, led by Brennus, and captured the city, and later another tribe of this mercurial population crossed the Hellespont into Asia, and there established themselves as a permanent power for many ages; the same people, exactly, from which the Irish and Welsh of the present day are descended; Celts, Gauls, Galatians, quick of apprehension, lively in imagination, soon to see a thing, rapidly to adopt it, and just as speedily to turn away from it. O ye unstable people! Ye mercurial population, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was set forth as evidently crucified before you, why do you turn back to the obsolete and beguiling elements of the world? The gospel of Jesus Christ is meant for man as man, for the barbarian, for the Scythian, for the cultured Greek, for the Roman, for the Jew, for all men. Tear down the walls of the partition that separates the nations and scatter its dust, and bring the long parted, long alienated members of the family of man into one commonwealth of Jesus Christ, and on one broad plane of humanity. That was Paul’s mission. He says, "Now, I did not learn it from Peter. He never had opportunity to tell me that. I never saw him until three years after my conversion. I was only a fortnight in Jerusalem with him at that time. I did not then go up to get any information from him. I wanted recognition on the part of the apostles in Jerusalem, of my gospel and my mission, but not a shred of its authority, not one fact of its history, not one item of its doctrine, came to me through any of them. I got it direct from my Lord. I went to Arabia."

Elijah went there once. He went to that mountain once to study its problems, and I am inclined to think our Lord Jesus Christ went to that mountain; that He, too, looked upon the mountain, when He went into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, and from that mountain in Arabia, that stood for the Mosaic covenant, our Lord Jesus Christ came back to preach an entirely new gospel.

Now, watch this man when he comes back from his retirement. There is no longer any hesitation. He knows what he is going to preach. He has been three years learning it. He has been receiving revelation after revelation. It was just as clearly mapped out to his mind on his return from Arabia as it was at any later period of his life. You see it in the first letters that he wrote to the Thessalonians, and then to the Corinthians, and then next in order comes this letter, the letter to the Galatians, which Martin Luther made the very sword of the Spirit in bringing about the

Reformation in Germany; and then immediately followed his letter to the Romans, in which he embodied the full plan of the salvation which he preached in all of its departments and respective relations. But it was a terrible battle.

He finds when he comes to Jerusalem a chilling reception. Only after Barnabas relates his Christian experience is Paul permitted to go in and out among them. And there in the temple his Lord speaks to him and says, "This is not thy place. I send thee far hence to the Gentiles. You must carry my gospel to the-nations that have never heard this Word, to all of the outlying populations of the earth, and as you go you must tell them who is Jesus. He is God manifest in the flesh; though veiled in the flesh, authenticated by the Spirit; though veiled in the flesh, recognized by the angels; though veiled in the flesh, preached unto the nations; and though veiled in the flesh, believed on in the world, and finally received up into glory." "Yet have I set my King upon the holy hill of Zion." 'The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."

He tells them that he came to preach that Jesus of Nazareth was the revelation of the Father; that He was the express image of His person; that He was the radiation of His glory; and that by Him the world was created, and that because He condescended to be a bondman, stooped from high heaven to the slavery of earth and became obedient unto death, that God had highly exalted Him and given Him a name above every other name. That at the name of Jesus every intelligence should bow, whether Jew or Gentile, on earth; whether demons in the pit or angels in heaven through whom came the ministering of the law. Every intelligence of the earth should bow to Jesus of Nazareth as King of kings and Lord of lords.

I never got the right conception of the gospel of Jesus Christ until I studied Paul's life and teachings of Jesus. Then I understood why it was that He looked upon the disciples with such sadness, and complained of blindness, and hardness and slowness of heart to believe, making it impossible for Him to set forth the gospel in its fullness and in its power and in its glory.

We see Paul pass to Antioch, and there, under his ministrations, for the first time after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, an impression was made upon the outside world in a certain direction. I am sure that many people miss seeing how much there is in the fact that the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch.

I say that in Jerusalem Christ's people never could have been called Christiansnever, because under the leadership of James they kept up the observance of all the temple laws. Under the leadership of James, Christianity was but a Jewish sect, only one of its many schools. But over yonder where Paul went, over into Antioch, the world on the outside saw a strange thing by watching the followers of Paul and Barnabas. They said, "There is a difference between the Jews and these people." And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.

Now, if they had been at Jerusalem, they would not have eaten with the Gentiles. There would have been nothing in their external observances that would have created any impression that they were anything but a sect of the Jews. But look! Here at Antioch is a man who has never been circumcised; he has never even been a proselyte of the gate, much less a proselyte of righteousness, and by the power of God he has been converted, and Paul admits him into the kingdom of heaven, without submitting to one Jewish ceremony, and then sits down at the table

and eats with him. And just look at them there when they gather and have their love feast! There they all are eating together their common meal, and when they come up to the Lord's table, every member of that Antioch church, without regard to nationality, partakes in common fellowship of that memorial or ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ, and those descendants of the kingdom of Antiochus say, "These are not Jews." These outside people say, "These are Christians. Here is something different from anything we have ever seen before in the world." And that very difference evoked the sleeping prejudices at Jerusalem, and deputations came down and wanted to undo the work that had been done, and make these Christians just Christian Jews. They wanted ¾ and as well might they have attempted to dam up the Nile with bulrushes-they wanted to run the great, broad current of eternal life for all men into a narrow Jewish channel. And Paul stood there and said, "You can't do this. I have seen the Lord. I was at school under Him for three years. I stood under the Mount Sinai, which once rocked with the presence of the angels and thundered with the storm of that great enunciation, and I tell you the law was transitory. The law was but an educator. The law was but a slave to lead you to Christ, and in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female, neither Scythian, bond, nor free, but you are all one in Jesus Christ." And that terrible battle followed, as recorded in Acts 15:1-41, and James, the brother of our Lord, and John and Peter, the apostles, acknowledged that Paul had received an independent gospel, and was sent upon an independent mission that they had no right to supervise it, the proof of whose sermons never had to be submitted to them for revision and emendation, whose statements of life came from inspiration in its perfection. They admitted it and gave the hand of fellowship on it. But that did not end it. Wherever he went the battle had to be fought-in Syria, in Cilicia, in Phrygia. And when from Troas he had crossed the intervening sea in response to an appeal from Europe, and when at night he slept and in a vision looked across the sea, and way over yonder on the European shore there stood up a man and beckoned and pleaded, "Come over into Macedonia and help us," and when he went into Europe and in the Roman colony at Philippi established a church upon the broad principles of humanity, there also he had to renew this fight, and when he passed from Philippi to Thessalonica, and from Thessalonica to Berea, and from Berea to Athens, and from Athens to Corinth, and from Corinth back again to Antioch and all the succeeding tours, everywhere he had to fight the same battle: "I received my gospel direct from the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a complete gospel. Peter is not my pope. It is for all men, and the terms of eternal life are simple enough for a child to understand them."

One man said not long ago, "A proof that your Scriptures are not inspired is this: The best part of them, the most interesting part of them, are the books written by Paul. He wrote about half the New Testament, and nearly the whole of it is based upon a conflict that ended within a few years, with the destruction of Jerusalem. Now if it had been intended as a revelation for all time, why take up so much space to tell about this battle between the law and the gospel which ended with that sensation? What do we care about it now?"

Ah! God is wiser than this questioner, and Paul's battle was not won when he died. When he was martyred, over his very grave came the same enemy, and in the succeeding ages superimposed upon Christianity the rites and ceremonies and liturgies and priesthood of the Old Testament, and every foot of Christendom today is under the shadow of Mount Sinai. More than half of the professing Christians of the world today look to Mount Sinai rather than to Calvary. That is why so much of the New Testament is given to it. Then again, it is there because it is to be made the

instrument of the culminating act of redemption. The last battle that is to be fought, when Israel shall be saved, when the descendants, the children and the kindred of Montefiore and Zangwill, when all of these are to be brought to see, as see they will, that Mount Sinai is the bondwoman, they will turn to the Lord, and the veil that is on their eyes will be taken away, and they will see Jesus, their Messiah. The gospel of Paul is to be the instrument under God for the salvation of the Jewish race.

So, then, the world not only needed that gospel in that form, in the beginning of Christianity, but it was needed in the Reformation; it was needed in the days that brought about the dark ages; it is needed now. And you can seldom now find a man who will get up in the pulpit and preach the gospel that Paul preached; that will allow God by His Spirit to reach the heart.

You may see churches now gathered for a meeting of days, and they will begin to prescribe: "O Lord, we have picked out this man for you to convert. He is worth a half million dollars, or a million. O Lord, we want you to convert this man. He is a great scholar. He is a mighty teacher. His intellectual influence would be worth so much to the church of Jesus Christ. And this lady, Lord - she is a leader of fashion. Her influence among the prominent women of the city is so great. Lord, convert her." When Paul preached he left it to God, and if God chose to convert the hostler instead of the owner of the horses that the hostler curried, Paul took the hostler. And if God converted the servants, Paul took the servants. If God converted those whose chains jangled as they walked, he took those convicts, for he said to them, "Such were some of you. You were thieves. You were liars. You were adulterers." He preached the gospel to the poor, and did not for a moment suppose that Lord Chesterfield was the author of the gospel instead of Jesus Christ. When Paul organized a church, he organized it for the capturing of the cities, and we have fallen short on that. We have turned back from Paul on that. He could go to Ephesus, the capital of Proconsular Asia, with its Temple of Diana, with its festivals, with idolatry fastened on the business interests and tradesmen’s guild; he could go to that city and could call out 10,000 converts in a meeting. And when magic, with her books and other evil literature attempted to overturn the simple gospel that he preached, he saw those books piled in the street and burned, and their sparks going up to tell the stars that the Book of God was prevailing and that the books of the devil were burning.

Something is wrong, radically wrong, with our present method, or else we would not fail to reach the cities. Paul reached Ephesus. He reached Corinth. Paul reached Thessalonica. Paul reached Rome, the imperial city and capital, and the empire was captured by the gospel which he preached.

I think that it would do some of us good to take a trip to Arabia, to go into the wilderness a while for retirement, to learn that repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ is the gospel of life and of eternal salvation to Jew or Gentile. I am glad he went. I am glad that on Paul’s gospel there does not fall the shadow of any other man. I am glad that he had to submit his interpretation to no Jerusalem clique, but that he got it fresh from the Master and gave it to us as our heritage.

One thing I know, brethren, that when God converted me that was the kind of Savior I met ¾ the Lord Jesus Christ ¾ and from that time until now it has seemed to me the highest honor under heaven to hold up before all men, irrespective of their past habits of vice or virtue, irrespective of race, or age, or sex, the Lord Jesus Christ as the end of the law for righteousness to every one

that believes in Him. Jonah went to Nineveh at last. The reason that he refused to go the first time was that he knew that God was long-suffering and gracious and forbearing. He knew that if he went and preached and a single man repented God would forgive him, and he plainly told God so. We can almost hear him saying, "That is the reason I would not go. Now, if you had sent me to preach them into hell, I would have gone joyfully, because here in your Book is the prophecy that Nineveh is going to overthrow my people, and I want Nineveh to die, but I knew that if you sent me to preach, they would repent, and then you would forgive them."

Oh! We want to get into the spirit of Paul, that man who by day and night hungered for the salvation of men, of all men, of any man, of any woman, any child, anywhere, no matter how crimson with sin, scarred all over with its defacing marks, groaning under its bondage, bound hand and foot by its fetters.

O imprisoned and imperiled soul, God in Jesus Christ, in one moment of time, can turn you from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. Oh! If you will go and preach that way, if you will read what Paul said to the elders of the church at Ephesus (let the city churches put that on their walls), and carry out that method, we will capture the cities as Paul captured the cities.

I bless God for the five gospels. I bless Him most of all for the fifth, the last, the complete gospel. I commend it to you, brethren. I commend it to you not only as a lamp to shine on your pathway in the valley of the shadow of death, but as your comfort, your consolation when your heart is riven with sorrow.

I commend it to you as God’s culminating revelation of His unspeakable love, intended to lift you up from the depths of wretchedness and mire of your sin, and to plant your feet upon the firm foundation, the everlasting rock of eternal salvation, and to put in your mouths a new song-a song of praises, that can no more be hushed than you can hush the babbling of a fountain which God has unsealed-a fountain of praise that will seek heaven in its upward trills and in its rhythm and melody, though you may be in a dungeon, and your back covered with stripes, and your feet in stocks, and give you a joy that all outside sorrows in the world can never eclipse. God give it to you to take into your heart the gospel of Paul!

Chapter 85

# S. SALVATION THROUGH THE BLOOD OF CHRIST

SALVATION THROUGH THE BLOOD OF CHRIST

TEXT: 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; looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. - Titus 2:11-13. The object of the theme today is to show the origin, end and the means of salvation. The very term, salvation, implies that men are lost, and so lost that they can not save themselves.

Two things are distinctly affirmed in this context, that salvation is not by works of righteousness which we do ourselves, but that it flows from the grace of God. As Paul expressed it in another context, "By grace are we saved, not of works," putting the two things over against each other again, so we, in determining the, first thought of this text, are showing that the origin of salvation is God’s love. The Apostle John expresses the epitome of the gospel when he says, "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life." We sometimes allow our conceptions of certain doctrines to limit the range of our thought and the scope of our comprehension of the love of God. Sometimes, it is presented to us as if that love had been superinduced by the work which the Savior did-that the Savior having died for us, secured to us God’s love. But that makes the Savior’s work the origin of salvation, and contradicts the statement that the Savior was given because God loves us. It is the love of God that caused the Savior’s work, and not the Savior’s work that brought about God’s love.

Again, in our construction of certain passages of scripture, such as "God is angry with the wicked every day," we seem to limit the love of God to the good people. We say He loves the good and hates the bad, which is equivalent to saying, "By works of righteousness which we did ourselves." That not only puts the condemnation of a man on the ground of his evil deeds, but it puts our salvation on the ground of our good deeds and it supposes not that Jesus Christ by His works secured the love of God, but that we by our works secured the love of God. The Apostle Paul asks the question, "Whoever did first give to him that it might be recompensed again?" Where is there in the annals of history to be found the name of a man whose own goodness superinduces the goodness of God, so that God’s favor to him was an obligation, a debt arising from the piety of the man?

Again, we are disposed to place a limit upon the love as to nations, or as to congregations or sects. But not so the record: "God so loved the world." "The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men." "God willeth (that is, desireth) not the death of any man." Indeed He swears by His own eternal existence that He takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked; that His pleasure rather, is that they should turn and live. The origin of salvation, then, is the love of God; that love not brought about by what the Savior did, but bringing about what the Savior did; that love not brought about by our piety, but our piety brought about by that love; not limited to Jews,

but including Gentiles, barbarians, Scythians, bond and free, i.e., the world. "The grace of God hath appeared." It was often before dimly foreshown. It was adumbrated, i.e., the coming event cast its shadow before. It was obscurely hinted in types, but our Savior Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light. "The grace of God hath appeared," that is, made itself manifest. No sun that shines in the skies is more apparent and conspicious. No truth has ever been so demonstrated and published. No proclamation has ever been written in larger letters and carried to greater lengths and extents than the grace of God.

It hath appeared. It appears in the declarations of angels. It appears in the revelation of this Book. It appears in the commission of Jesus Christ. It appears wherever church spires point to the skies. It appears wherever missionaries go. There is no voice nor language where the word of this grace is not heard. It means, to quote the exact meaning of the Greek, for this term is an adjective, and the only time that it is used in the New Testament, "bringing saving to all men." Wide as is the advertisement, wide as is the proclamation, so wide is the proffer of salvation to all men.

Now we are on questions today, of both doctrine and life, not of life versus doctrine, nor of doctrine versus life, but of the doctrine that there may be the right kind of a life, the right kind of a life growing out of the doctrine, the sound doctrine. And it is sound doctrine that the origin of salvation is God’s love, and that that love is now made manifest.

Angels once desired to look into the mysteries that today the Sunday School child is familiar with. Prophets themselves forecast things concerning salvation, that they were unable to comprehend, but it is now apparent, brought out of all original mystery and put in simple and plain language, so that a little child can understand it. The fundamental thought of it is that God, loving all the world, and every man in the world, offers salvation to every man in the world. "I would, therefore, that prayers be offered, supplications and giving of thanks for all men." "Who will have (or desires to have) all men to he saved."

Therefore we ought never to allow any view that we may have of an isolated doctrine to hamper our thought, to restrain our conception of the broadness of God’s love, and of the wideness of the offer of salvation.

It is a matter of divine sincerity. Suppose you, as a preacher, open the Book at your commission. You read it: "All authority in heaven and on earth is vested in me. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations." Does God mean that? Do I myself believe that? When I preach must I preach for the salvation of all men? Have I the spirit of Jesus Christ, or have I the spirit of Jonah? When God said to Jonah, "Go and take my message to that great city, Nineveh," Jonah refused to take it. Why did he refuse to take it? He himself says that he refused to take it because he knew God, and that if he took that message and the Ninevites repented, that God would forgive them and save them, and as he did not want them to be saved he would not bear the message.

Jonah did not misunderstand. He did not think God was insincere. He believed that if God sent even a threat to Nineveh, the fact that He sent the threat was an intimation that if they would regard the threat, and break off their sins, and repent of them, and implore His pardon, that He would forgive them-every one of them. But I heard a preacher say that there were men for whom he had no message; that he never had a sermon to preach to a man until there was some proof to his mind that the man was a child of God.

Now, let us consider the next thought in this text. The origin of salvation being God’s love, what is the procuring cause of salvation? It is distinctly stated in the text and context, and all through the Bible, that there is but one procuring cause. We need not try to think of a great many things. There is just one thing, and it is the work and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, who came on account of God’s love and grace into this world.

If any man be saved he is saved on account of what Christ has done and not because of anything that he has done or promises to do. The meritorious basis of salvation is the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now we have gone a long step toward the comprehension of salvation when we settle these two points: What is its origin? What is its meritorious ground? Starting in God’s love, a love revealed, a love bringing salvation and hope, it finds expression and merit in the work of Jesus Christ-that "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man he lifted up, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life." It is not, "Do and live," but it is, "Live and do." Moses describes the righteousness which is of the Law, that they which do those things shall live by them, but Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

Perhaps you do not always understand the purport of certain persistent questions addressed to candidates for church membership: "On what ground, on what account do you think you are saved? Do you think you are saved because you are sorry for the wrong you have done? Do you think you are saved because you are good? Do you think that you are saved because you have now promised to do good and think you are going to be able to do good, and do you think you are going to be able to do good, and do you think you are saved because of your emotions of joy or peace? What is the basis upon which your hope of salvation rests?" These questions are intended to fix the mind exclusively upon the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, embodied in the act of dying vicariously on the cross for men. Hence we have made, I say, a long step when we settle these two points clearly.

Now comes the next point. Men in their low estate by nature are children of wrath. Their mind is enmity, against God, not subject to His law, neither indeed can be. While Christ’s death is the meritorious ground of salvation, the question comes up,

"How is this saved man now to be fitted for the heaven which is his home, and for the service into which his salvation proposes to introduce him?" Hear the Scripture again: "Not by works of righteousness which we did ourselves, but by His grace through" ¾ through what? ¾ "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Well, from what flows regenerating grace? It is a question of order here. "Which He shed on us abundantly in Jesus Christ." As God’s love is the origin of Christ’s sacrifice, so Christ’s sacrifice is the origin of the Spirit’s regeneration and cleansing power, put forth to change the nature of men and fit them for the kingdom of God, for service here and for enjoyment hereafter: "The washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." That then is the third thing.

Now what does it mean? If we go back to Ezekiel’s time we find that there is involved in the saving of a man, first, a cleansing and then a renewing. To cleanse him by itself would not suffice, for unless he is renewed, as to his nature, he would be like the sow that had been wallowing in the

mire. You might wash her with fuller's soap, and yet she would go and wallow in the mire again, because not renewed, being still a hog. So two things are involved. One is the washing or cleansing, and the other is the renewing.

Ezekiel says, "Then I will sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be clean. I will take away your stony heart and give you a heart of flesh. I will put my Spirit within you." That is, I will not only wash you and make you clean from all past defilement, but I will renew your nature, so that it will love God where it had hated Him, and desire holiness where it had preferred unrighteousness. That is exactly what is meant in the third chapter of John, "born of water and of the Spirit"

There are two things in the Spirit's work, a cleansing by the application of the blood of Jesus Christ, symbolically set forth in the water of purification. "Then will I sprinkle clean water," water of cleansing, water that represents the blood of Christ. "Born of water and Spirit," is equivalent to saying, "Born of the blood of Christ and of the Spirit," that is, the Spirit applies the blood of Christ for cleansing purposes, and then by His own power renews the nature, what is called here the "washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Here arises a question: As the washing here is the washing that does the cleansing, is it not referred to in Zechariah, "In that day a fountain shall be opened in the city of David for sin and for uncleanness?" To this, Cowper in his song alluded when he said, "There is a fountain filled with blood Drawn from Immanuel's veins, And sinners plunged beneath that flood Lose all their guilty stains." This is the clean water of Ezekiel, the clean water that typified the blood of Christ, not meaning pure water, not clean in that sense, but cleansing water ¾ water for cleansing ¾ which consisted of the ashes of a heifer, mingled with water, typifying blood. Hence Paul says, "If the sprinkling of the ashes of an heifer sanctify to the cleansing of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your consciences from dead works to serve the true and the living God." Then, "born of water," in the third chapter of John, refers to the blood of Christ, set forth in the image of cleansing water, water of purification, which also shows the connection between regeneration and the Word of God. For we get to that cleansing through faith, and faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God, and therefore Paul says, "By the washing of water through the Word."

Then to put it in plain English, whenever I hear the gospel preached, whenever Jesus Christ is held up before me in faithful preaching, and I in my heart believe it, there has taken place in me that part of the work of the Holy Ghost, which is called purging the conscience from dead works by the application of the blood of Christ ¾ that part of the work which in this text here is called the washing of regeneration, and is called the washing by the Word, and hence it makes the Word of God an instrument in the salvation of men, and therefore it is said, "Of His own will begat He us through the Word."

Whatever may be the view of it from the divine side, a man comes in touch with this wonderful love of God, which produces this wonderful sacrifice of Christ, from which flows this wonderful work of the Holy Spirit ¾ a man comes in contact with that when the Word of God is preached, and in his heart he believes it.

It is on this wise. It does. not say, "Who shall ascend into heaven to bring Christ down here so that I can get at Him in person." It does not say, "Who shall descend into the deep and bring Christ up

so that I can get at Him in person." But what does it say? "The Word is nigh thee, even in thy month and in thy heart, the Word of faith which we preach." "If thou shalt believe in thy heart that Jesus Christ has risen from the dead thou -shall be saved."

Now we see that salvation originates in the love of God, that from that love of God comes the wonderful sacrifice of Christ, that from that wonderful sacrifice, in order to make it efficacious, there is the Spirit's work of two kinds, the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, the cleansing and the renewal, and that this cleansing part is apprehended on our side when we believe.

It comes by faith, and that solves the very question propounded by Nicodemus. When Jesus said that a man must be born from above, that he must be born of water and of the Spirit, Nicodemus says, "How can these things be?" What is the modus operandi? Jesus says that "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have eternal life." That is how it is done. That is how a man is born of the Spirit. That is how he comes in touch with the salvation which God has provided. Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.

So, if from your heart you accept the Lord Jesus Christ as your Savior, you need not waste any time over the question as to whether you are regenerated, because you could not be regenerated if that thing had not occurred. The washing of regeneration is through the Word, and the Word is apprehended by faith, and I need not puzzle a child's mind about but one thing. Here is Christ set forth before your eyes as crucified for you. Do you accept Him? Does your soul receive Him? Do you say, "My Lord and my God?" Then you need not bother about election and predestination and regeneration.

How then can these things be? They are just that way. That is the Savior's own explanation of it. I prefer His method of explaining it to all of the obscure and the endless metaphysical discussions of the subject in more than eighteen hundred years by the learned doctors of divinity who have spent scores of years to put their thoughts beyond the understanding of the people.

Now let us come to the next point. What is the end of all this? I am going to make an application of it directly that ought to startle some members here. Here is the end of it: "Who gave himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works." "The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men." The origin, the merit, the efficiency, the instrumentality, have all been set forth. Now what is the end of it? That He might redeem us from all iniquity.

Now to redeem means to buy back. You cannot use that word redeem in its etymological sense and exclude the idea of purchase. You cannot use it and exclude the idea of a purchase under an execution. That is to say, if a property is sold under a tax law, you redeem it and buy it back from under the execution. If a man has been captured in battle, you ransom him-you buy him back for a consideration given by you. He is bought back from captivity-from under the execution of his situation. Redemption involves in its very etymology not only the idea that the thing redeemed had been lost, but that it was a lawful captive, and that it is purchased back.

Purchased back how? Upon what consideration? Not gold and silver and precious stones, but the precious blood of Jesus Christ, says Peter. That was the price paid. But the end? When you

bought it back, when you redeemed this man, when God's grace appeared flashing its light over the darkness of this world, when God's merit in Christ astounded the world, what was the object? What was the end? "That He might purify unto himself, for His own possession, a people zealous of good works." So you understand what Paul meant when he says, "I want you to speak the things that befit sound doctrine." If a man has the form of Godliness and denies the power of it, he is a heretic. If a man professes the faith of the gospel and in works is reprobate, his life is ¾ a lie. It is more than that. It is awful blasphemy and sacrilege. Why? Where is the sacrilege in it, the blasphemy in it? It says this to God: "You love me. You gave the Savior to die for me in consequence of that love. You paid a tremendous price, and on account of that price, to make it efficacious, you sent forth the Holy Spirit, and He cleansed me from past iniquity and renewed me within, and though I am cleansed and renewed within, being a new man, my works are just like they were before. Your good fountain sends out impure water."

You have heard the instance of a man's being indicted before his church. Charges were preferred against him for heresy. The specification was that he was a heretic on the doctrine of election and predestination. "Why," he says, "I don't think about anything else, and I don't preach anything else but that." "Yes, but you don't preach the Bible doctrine of election and predestination. The election of God is unto good works. The predestination of God is that you may be conformed to His image. But the kind of election and predestination you are preaching and illustrating is. an election and predestination that work no reformation in the life, and does not make God's own possession zealous of good works." Now you can see how easy it was to convict him of heresy, and he was a heretic ¾ the worst kind of a heretic. The grace of God instructing us-instructing us what? A denial, which is a passive form, and a doing, which is an active form. The grace of God hath appeared bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, that we should deny ungodliness and worldly lust, the negative part; that we should live soberly, righteously and Godly in this present world, the active part, and "looking for the glorious hope and appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ." That is the attitude toward the other world. In this present world denying certain things and doing certain things, and as to the other world, looking, hoping, longing, anticipating, moving toward it, and expecting to enter into it.

Oh, immortality, immortality, what a thought! The man that believes in it, the man that believes that he is deathless, that death makes no break in the continuity of his being, that this world is but a stepping stone to another world, that this is temporal and that eternal, that here he denies one thing and does another thing, and looks to the appearing and glorious hope of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ! I say to you today, brethren, that when I turn my mind toward that glorious hope, toward the nearness and certainty of that appearing of the great God, our Savior Jesus Christ, when I think how fleet are the days that belong to the temporal, how eternal that which belongs to another world, my heart glows as I hear His grace say, "Be faithful a little while. Do not become discouraged. Do not become weary in well doing. Do not lose heart. Do not give up. Do not run away. Do not skulk. Do not go into the brush. Fight the good fight of faith, looking for that glorious hope and the appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ."

Now, that is salvation in its entirety, commencing at the fountain, God's love, going to the stream that flows from that fountain, Christ's meritorious sacrifice, down the stream to the lake which is made up of the streams representing the work of the Holy Spirit in cleansing and renewing, and then the life that results from that denial of ungodliness and worldly lust, the active part of it, living

soberly and righteously in this present world, which is a little while and will soon pass.

Ah, me! If our ship, storm-tossed and tempest-shaken, if the ship could but realize that we do not cast the anchor on an earthly bottom, but send it to yonder eternal shore, and fasten it to the coming of Jesus Christ, then would our hope be an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast. That is Paul's argument The anchor of your hope cast forward, and every day you pull on the cable you come nearer, nearer to the port, nearer to the landing on the other shore, nearer to the light which has no night, nearer to the joys which have no sorrows, nearer to the body which has no aches and pains, nearer to Jesus and the spirits of the just made perfect. Pull on the cable and bring the ship nearer to the future, looking forward and hastening unto that great hope end appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ.

Chapter 86

# S. SOWING WILD OATS NOT CONDUCIVE TO SALVATION

SOWING WILD OATS NOT CONDUCIVE TO SALVATION

TEXT: Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him. - Acts 10:34-35.

It is almost, if not quite impossible, in preaching, to emphasize one truth of a system without disparaging some other in the mind of the hearer. And oftentimes, either through an imperfection in the preacher's method, or from an infirmity of the hearer, the accentuation of the peculiar truth under discussion results in monstrous error in the opposite extreme. It is a good thing, therefore, for the preacher to ascertain in some fashion what impressions are being made in the minds of his congregation by his pulpit ministrations.

I cite three instances which sufficiently account for the selection of my theme today. The first occurred many years ago, when, in my early ministry, I was preaching to Old Providence church in Burleson County. At the conclusion of the service in which I had emphasized salvation by grace through faith, and described the impossibility of salvation by works of righteousness which we may do, I was invited to dine with a lady member of the church who seemed greatly troubled in mind. When the opportunity for conversation arrived she amazed me by propounding, pointblank and solemnly, these questions:

"Brother Carroll, do you regard it as a positive disadvantage to a woman seeking salvation that she has lived a chaste, modest, pure life; that she has been a good daughter, a good sister, a good wife, a good mother? Are a harlot's chances better than hers? And is it an advantage to a man seeking salvation that he has been a prodigal, a reprobate, an outrageous, outbreaking, shocking sinner, familiar with all unclean things? And ought we, who are burdened for the salvation of our children, to encourage them to hasten to the depths of unrighteousness because a rise from the bottom is more probable than from a position half-way down?"

I was horror-striken by these questions, evidently propounded with all seriousness and anxiety of mind, and I said, "My sister, is it possible that you derived these impressions from my preaching?" "Well," she replied, "I don't know what to think. I am perplexed. But it seems to me, that the gospel, as you preach it, offers a premium to the worst cases, and that the comparative probabilities of salvation give all the advantages to exceedingly vile sinners." Of course, I made clear her misapprehension of the gospel, but the incident made me more cautious in my methods of presenting single truths. The second incident occurred some ten years ago. In a conversation with a skeptic, he charged that the trend of the average preaching was virtually an encouragement to gross immorality in order to conviction of sin sufficient to lead one to a Savior. The third incident was quite recent, a youth justifying himself in sowing a crop of wild oats by the plea that only prodigals stood any showing of salvation. The last incident revived the memory of the preceding ones and led to a serious reflection on the comparative effects of morality and immorality on the

probabilities of salvation by grace, through faith in Jesus Christ. The conclusion reached by the reflection may be stated in the form of a proposition: Scripture, reason and experience, unite in teaching that the probabilities of one's believing in Christ and thereby being saved by grace are enhanced more by previous morality than by previous immorality. But even here in the very statement of this proposition, great caution is necessary.

Let it be carefully noted that the only salvation contemplated by this proposition is salvation by grace and not of works; that this salvation finds its only meritorious ground in the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ; that we come in touch with the merits of His atonement by faith in Him; that no antecedent good works in us, and no foreseen repentance and faith on our part is the ground. or reason of God's election of our souls unto eternal life.

If the proposition can not be maintained without surrendering all, or even one of these clear teachings of Scripture, then its position is conceded to be untenable. At the outset, therefore, it is maintained inflexibly that on no part of the ground does man first give to God that it may be recompensed unto him again. It is also disclaimed with equal emphasis not only that the morality of any fallen being is perfect, but that it can be morality at all, except as superinduced by divine grace.

It may then be asked what remains of the proposition? Much, every way. This much at least we may affirm-that one who walks in the light perceived is more apt to reach fulness of light than one who turns his back on it and walks the other way; that one who yields to the Spirit's motions however given, and one who uses the appointed means of salvation, will more likely attain the salvation, than one who turns a deaf ear to the former or wilfully declines to avail himself of the latter; that indulgence in known sin blunts the moral preceptions, sears the conscience, hardens the heart, increases the evil environment, decreases opportunity. For example: The fourth commandment of the moral law is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Among the beneficent objects of this law we may reckon these:

(1) To give time to think of our relations to God;

(2) To give time to learn of these relations and their consequent duties.

Now on this day Christ is preached and the word of life is taught. And since faith, the faith of our proposition, comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word' of God, how can they believe except they hear, and how can they hear, if through the immorality of Sabbath desecration, they forsake the assembling of themselves together? How can the immorality of secularizing the Lord's day be conducive to believing?

These reflections lead me to select a subject today as set forth in Acts 10:1-48, Acts 11:1-30, and Acts 15:1-41. Let us get the whole case before us:

"There was a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band, a devout man, and one that feared God with all his. house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway. He saw in a vision evidently about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, 'Cornelius.' And when he looked on Him, he was afraid, and said, 'What is it, Lord?' And He said unto him, 'Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose

surname is Peter: he lodgeth with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by the seaside: he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.'"

Omitting a part, I read again:

"Peter went away with them, and certain brethren from Joppa accompanied him. And the morrow after they entered into Caesarea. And Cornelius waited for them, and had called together his kinsmen and near friends. And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshiped him. But Peter took him up, saying, 'Stand up; I myself also am a man.' And as he talked with him, he went in, and found many that were come together. And he said unto them, 'Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean. Therefore I came unto you without gainsaying, as soon as I was sent for: I ask therefore for what intent ye have sent for me?'"

Cornelius then goes on to recite the visitation of the angel directing him to send for Peter, and concludes by saying,

"Immediately therefore I sent to thee: and thou hast well done that thou art come. Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded of God." To which Peter replies,

"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." Then he goes on and presents the gospel to them, and they are all instantly converted and the Holy Ghost is poured out on them. This transaction excited attention in Jerusalem, and they called Peter to account for it. In his defense of his conduct, he said this, "And the Spirit bade me go with them, nothing doubting. Moreover these six brethren accompanied me, and we entered into the man's house: and he shewed us how he had seen an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, 'Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved.' And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, 'John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'

Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, 'Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.'"

Now in the fifteenth chapter, in the council at Jerusalem, we have these words by Peter, referring to the same thing:

"And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, 'Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith:"

Now, having read these scriptures, I select as a text Acts 10:34-35 :

"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." The salient facts in this case are obvious. Here is a man who feared God and wrought righteousness, and yet he was not a saved man, because the object in sending for Peter was that Peter might "tell him words whereby he should be saved;" and because after he heard Peter, "God granted him repentance unto life;" and because after he heard Peter, he believed in Jesus Christ, and "God purified his heart" by that faith; because the Holy Spirit bore witness to his faith just as He did to the faith of Peter himself. Peter, being a believer on the day of Pentecost received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that gift of the Holy Ghost, which was to be given unto them which believe in Jesus Christ. It was like the gift that Cornelius received, and it was given to the apostles who believed; so it was given to Cornelius who believed. It is evident then from this scripture that Cornelius was not a converted, a saved man, before he met Peter. No man with the record before him can fairly take that position. And that being true, we have another view of the case, which is that he was under the Spirit's injunction, and so he feared God and continually prayed to Him and continually offered up alms.

Whatever you may think about it, that is the scriptural statement of the case. He feared God. He was endeavoring with all the light before him to honor God; to do what under this light seemed to him to be the will of God. Then we have this statement, that these alms and prayers of this man came up as a memorial before

God; they memorialized heaven and they were received in heaven as an indication of the attitude and character of the man who offered them.

It is also stated that God accepted what this man had done; that it made an impression on the divine mind; that it made a favorable impression on the divine mind, and that it did not count anything against him that he was not a Jew. And that is the tremendous truth impressed upon the mind of Peter. Under God's dealings with him concerning this case, he said, "I perceive (I did not see it before; I did not understand before, but now I perceive; from the evidence which has been brought to my mind, I now perceive) two things: first, that God is no respecter of persons as to nationality; second, what God does have respect to is character, shaped under His guidance, whether in a Jew or a Gentile."

"Whosoever feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." Not accepted in the sense that he is saved; not accepted in the sense that he has become a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, but it yet teaches a tremendous truth, and it is a truth which I feel constrained to press upon your hearts and consciences today. And what is that truth? It is not to the credit of any man; it never will be to the credit of any man; it never will be regarded as anything but loathsome and shameful to any man that he commits sin. It will never be an advantage to a man that he was an outrageous sinner. It will always be to the disadvantage of a man that he had been vile. It does not increase the probabilities that he will be a saved man that he has gone out sowing wild oats. It decreases the probabilities that he will be a saved man, that he has gone out and sowed wild oats.

It never will be to the credit of a girl or a woman that she was sinful. There never will be a time when it will be an advantage to a woman that she was a harlot. There never will be a time when it will be a discredit to a woman that she was a good daughter, that she was a good wife. It was God who said, "Thou shalt not steal," and who also said, "Believe on Jesus Christ." Disobedience to one does induce disobedience to the other.

Now unless these positions are true God goes against His own nature which led Him to inscribe with His own finger the Ten Commandments on the tables of stone. "Thou shalt not have any other god before me." Now, how can it be creditable, with that commandment there, that a man would become an idolator? "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Under that law, how could it ever be to the advantage of a man that he was noted for profanity? How could heaven ever have pleasure in that as an inducement to accept Jesus Christ, or increase the probabilities that he ever would accept Him? The New Testament gives us an account of very many thousands of people being converted, and mentions the conversion of but a few harlots. Thousands and thousands of women who were not harlots were converted. A few harlots were converted, and so vivid an impression did this make upon the public mind that the attention was fixed more upon those than upon the many. There were hundreds and thousands of harlots in the time of Christ, but the life they led was not conducive to an acquaintance with Him, and but few of that great number ever found Him. And those who did find Him did not find Him because they were harlots and' were not recommended to Him on that account, and their shame was not put to their credit. Not only this, but whenever a bad man, an outrageous sinner, was saved, really saved, it never was a matter of glory to him afterwards that he had been so vile. It was a matter of shame to him. Paul never gloried in his crimes. Whenever he referred to them it was with deep, profound shame that yet oppressed his heart, that he had been so vile. It is a bad sign, it is a sign arguing a doubt as to the conversion of one who has been an outrageous sinner that he rolls that fact under his tongue as a sweet morsel; that he counts it a feather in his cap; that he parades it before men as something to rejoice in, that puts upon him special honor. No, young man; sin is sin, and in all eternity it can never be to your advantage that you were extraordinarily vile; sever, never.

If God in that first commandment requires men to seek Him and to believe that He is, it was not to the discredit of Cornelius that, under the dim light, he had groped after God and prayed to Him. When God's law commends mercy to man and pity and sympathy, it memorialized heaven of the character of Cornelius that he gave much alms to the destitute. It was always then, is now, and will be at the last, an advantage to Corneliusthat he had never been as vile as some.

Now, there is a tendency in sin to debase, and there is a law in sin that the wicked wax worse and worse; and that is true always. God says, "Thou shalt not steal." Is it a commendation to be a thief? God says, "Thou shalt not kill." Does it increase a man's probabilities of becoming a Christian that he has been a murderer? God says, "Thou shalt not lust." If one has become so corrupt that his eyes can not cease from sin, and loathsome and slimy thoughts, like unclean worms, writhe and twist in his brain, and his heart has become like a cage of unclean birds-does all that, think you, increase his probabilities of salvation?

Now, we ought not to make a mistake in either direction. Here is the truth; that is, what the preacher aims at-what he means to say is, that no man can have a morality perfect enough to save him, and that if he relies upon his works of righteousness for salvation, he will miss the mark as this scripture teaches. It said to this moralist, Cornelius, it said to this man, comparatively a good man, it said to this worshipper, "You send for Peter and he will tell you words whereby you can be saved; there is sin with you and God will grant you repentance unto life; there is skepticism in you and God will grant you faith unto life; though you are a good man, as men call goodness, if you had to stand before God in His immaculate purity and be saved or lost upon your record, you would be lost. But yet it is well-pleasing to God that you honor Him as far as you do; it is more

acceptable to God that you are an honest man than if you were a thief; it is more to be approved by the divine mind that you should tell the truth than to tell a lie; it is better for you that you should remember God in your younger days than that you should put off seeking God until you are old, and though God's grace is so great, His mercy so abounding, that even an aged sinner may be saved, and a vile aged sinner may be saved."

It always will be true that it would have been better if he had found God in his youth. Now there never will come a time, it is impossible even in eternity that there should come a time when a man can say, "It is better that I was a spendthrift, and that I was disobedient to my parents; that I was a bad sinner, that I was a thief and a drunkard, that I brought sorrow to my mother's heart and anxiety, and that I debauched my person and became loathsome." It never can be that it was best that he should have lived that way.

I wish we could get that into our minds. I am sure I did not intend to make that impression on the mind of that good sister at Old Providence church; she misunderstood me; she misconstrued what I said. How could she think that I would teach that it was an advantage for a girl to be sinful; that it was a feather in a young man's cap that he was a prodigal and a spendthrift? Unrighteousnesss is sin; it is never good; it is always abominable and vile. It never can be made a matter of glory; it is always a matter of shame. And yet it is true that the grace of God is sufficient for the salvation of the vilest on repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a restful thing, it is bound to be considered a restful thing, to see salvation coming to a man like Cornelius. We must not count it against him that he was reputable. We must not count it against him that he was honorable. We must not count it against him that he loved the truth. We must not count it against him that he was merciful. We must consider that any approximation in his life and conduct to the moral law under the monitions of God's Holy Spirit was such as God would approve and not condemn. I have given some attention to the statistics of this subject, and they show that the probabilities are that the less vile you become as a sinner, the more, humanly speaking, is the prospect of becoming saved through the blood of Christ. Is that true? Let us look at it carefully. Is that true?, Is it a scriptural idea? I stated it once, and a man said, "That cannot be true." "Why?" "Because it is against the Scripture." "What does the Scripture say?" "The Scriptures say the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of heaven before you." "Before whom?"

I admit that publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of heaven before some people, and that it was more probable that they would go in ahead of that other crowd. But what was that other crowd? Compare the two classes-was that a better class than this one? Our Lord said that for a pretense they made long prayers; that they were whited sepulchres, inwardly full of rottenness and dead men's bones; that they lived by extortion and devoured widows and orphans. They were as loathsome sinners in the sight of God as these harlots. They were worse sinners than these publicans. They had only an external sanctity, which was itself an abomination to God.

Hypocrisy is no more conducive to acceptance of Jesus Christ than idolatry and extortion is no more to the credit of a man than to be a spendthrift, and on the whole I am inclined to the opinion that the probabilities are, humanly speaking, that the spendthrift will go into the kingdom of heaven before the miser does. But I do not say that he will likely go into the kingdom of heaven before what is called the average man - honest, reputable man. The miser is viler than the spendthrift. He is a meaner character than the spendthrift. His soul is shriveled more. He is guilty of more heinous

offenses than the other.

It remains true-is bound to remain true if God is God, if His law stands good, if the

Ten Commandments constitute the rule of human life, it must always be true ¾ that it is better to have been honest and truthful and fair and merciful than to have been the opposite. If I see a young man disrespectful to his parents; if I see him weak as water, yielding to dissipation by night and by day and undermining his health and weakening his mind, I know that it does not increase his chances of salvation. I know that if he is ever saved, it will be nothing to his credit that he had gone as far down in degradation as he did; that it always would have been better if he had bees more upright, temperate, respectful and obedient to his parents; it always would have been better. Do you know that very few gamblers are saved, very few drunkards are saved, very few harlots are saved? The grace of God is rich enough and deep enough for their salvation, but it is a very small number of them that are saved. But if it were true that living a life of that kind increases the chances of one's being saved, we would not have such statistics.

Let us take the history of this church. I venture to say that ninety-nine per cent of those who have been converted since God established this church were not extreme cases of lawlessness; and yet you know that since this pulpit was erected, every preacher that occupied it has declared the fulness of the grace of God as sufficient to save any man, even though on the very brink of hell, if he would only turn to God for mercy through Jesus Christ.

Having made that point plain, I suppose, I want now to make another point plain. I want it to be just as plain as the first, that if a man shall say within himself, "I am reasonably truthful; I am reasonably temperate in my life,; I pay my debts (which some members of the church do not, to their shame); I stand in the eyes of the community in which I live as a man whose word is as good as his bond, and therefore I am good enough; I do not need any Savior" ¾ when he takes that position ¾ I am bound, in view of the truth, in view of the teaching of God's Word, to say that he is very nigh to hell, whoever he may be.

I know Cornelius did not act that way. I know that- he walked in the light that he had and was not satisfied with it. He wanted more. He prayed to God for clearer views of truth. He stood ready to welcome the truth. Listen to this one sentence describing him and see how it is: "And Cornelius said, 'Immediately therefore I sent to thee (just as soon as it was made plain to me that there was clearer truth than I had ever received, immediately I acted on it) I sent for thee and thou hast well done that thou art come. Now, therefore, we are all present here before God to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.'" That readiness of mind, that docility of spirit, that teachableness, that the man who relies upon his morality has not, but he has made a god of his imperfect righteousness and has put that up as a savior. Hence, Paul teaches that if you are raising this question about putting a bridge across the chasm that separates God and man there is no difference between a truth and a lie, or your short bridge and your longer bridge, since neither can reach the other shore. Now, it was in that sense that Paul said there was no difference. He did not mean to say that there is no difference between a truth and a lie; he did not mean to teach that it makes no difference whether a girl is pure and modest or sinful in speech and life; he never meant that. But he said as touching the question of salvation by one's personal righteousness, in that respect it made no difference.

Let us discriminate. Let us not apply a sense to words that the apostle never applied to them. He did say, in effect, that a moralist who thought to enter heaven in his own righteousness, and a vile man, an immoralist, would both alike fail of heaven. Didn't he declare all under sin and as for pure and perfect righteousness, there is none righteous ¾ no, not one? They are all under condemnation and guilt, and Christ is offered as a means of perfect salvation to all men, whether Jew or Gentile. There is something here to think about. Let us suppose that the judgment day with its decisions has come and gone a thousand years, and up there in heaven is Lydia, and Dorcas, and that nameless woman who kissed the feet of Jesus. What I mean to say is that even that long after the judgment day it will never be a matter of congratulation to that woman that she had been so vile a sinner, and that it will never be a matter of regret to Lydia and Dorcas that they had lived purer and more useful lives. Let us not mistake on these points.

We have an illustration in point: A few days ago I was invited to conduct a meeting in Baylor University. That meeting has been going on about ten days. I never in my life saw a meeting commence at the start with such power and continue with such power. On a number of occasions I saw a greater per cent of the unconverted people in that audience express an interest in salvation-their own salvation-than I ever saw before in my life but once. Now, I maintain that even if I had an equal audience of hardened sinners, town-bums, political ward-healers, men steeped in iniquity, that the same proportion of -the unconverted would not have been moved to Christ. But antecedent to that, when will any preacher have so great an audience of the hardened classes? And how can they believe except they hear? Their life is not conducive to a hearing. Think about that.

You are on a .question of probabilities. I say the same proportion of them would not have been as easily reached. And why? Because of the trend of sin to blind the eyes and harden the heart, and make the soul impervious to the reception of the truth, and to increase skepticism more and more. And speaking of probabilities, there would not have been so many, and I take pleasure in telling these young people that it never can be to their disadvantage that they have not become vile; it never can be a discredit to them that they have refrained from drunkenness and debauchery and a shameful life in the sloughs and sinks of iniquity. But yet if I saw one of them very near the pit of hell, on the edge of it and he would listen to me, I would try to lead him to Christ, whose grace is sufficient for the salvation of the vilest sinner.

Suppose one is not in the habit of going where the gospel is preached-does it increase the probabilities that he will be converted? Suppose he does not go to church more than once in six months or a year, what are the probabilities in his case? Use common sense to decide the question. If it is to the advantage of the man not to come; if his chances are increased by staying away; if he is more likely to be saved by forsaking the assembling of the people of God, then we are making a mistake in urging the people to come up every week to the services of God. I say that but few people whose habit is to stay away from the place of worship and the means of grace, may hope for accidental opportunities of eternal life. Law is law either in the kingdom of grace or in the kingdom of nature. When I look in the face of my own child, I would, God knows that I speak the truth, I would rather she would, give her heart to the Lord Jesus Christ when she is young and the younger the better, if it be a genuine surrender to Christ I would rather that her childhood, like Timothy's, should be devoted to the service of God than that she should wait and bring only the remnants of life to be laid on the altar of God, and it will always be better if she is saved at ten

years of age than if she waits to be saved at fifty years of age. If that is true, then it is not true that one is under obligations to honor God at ten years of age; that there was no law obligating us to accept Christ at twelve, at fifteen, at twenty, at thirty, at forty, and the obligation came only at fifty. You know that is not true.

Then it is better to "seek ye the Lord while He may be found; call- upon Him while

He is near." I say it is better to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness before you seek the things of this world. I say it is better to bring the child-heart to Jesus than it is to bring the aged heart to Him. And yet, as men in a life-boat go out to a wreck whose minute guns and despair mingle with the roar of the breakers, so I would strive to save the aged sinner and preach to him that even in the eleventh hour, on his repentance, God will save him.

I have felt constrained to present these things to you today in the interest of righteousness. There are boys in Waco who glory in the fact that they are vile; who count it a feather in their cap that they have despised their mothers; that count it a special mark, a peculiar distinction, that they are becoming drunkards; that they are sowing a big crop of wild oats. Not so. Not so. Not so. "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons."

I mean to say that because you are an American or an Englishman or a Spaniard or a Hottentot, that signifies nothing so far as commending you to God is concerned. He is no respecter of persons as to nationality. God being just, does hold it as a memorial of a man whatever he does in the direction of truth and righteousness. It is bound to be so. True, He will not count that imperfect righteousness sufficient to justify him at the judgment bar. Tell me why it is that when Jesus looked upon that young man who had such a respect for law and order, such a regard for God and His commandments, why is it that Jesus, looking on him, loved him? It is true that

God loves all sinners. But that is not the thought expressed here. It means that there was approbation of whatever of right there was in him.

I have endeavored to present these two truths side by side, that it was better for Cornelius that he had followed what light he had, and yet, even Cornelius had to repent toward God and have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved. I want us to unite in prayer that the whole truth of the gospel may be seen in its symmetry, so that in looking at one view of it we do not lose sight of other views of it; that we may ask God to give us full and clear conceptions of divine truth as a system. Especially should we pray God to remove the impression that it will be any advantage to you that you should be an infidel for a while.

O, how many thousand times I myself have regretted that I ever did distrust God; that I ever was skeptical about revelation; that I ever did turn from the Bible! There never will come a time when it will be of advantage to me, when it will cease to be anything but a shame to me, that I did not from the first with a full heart, receive all the truth of God. Let us hate with unspeakable hatred a sham, a hypocrite, a whited sepulchre, but also hate that flaunting of sin in its tawdry rags, of shame, as if there was glory in it. Both are abominable in the sight of God.

Chapter 87

# S. Salvation Not in Church Ordinances

SALVATION NOT IN CHURCH OR ORDINANCES, BUT IN CHRIST

TEXT: These things write I unto thee that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground o f the truth. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the nations, believed on in the world, received up into glory. - 1 Timothy 3:15-16. There is a word which means to call, a Greek word, kalleo, I call. This word is united sometimes with a preposition which means “out of,” the preposition ek, and thus you have ekkalleo, “I call out.” And from that you have ecclesia, which means “the called out.” And that is the word which one hundred and fifteen times in the New Testament is translated “church,” the “called out.” The word was not coined for the occasion. It was in good use among the Greeks when our Savior employed it. In the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we have three instances of its use in the Greek sense. Ephesus was a Greek town and had Greek customs and laws, and they had an assembly which transacted the business of the town. And this assembly, in order to transact the business committed to it, had to be regularly summoned by a town-crier, who went around and issued his call, calling out this man and that man; then the “called out” would come together for the transaction of the business committed to them. On one occasion they were illegally called out. It was not done according to Greek law, and hence the town clerk said that it was an unlawful assembly, in that the forms of law had not been complied with in the calling out, and he said that if any man had any business to come before the assembly, the ecclesia of that town, there was a lawful way in which it could be done. These three instances are the only ones in the Bible in which the word is used in its ordinary Greek sense. In the seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostles it is applied to the people of Israel, whom God called out of Egypt. The assembly in the wilderness, that national congregation, by the call of God, came out from Egypt to go to the Promised Land which God should give them. This was a national assembly and organized for national purposes. In other places in the New Testament the word is applied, not to any particular assembly, but to the church as an institution. Allow me to illustrate: Suppose I were to say that upon certain principles of civil liberty the jury was established. I would not have in my mind any particular twelve men when I used the word “jury” in that sense, but the institution called the jury. Now, in that sense the word ecclesia, or church, is used by our Savior when He says that upon the public profession of faith in Him as the Messiah, the Son of the living God, “I will build my church. I will call out from the world a people who believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of the living God, and upon that professed faith in Him, I will build the institution, my church.” Now He has no particular local congregation in His mind when He says that. The term is used just as I used the term “jury” a while ago. But in ninety-five out of the one hundred and fifteen instances in which the word is translated “church,” it refers to a local congregation assembled together in one place. In a few instances it refers to all of the saved people who are called from the earth up to heaven, as “the general assembly and church of the first-born who are written in heaven.” But in the ordinary use of the word it applies to a congregation called out for a specific purpose, and

organized for that purpose, legally organized for that purpose, and the basis upon which it is called out is that every member of it is a personal believer in the Messiahship of Jesus Christ and His divinity; no other may lawfully enter it; whether man, woman or child, there must be personal faith God-revealed faith in Jesus. It is based upon that. Do you personally, for yourself, without the intervention of-any third party, and from God's individual dealings with you, do you, from your heart, accept the Lord Jesus Christ as your Divine Teacher, as your Divine Savior, as your Divine King, making His word the law of your life, and His atonement the basis of your salvation, and His government the rule of your life? Now, in that sense of the word, Paul says to Timothy in this text: "I write to thee that thou mayest know the kind of life (it does not refer to proprieties and civilities) thou must live as a member of the church." The word house in the text in no sense means the external building in which the people assembled. It never had that sense until modern times. People now sometimes build a house, and they dedicate it and they consecrate it, but that is not the Bible idea. This building here where we are is but brick, mortar and wood. It is for convenience. It is not the church but is built for the church to assemble in. It is not the church. You are God's building, the congregation, not this structure, and there is no use for this building beyond the purposes of affording a convenient, comfortable and suitable place for the gathering together of the Church of God. And I would have you disabuse your mind of any sort of conception that any kind of building of brick or mortar is the house of God. I repeat, you, you converted people are God's building, and you would be God's building if you did not have a house to meet in; you would be God's building on the prairie, and all this idea about the special sanctity attaching to the building that we put up, is the veriest superstition, and very destructive of the souls of men. "Joining the church," then, never means joining the house. I mean the house that we put up; the house of God is built by the Lord Jesus Christ. He says: "Upon this rock I (not you) will build my church." Now, the ancient temple of the Jews is not to be imitated in modern buildings; that was a type, but it was not a type of any other building to be erected of an earthly character. It was a type of the spiritual building, the true church. For instance, God says: "You are God's temple, you converted people; you called out people; you people called out from the world by the Spirit of God, and trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ, and assembled together for the purpose that I am going to tell you directly. You are God's temple; you are built up for an habitation of the Spirit of God, and in this spiritual temple every stone is a living stone; not a dead one in it." It makes no difference whether you are eighty years old or ten years old; whether you are a man or a woman; whether you are a Jew or a Greek; whether you are a barbarian, bond or free. If ever you become a part of the true house of God, of which the Temple was the type, you will be made alive by the Spirit of God; you will be a living stone. And you have no more place in the church of God, in the true house of God, if you are an unconverted man, than the devil himself. I do want to make this point clear to you today, that the most destructive idea that was ever presented to the minds of the people is that anybody or anything is the Savior except the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. And it is a deadly sin, by whomsoever propagated, that any ordinance, like baptism, or the Lord's supper, or any church organization is a saving machine in the sense you must be in it to be saved. Jesus is the Savior. He builds the true church, and you do sin against your own soul, and you do love death rather than life, whenever you go to any ordinance or any organization in order to be saved. The church can no more save you than the angels can, and the angels can not save you. You are to be saved by the power of God, or you are lost, and it is high treason, and I do impeach any man living today of high treason against God that makes any ordinance or any church organization on this

earth the Savior. I impeach such an one of a direct and palpable violation of the law of salvation. I have no ambition for “broadness” contrary to God’s Word. I have no authority to palm off my “broadness” on the credulity of men. I am just as broad as God’s law. Suppose a judge, sitting on a bench, with the statutes before him, and a criminal for trial before him, should say: “This is a broad court; if you think you have kept the law I will acquit you; if you intended in your mind to obey the statutes, whether you obeyed them or not; this is a broad court; it justifies on your intent.” Such a judge would be impeached and removed from the bench. He has no right to be broad beyond the law, and if he speaks not according to the law and the testimony, there is no judicial honor in him. The church of the living God, the called out assembly, was not instituted by man. Why, I have no authority to start a church, unless I claim to be God. The conditions of membership are not matters to be settled by the fancies of people. No number of them can get together and say: “Let’s organize a church that will suit us.” It is not a question of whether it suits us or not. Any man who is thoughtful, and who really wishes to be saved, will, in his heart, look with contempt upon any human organization that assumes to save his soul. Why? He says, “I am a man myself, and if you people can organize a saving machine, I can do it myself, and who are you that I should bow down before you as my Savior?” If the legions of God’s angels, in the sheen of their heavenly apparel, were to come down in one blaze of splendor and cover Waco with the dazzling glory of their heavenly appearance, I pledge you my word, so great is my idea of the dignity of manhood, that I would not fall down and worship that assembly of flaming spirits. I would not kneel to any angel that ever carried a message of God. Whenever I bend the knee, I must bend it to Divinity; not to man; not to angels. Now we come to the purpose of the church. Let us look at it: “The pillar and ground of the truth.” The church was established by the Lord Jesus Christ, called out from the world, upon principles which He prescribed, not which were convenient and suitable to them or pleasing to their fancies. He prescribed everything and consulted them in nothing. He organized them, not for their delectation, nor for the accomplishment of their purpose, but to hold up the truth by which men could be saved. And if I stood here in this pulpit as the mouth-piece of this local organization, and were to present to men anything which had not a “thus saith the Lord” for it, which is not bottomed upon a plain passage of the Word of God, I would deserve the repudiation of the just, and the contempt of all the honest and earnest who are seeking salvation by the power of God, and not by the sleight-of-hand or craftiness of men. I have no message of my own. I am no more than one of you. I am a sinner just like you are. I claim no special superiority over any of you. If I get to heaven, it will be by no superior sanctity of my own, but it will be by the grace of God that saved me, as I invite you to be saved. Now, let us see what this truth is that the church is to hold up. Listen to the items of it. 1. God Was Manifest In The Flesh. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.” The first item of the truth is that the one to whom we ask you to come as a Savior is God Himself. Would I ask you to come to a pope? Would I ask you to come to the Virgin Mary? Would I ask you to come to Gabriel or Michael? Would I ask you to come to a poor sinner like myself? Shall I come to you as an intelligent man, and ask you to accept as a Savior anybody who is not divine? Why, you would tell me at once that when a man can save, you will save yourself. Now, look at this picture; I want it to be vividly before you. In the old Aztec government when they captured a royal prisoner, they would say to him: “We receive you as our distinguished guest. We appoint you the most luxurious room in our palace; we provide for you the most delicate viands upon which man could wish to feed; we fill your room with the most subtle and pleasant aroma; we

cause the most beautiful women to stand before you, and with their fans of gorgeously variegated feathers of birds, to keep even the smallest insect from lighting upon you. You are very precious to us. We honor you very much." And the unsuspecting victim smiles at his royal treatment, and they continue their deceptive compliments. But on a certain moonless night, when everything is dark, they come with soft and flattering words, take that man by the hand and lead him out. They furnish him a grand escort of robed priests. Each one holds a flaming torch in his hand, and they come to that vast tower of the war god, around which winds an outside spiral staircase, leading up to the top. And as that crowd moves up, and the torches go round, it seems like a glittering serpent of fire climbing up in that dark night to the top of that temple. And when they get the victim up there, still speaking soft and flattering words, they gently lay him down upon a huge rock and bare his breast, and suddenly a priest steps out with a sharp knife and rips his breast open, and plucks out his heart — the palpitating and smoking heart — and thrusts it down at the foot of his war god. O, no; they did not intend to hurt him; they simply wanted to take his heart out. And so when men say, "If you will preach Jesus Christ as a man, I can take hold of that," I tell you before God today that that would heart the Gospel; that would take the heart out of it. And you might cover that book with fulsome compliments, and you might pat obsequious and truckling ministers upon the back and say: "How broad; how liberal; how catholic! Why, you will spread it out so any of us can come in." I tell you no honest man would come in. He would say: "If you have nothing more to present to me as a Savior than a man, I am a man myself, and I bow down my knee to no man." There never was a shrewder trick of the devil than his saying to preachers: "You be broad; you be liberal; you take out the supernatural; you reject the miracles; you reject the divinity of Jesus Christ; you preach Him as a man; you hold Him up as merely a pattern, as an example." Ah, me, it would not save a soul, not a soul. My Savior is Divine, and the very minute that I repudiate His divinity I step out of the pulpit and I say: "Gentlemen, do not ask me to preach a man as a Savior; I won't do it." It is the mission of the church to hold out before lost souls a Divine Savior, who was God before He created this world; who was God in eternity; but who, to save men, took upon Himself human nature, and in His humanity suffered and died for men. When I was an infidel, in some respects at least, I was an honest one, and talking once with a Christian, who began to lower the bible down so as to make it fit me, I said: "Stop. Whenever you put it down that low, then quit preaching; if it ever touches me in the world, it must touch me on its divine claims; it must touch me upon its supernatural origin; it must touch me because it is from God and not from man; and if you take out the supernatural, then I tell you frankly I had as soon adopt any other old wives' fable as that. I put it with other myths and legends of men. If you can prove to me its divine authority; if the Lord Jesus Christ can come before me as God, and I can see it, I will bend my knee to Him that very moment." I have had men in this town to come to me with wonderful compliments to the Bible. "Marvelous book," they say, "and if you will eliminate the supernatural, take out those miracles, take out the divinity of Jesus Christ, I will come and stand with you." I don't care whether they come or not. I mean to say that not to gain the approval of a man would I lower the divine plan of salvation the ninth part of a hair; and it is for his good I would not do it, for whenever I lower it he turns his back on it with contempt. The devil does not fear a "broad church." He has no fear of it at all; the devil does not fear baptism as a Savior; the devil does not fear the church as a Savior. It pleases him when people join the church to be saved. He doesn't care how many times you look in a pool of water for the remission of sins. He doesn't care how many times you appeal to a woman, and say, "Mother of God, do thou intercede for me!" He doesn't care how many times you try to get

to heaven by joining the Sunday School. Why, he knows you cannot get there that way, and if he can side-track you on that delusion he has accomplished his purpose.

2. Notice the next point. God was not only manifest in the flesh but justified in the Spirit. When He took upon Himself human nature, there had to be some attestation that He was the Divine One, that He was God Incarnate. It required credentials; it needed authentication; and if Jesus of Nazareth is not justified as God by the Spirit, I for one disclaim Him as my Savior. When God sent John the Baptist to preach, He says: “I send you that in your baptizing the true Messiah may be made manifest.”

John says: “How am I to know Him?” That was a very sensible inquiry. “That baptized man upon whom you shall see the Spirit of God descending and resting, He is the one.” And when the Spirit did rest on Him, the devil also knew He was the one, and he did not waste any more time. He determined to meet that being upon whom the Spirit of God rested and test His divinity; and into the wilderness the Spirit led Jesus in order that His divinity might be tested in conflict with Satan himself, the arch enemy of man; and if the devil had triumphed over Him, He would not have been God. Then look at the attestation of the Spirit when He ascended into heaven. He based all His claims to the Messiahship upon that fact. What was the fact? That if He ascended up into heaven, and He was preached as God manifest in the flesh, as the Divine Savior, that the Spirit of God would attest that preaching until the end of time. Why, do you think I would get up before you here today, and preach the divinity of Jesus Christ, and no way to authenticate it this side of Pentecost? I tell you He will authenticate it in this house today. He has authenticated it here one hundred and fifty times since this meeting commenced. Jesus Christ as God manifest in the flesh, has been justified by the Spirit time after time since we commenced these services; and I do not ask any man to rise up and say, “He is my Savior,” unless the Spirit of the great God has moved upon that man’s heart, and has by divine power convinced him of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. I know how, as cold as an icicle and with my mind analyzing every sentence that the preacher spoke, I looked in calm, proud scorn upon what I regarded as the preaching of the gospel, and it was only when the proposition was made to me that I was to have an experimental demonstration in my heart, in my conscience, in my spirit, in my judgment, that Jesus Christ in my soul was to be justified as Divine, as God, by the power of the Spirit of God-I acted on that proposition in a minute. So I have seen gray-headed men, who have lived in this town as unbelievers, upon the witness in their hearts, acknowledge Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord. And it does seem that with the vast deal — and you must excuse the expression — the vast deal of superstitious stuff oftentimes presented for men’s acceptance, there is some sort of an extenuation of their unbelief. They see no power in it; the whole thing seems to them as an empty shell, a system of mere rites and ceremonies, of formal professions, of unchanged lives, and in their hearts they say, “If you cannot give me something better than that, you let me alone.” And I will let them alone, unless I can offer them immediate and personal demonstration of Christ’s divinity. Not by an argument, for many of them can outargue me; their minds are equal to mine, their powers of analysis perhaps superior; I would not try to argue one of them into salvation, but I say: I offer you a proof, not of my own manufacture; I offer you a proof not even of angelic, origin; I offer you a proof not found in running or standing water, however it may sparkle or gurgle or thunder in its downpour; I offer you a demonstration, not in a wafer that you put on your lip, not in a little wine that you take into your mouth. I offer you a demonstration of the almighty power of God in His working on your heart and

in your soul, so that after a while you can stand up and with a perfectly clear eye look out in the face of your neighbors, and with whom you have been associating all your life, and say: “Friends, I once spoke evil of this way. I did not think there was anything in it; but a change has come over me; I do not see it as I once saw it, and there is in me the witness of my conscience that God, for Christ’s sake, has forgiven my sins. I do not know how to explain it, but now I love Thy church, O God; I love Thy worship; I love Thy songs; I love the Gospel of Jesus Christ; I love the meeting of Thy people. My affections have been changed, and I am willing for Jesus Christ to be my teacher, because He is not a man, and to be my Savior, because He is not an angel, and to be my King, because He is the only true and living God.” 3. Now take the next point of the truth of which the church is the pillar and ground: “Seen of angels.” Not only was He to be authenticated by the Spirit of God, but He was to the angels that stand around the throne of God, to appear to be the Son of God. They were to recognize His divinity. When the shepherds were watching in the field a bright light shone around them, and there was heard a voice (and not an earthly voice): “Unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Savior who is Christ, the God, the Lord. Behold, it is good tidings for all men.” They saw it. They recognized His divinity in the cradle. He appeared unto them in the temptation to be divine, and when the devil left Him, the angels came and ministered unto Him. He appeared unto them to be divine in the Garden of Gethsemane, when after His prayer one of them came and held up the head of His humanity. He appeared unto them to be divine when they came to His tomb and looked upon its emptiness, and testified to the disciples, “He is not here; He is risen.” He appears unto the angels to be divine, whenever God’s people come together, for by the church the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known unto the principalities and powers that are in heavenly places. When He came into the world, all the angels of God worshipped Him. So instead of bowing down to an angel, I kneel down by the side of the angel, and I hear that angel say, “I am thy fellow servant, as I was the fellow servant of the prophets, and I, too, will bend the knee when you bow down to Jesus Christ.” And any Savior that the bright spirits above do not recognize as the Savior cannot be my Savior. 4. Now notice the next point: “Preached unto the nations.” This God that was manifest in the flesh, that was justified in the spirit, that appeared unto the angels to be God, He was preached unto the nations. Who was preached? We preach not ourselves, no; we are sinners. We are your servants for. Christ’s sake. God forbid that I should ask you to look to me or to trust in me. We preach Christ. He is the one to be held up before the world as the Savior of the world. Suppose I go out here in Waco to an unconverted man, and say, “You are a good man; you ought to stand on the side of whatever is right, and now you come and join the church.” Shall I preach the church to him? Shall I? God forbid. Shall I not preach Christ to him? Shall I not hold up before him as a Divine Savior the Lord Jesus Christ? Preached among, the nations, all nations; if He is the God of the Jews only, He is not my God. If there is no way of salvation by Him for me, then how can He claim to be God? Has God only one little people here? Did He not reach out His strong hand and break down the wall, the partition, between Jews and Gentiles, and say in His wrath against bigotry: “God is no respecter of persons. In every nation, whosoever feareth Him is accepted of Him?” What are you, just one little people among so many, that you should monopolize Divinity and salvation? Break down that wall; pull up its foundations; let the world in. Go, preach this salvation to every tongue and tribe and kindred upon the face of the earth. When you take away the catholicity of this means of salvation, I for one will reject it. 5. Now, not only preached among the nations, but “believed on in the world.” You say it is incredible; I say it is credible. Now, which of us is right? You say it is incredible, I say it is credible; and I can

prove what I say by a fact that you cannot gainsay; and that is the fact that He has been believed on in the world. Will you say great men have not believed on Him? I point to Gladstone, to Washington, to Justice Marshall, to Greenleaf, to the mightiest minds that this world has ever known. They have delighted to believe in Him. And then I will give you a grander proof than that. I will go down where humanity has suffered, where the people are poor, where they are sick, where they are distressed, where they are blind. I will go down to the mud sills and leave the upper crust, and go where human hearts are bursting and breaking, and I tell you that He is believed on there. O blindness, thou didst see Him, and see forever; O deafness, thou didst hear Him and hear forever; O death, thou didst receive Him, and He burst thy narrow boundaries and came out, because it was not possible that He should beholden by them. Believed on in the world! Why He is believed on here in Waco. He has been believed on one hundred and fifty times already by new born souls since this meeting commenced. Believed on? Yes, and will be until the last syllable of time. And whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. That is why we preach Him. We preach that He may be believed upon, and He is believed on, by strong men and weak men, and great men and little men, and rich men and poor men, kings and slaves. O let them come; let them come as sinners, not to waters, not to wine, not to bread, but to God. God God manifest in the flesh; O Divine Savior, thou living God, save men today. Who else can save? Accursed, accursed is the man that trusteth in an arm of flesh. 6. Now, here is the last item of the text — “received up into glory.” Am I to preach that? I do. I am to preach that Jesus of Nazareth came into this world, not by ordinary procreation,: but by the over-shadowing of the Eternal Spirit, was manifested in the flesh and justified by the Spirit, was seen of angels, was preached to the nations, and was believed on in the world, and what? Received up into glory. Do you believe it? If I did not believe it, I would be a fool to stand up here and preach. Him to you. While they were standing looking at Him after His resurrection, He began to rise, rise, rise, until a cloud received Him out of their sight. But God permits us to go above the cloud. Come up with me — in your mind. Let us go up above the cloud and see where He goes. We have a clear sweep of vision, as He rises to the highest heaven; we hear His voice: “Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and let the King of Glory come in.” “Who is this King of Glory?” “The Lord, mighty to save, He is the King of Glory.” And I believe, just as much as I believe that I am alive, that He is enthroned as King of kings and Lord of lords; that all power in heaven and on earth is given unto Him. Received into glory! O, blessed thought! This overwhelms me; this takes my breath away, that He said, “Where I am, there shalt thou be also. Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel and afterwards receive me into glory.” I shall follow the Lord out of this land of darkness and sin and death and be received into glory with Him, to be forever with the Lord. Dear brethren, sisters, grounded in the faith of the Gospel, believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, let me tell you, you will never die, never. I do mean to say that when you come to what is called death, it won’t be death to you. The river will be divided and you cross over dry shod, and there shall be no taste of death to you. You will never die; you will be received up into glory. O, the chariot of God, the chariot of God and the horsemen thereof! Thou vehicle of fire, thou vehicle to which is harnessed flaming steeds, thou conveyance of the redeemed, thou takest every Christian when he dies up immediately into the presence of God to be received up into glory. Now, you understand what I mean by the church and by the business of the church, that no man on earth has any business in the church unless God by His Spirit has called him out from the world, called him to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as Divine, as God, as the Savior, and when God for Christ’s sake has forgiven

his sins and he is one of the redeemed, then I am willing to baptize that man. But I would let this right arm drop in everlasting paralysis at my right side, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, before I would baptize man, woman or child, if I did not have evidence that such a one was saved, saved by the power of God. But perhaps someone may say: “We are broad enough to take our children with us.” I take my children with me. That is, I take them to Jesus, not to the fount. “Suffer them to come unto me and forbid them not.” Don’t forbid them to come to Christ. Come, boys, come little girls, I will take you with me. I went to Jesus; I found Him to be my Savior, and when you find Him to be your Savior we will go along together. But I could not pick you up unsaved and take you with me. That would be a cruel thing, for me to have my soul washed and made clean in the blood of Jesus and give my child only a water washing. Shall I trust him to water when I demanded blood for myself? God forbid. When he comes just like his father did, then we go together; never until then, never, never, forever. Men of Waco, look at me for a few minutes. I want to speak some earnest words to you right now. I know that I desire the salvation of your souls. As the Lord God is my judge, there is not one of you against whom I have an unkind feeling; on the contrary, to every one of you I come with tears in my eyes, and, God knows, love in my heart, while I say, “Friends, look here, I do not ask you to a man, I do not ask you to a church, I ask you to the Lord God Himself, and if you will meet Him, come to Him, come just as you are today, you will be saved.” And let me ask you if it is not true: Have you not had many heavy burdens in your time? Have you not in many respects had a hard time? O, many a time have you not had the bitter cup pressed to your lips? Have you not felt, when you looked out around you, O, what a problem is life? Is there nothing better than what I have come to? Is there nothing beyond the miserable things that I have reached? O immortality, immortality! I stand an immortal spirit, but when out of an old broken cistern I try, to draw up water, I hear my little bucket hit the bottom, and the dust arises while I die of thirst. O God, shall this man be forever unsatisfied? Shall he be forever restless? Shall he forever desire and have naught? O Spirit, omnific Spirit of God, Thou justifier of Jesus Christ, Thou accreditor of the Gospel: O Spirit, in mighty power today behold the hearts of these disappointed men and women and children and lead them from broken cisterns which hold no water to the Fountain of Livings Waters.

# S. Seeking the Mind of Christ

SEEKING THE MIND OF CHRIST TEXT: Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus. Php 2:5. But very recently this church in its official capacity had occasion to cite, and to commend as worthy of imitation, an illustrious example of our Lord touching the question of taking vengeance in our own hands. And now tonight it is my purpose to present for your most thoughtful and prayerful consideration another illustrious example of our Lord Jesus Christ, commended with equal sanction as the other, to our imitation. By imitation of this example we are to become, in a crooked and perverse generation, as the lights of the world. holding forth the word of life. By so much as the imitation conforms to the example set before us as our model, by that much light shines in the darkness around us. By so much as our imitation falls short of or deflects from exact conformity to the model, by that much is the light dimmed and the world left to perish in the dimness. The example of Christ to which I wish to call your attention tonight is expressed in the fifth verse of the second chapter of the letter to the Philippians: “Having this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.” Before discussing this text I wish very briefly to refer to the letter itself, of which the text is only a part. On the southeastern shore of Europe, with only a narrow sea dividing it from Asia, is a famous spot. Its first fame and its first name was derived from a gift of nature. A number of fountains of unusual fulness and force burst up out of the ground, as God unsealed, and flow off in living streams, and from this fact the place was called Crenides, or fountains. Later, it obtained another name, Philippi, in honor of Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great; and still later it obtained another glory because in the extensive plain hard by was fought the decisive battle between Octavius and Antony on one hand, and Brutus and Cassius on the other, by consequence of which victory it obtained the privilege of being a Roman colony. But its crowning glory was when God’s inspired Apostle landed there and preached to its people the glorious gospel of eternal life. There was a time, according to the song of Homer, when Greece sent her navies and her panoplied hosts to demolish the walls of Troy, but there came a later time when a stranger amid the ruins of Troy, by night saw a Macedonian at his bedside, whispering in his ear, “Come over and help us.” And thus the gospel was introduced into Europe. You remember the first convert was a woman, in that little prayer chapel by one of those flowing streams which first gave a name to the place. You remember the miracle wrought, which cast out the demon of divination, and the consequent chastisement by stripes and the imprisonment of the Apostles, and the appeal made to the Father, and how at midnight, the earthquake responded as God’s answer to the prayer of His preachers down in the cell and bound; and how the jailer was saved, and the little church planted. Of all the churches to whom Paul writes letters this church is never rebuked. So far as history testifies, it was a church that was to him a joy forever. And now the preacher who planted the gospel in that place has been led by duty far away from the scene of the great meeting, having received time and again, as remembrances of the affection of the people, contributions to his support, while at Thessalonica and at other places, and has now carried the gospel to Rome, and in Rome is in prison, with the expectation of death hanging over him. Unterrified he confronts it and welcomes it, regarding it as the portal to heaven and desiring to die, but leaving it to God whether he shall remain. Under these circumstances this church, hearing of

his critical state and hard and bitter necessities, sends to him through the hands of Epaphroditus another contribution of money and supplies. The messenger that brings it contracts an illness, and is nigh unto death, and as Paul says: “That I might not have sorrow on sorrow, God had mercy on me and spared his life.” Now he sends him back with this letter, in which he addresses himself to the condition of that church. While there are no rebukes in it, he recognizes dangers. There were two women in the church, both of whom he held in very high remembrance, Euodias and Syntyche. They had helped him very much in that place when he preached the gospel there. They had helped his successor there, but now, sad to say, these two women were at strife with each other, and there was likely to be a division in the church, growing out of the contention between two noble women that had so signally illustrated their faith in Jesus, and their spirit of sacrifice in the days that were gone. Women can form parties in a church even more easily than men. He sends a special message to them. You can see all through the letter how he exhorts all the brethren, and especially Euodias and Syntyche, “Who helped me in the gospel that they be of the same mind”; that is, if the Christian religion has no power to bring God’s dear children together in Christian work, then how can it claim to regenerate and reform the world? He had heard too of the persecution of that people. He says they were called upon not only to believe in Jesus Christ, but also to suffer for Him. The fires which commenced to burn there in his own time were burning still, and some of them were becoming afraid, and hence he writes this letter to stir up their spirit of courage “In nothing be ye terrified by your adversaries.” Then there was developing in the little congregation, just rising up as yet, but susceptible of enormous development, the spirit of pride, the spirit of selfishness, and in some the spirit of despondency, and in others the spirit of corroding anxieties. The object of this letter then was to induce this congregation, first, to have courage, not fear; second, unity; third, humility to lay aside pride, by which the Devil fell. And then cultivate a spirit of unselfishness, regarding not their own things, but regarding the things of others. And then, instead of being despondent, rejoice “I say unto you again, rejoice always and be anxious about nothing, but in everything, with prayer and supplication make known your requests unto God.” While these are the general objects, he enforces what he has to say by citing the illustrious example of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and particularly when He wanted to enforce humanity and unselfishness. And now before yet commencing to discuss the text which cites the great example of our Lord, I want to speak to you a few words about the standpoint from which the Apostle writes this letter. There is something exceedingly touching in it, something which renders the words very impressive. What was his attitude? It was the attitude of one held back from heaven, “Having a desire to depart,” facing death just ahead of him, expecting to hear the sentence pronounced at the lips of fallible men, expecting to hear the invitation to come Home from the lips of the Lord. Held back from Heaven! What a tremendous thought! Socrates is represented as saying just before he drank the fatal hemlock, “It is now time to depart, I to die and you to live, but which of us shall go to the better destiny is known only to the Deity.” Poor Socrates! “I to die, but whether that is to go to a better destiny, I don’t know.” Hear the Apostle on the other hand: “To die is gain,” or in the expressive language of the Greek, with its double comparative, “which is by far the more better.” Think of that, Christian people, that a man can in the light of Christianity look at death and say, “It is gain.” That he can look at death and say, “It is far, far better.” I desire to depart, not that death in itself be coveted, but because of that other sentence coupled with it, “To be with Christ.” It shows his clear conception of what lies beyond death. It shows that from the delectable mountain of revelation on which God placed him he could see

across the intervening river with its cold flood and chilling streams, the far uplifted heights of the -heavenly city, the sheen of its splendor end its glorious estate, that place where black night cannot spread her mantle or flap her wings, that place where sickness and sorrow and pain and death can never come, that place of reunion with Christ and with the loved ones who have gone before, that place so attractively dear, that he can say, “It is gain. I desire to depart. O, Master! Speak the word and call thy homesick servant to thyself!” Look at the standpoint. See the mariner who for a long. time has been out on a toilsome voyage on strange seas, exposed to strange fortunes by storm and other perils. At last in his storm-battered ship he gets in sight of the port at home. He can see the shining in the window where the loved one is waiting and watching. And just at that place he is held back. A voice says, “Turn the prow of the ship and make another voyage.” It must be a mighty motive, it must be a mighty incentive, with home in sight, to make him turn back and take up again the toils of another voyage. So might Paul say, “I don’t know which I will choose. I know it is better, far better, to go, and if I am not allowed to go it is because God means to use me for the good of others, and if I am held back when nearly home, then I cannot trifle. If I turn back at all it is to speak words as if in view of the judgment. It is to speak to do good. It is to speak for salvation.” How can you conceive of one writing from his standpoint, when God holds him back, saying, “It shall be for the fruit of your work,” bringing some idle message, some trifling theme, some transitory subject before the people? Men may trifle, but not under such circumstances. There are times when the heart is tuned to folly, but I venture to say that when after a long voyage, the port of home is in sight, and one is turned back, cannot land then, as he turns back he utters a strange sentence. He says, “I don’t know which I will choose, even after I know that it is expedient for me to remain. I don’t know which I shall choose, but I do know that I am going to abide somebody else’s choice for me.” He did not know which he would choose, but there was an election in heaven. A choice was made from the other shore, and he says, “I know that I will abide, and that it will be for your good.” Now that being the standpoint from which he writes, let us see what he says. Did you ever hear such words? Let me read them to you again, lest a while ago you failed to catch their deep significance: “If there is any encouragement in Christ, if any consolation through love, if any communion of the spirit, if any tender affection and compassion toward me, then make my joy complete by being of the same mind, regarding not your own things, but regarding the things of others. Also let this mind be in you, which was also in Jesus Christ.” How could any one who is a true Christian deny the force of such a predicate as that? Do you notice that every sentence appeals to a Christian’s experience? Not what you have read, not what you have thought, not some argument you are able to make, but if, as you have found it in your own heart, there is any encouragement in Christ, if there is any consolation from love, if there is any communion with the Holy Spirit, I press those thoughts upon you and appeal to your experience. I would go back and say, “In your past did you ever find any encouragement in Christ? What! None at all? Has there been no period of your life when you took courage as you thought of Christ? Have you ever found any consolation arising from God’s love for you and your love for God? Has your heart ever been comforted in any sorrow? Surely you have been stricken many times and woes have come to you. Did they entirely overwhelm you? Did they sweep you entirely off your feet? Didn’t you find any comfort for your soul, nor any promise of God fulfilled to you in that time? Did not some power, silent, invisible, touch your soul and make you feel as you never felt before in your life, that brought the tears to your eyes, and pierced your heart through with sorrow when you thought of your sins, that led you to look upon your Redeemer and to stretch

out your hands, and cry, “My Lord and my God?” If there be anything like this in your experiences, let it be a predicate for receiving the exhortation of the text. From the history of this case at Philippi, and from the standpoint of the writer and from the predicate upon which he makes his appeal, we may better approach his exhortation: “Be not terrified by your adversaries.” Be faithful. Fresh courage take. When was the Almighty put down before a host? If God be for us, who can be against us? If timid women, undergirded by the arms of the Almighty, have bravely confronted the greatest perils, and have patiently endured most poignant suffering, and have shouted in the very embrace of death, and have glorified the Lord by their martyrdom, then why should you be afraid? Is your adversary so formidable that with God’s help you cannot cope with him? Is the array of opposition against Christianity so vast, so irresistible, that even with God back of you, you are afraid to confront the issues If then there be encouragement in Christ, if there be consolation in love, if there be communion with the Spirit, lay aside your cowardice. Be brave. Peter was a bold man when he had communion with the Spirit. He testified boldly. He feared no evil. The persecution by the Jewish council, the persecution by the king, imprisonment with the view of death on the morrow, did not daunt the heart that was stayed upon God’s omnipotence. Behold on what unsinking and unsinkable foundations God has planted your feet. See how the thick bosses of Jehovah’s buckler interpose between you and the fiery darts of your adversaries. See how the feeblest, thus encouraged and supported, have been able to be as brave as a lion. Then let fear take its flight. Let it spread its wings and fly away like a fancy of the night. Rouse up in your firmness and boldness and testify in this city that God has power on earth to forgive sins. And, not only be brave, but unite. Be of one mind. “They were all of one accord in one place,” at Pentecost. Oh, the harmony that comes from God! Though a thousand harps be brought together, of different strings, if the Spirit attunes them and touches the chord of one, the chord of every other responds in unison, and there is harmony. Be of one mind as you work together for the salvation of men. “Ye are lights of the world in a crooked generation.” It is crooked. It is perverse. It is opposed to the religion which you profess, and which you teach, and which, blessed be God, you have. But there is power in the light reflected from the Sun of Righteousness in heaven to compel attention, compel conviction, compel faith, compel confession and compel a surrender, unconditional, eternal and absolute, to the government of your God. But here is the hard part to put on humility and unselfishness. Did you know that the classic Greek had no word to express humility? The nearest word that it has signifies “mean spirit,” “contemptible spirit.” So Christianity had to coin a word to express humility. You remember, some of you students, what Aristotle teaches on this subject. He says that high-mindedness is the greatest virtue, and that means that one shall deem himself worthy of all greatness. And you remember that he said if man professed humility, or the nearest thing to humility their language could express, it was never justifiable unless he was indeed some pitiable and contemptible fellow. You remember that Heine declared that humility was the dog virtue “the dog virtue of humility.” But the gospel came and coined a word a word that does not signify a mean or contemptible spirit. Our Lord announced the true thought when He said, “Blessed are the poor in spirit,” which means what? “Blessed are those who are conscious of need and poverty in their spirit.” Blessed are those who do not deplore the lack of riches that touch this world only, the external things only, but when they look inside, into the soul, into the spirit, feel that they are poor. “In my soul I am naked; in my soul I am bankrupt; in my soul I am lost.” “Blessed are the poor in spirit.” Now you will have to teach the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, I believe, next Sunday; it is your Sunday school lesson. It becomes you, therefore, to give

the children the right idea of it. Oh, pride! Why is it we get mad? Pride! Why is it we are quick to resent? Pride! Why is it that we will not meet and stand together as brethren? Pride! That vaunting devil! For by pride the vaunting devil fell, and, therefore, God's Word says, "Lay not the hands of ordination upon a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil." Surely the hardest thing to do is to avoid pride-social pride. Ah, me! the social pride of this town! Pride in money; pride in purse; pride that will not kneel to God; pride that will not admit its beggary and its want; pride that lies when it says, "I am rich and increased in goods and have need of nothing," for it is miserable and poor and blind and naked. How are you to induce these people to be humble? Now, we come to our great example. Look at it. Look at the example of the Lord Jesus Christ: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Now, what mind! Let me read it to you and see the mind that was in Jesus: "Who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, or retained, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, becoming in the likeness of man, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient," becoming obedient "unto death," becoming obedient unto the death "of the Cross." "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." I do put before you the example of Jesus. Let us look at it. What is it? Subsisting as God, the express image of His person, and brightness of His glory that He had before the world was. How did He regard His own fame? "Who, being in the form of God, counted it not as a thing to be retained;" "equality with God … but emptied himself," and stooped to what? To the place of a servant; took upon Himself our nature. Do you mean when He became a man he became a Solomon, a David, or like Aaron, full-grown? No. Oh, ye listening shepherds! This shall be a sign unto you, that you shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger. This shall be a sign unto you. A babe! He that was wrapped in swaddling clothes, brought to the world eternal life. You mean that He shall be found in some gilt cradle in a palace? No; in a manger, an ox-trough. But did He not come mighty in reputation? He made Himself of no reputation. But did He not come decked with the gold and silver and jewels of the world? No. He who was rich became poor, that we through His poverty might be made rich. But did He not come to a palace? No. "Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but he had nowhere to lay his head." But did He not come to have men gather round Him and minister unto Him? No. "I come not to be ministered unto, but to minister." "I, your Lord and Master, wash your feet." Oh, that condescension of Jesus Christ! We are too proud to obey, but He became obedient. He was subject to parents, subject to the law of the land, subject to all of its requirements; without guilt, without spot, without blemish. No man was able to convict Him of disobedience in anything. And we are too proud to obey God. We treat obedience as a mark of contempt, and when God speaks and the majesty of His law, "Thus saith the Lord," is put right before us, we are too proud to simply obey Him. He stooped to obedience, though it led to death. Says one, "I would obey. I would confine myself to a business which Jesus Christ approves, but I must make a living, and then I will enter into this. My conscience tells me it is not right. I feel that it is not right, but I must make a living." He was obedient unto death! "Well," says another, "I am willing to be obedient unto death if you will make it a glorious death. Let me hear the trumpet sound. Let me hear the beat of the drum. Let me snuff up the dust of a glorious battle; amid the plaudits and huzzahs of admiring comrades let me storm some deadly breach and die on the pinnacles of fame." But He became obedient unto the death of the Cross, crucified between two thieves. So, "let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Oh, that height from which He stooped, that marvelous

condescension! No wonder the Greeks had no word to express humility. And now the unselfishness of it! What was it? What motive prompted Him? He loved sinners. It was the motive in the shepherd's heart when he counted the flock and only ninety and nine were found; one was gone, one was lost, one was wandering on mountains bleak and bare: "I will leave the fold and the protecting shelter and go out and face the darkness and the storm to find that one." It was the motive, the benevolent rescuing of the perishing at personal hazard, of becoming poor that we might be made rich, of dying that we might live, of baring His heart to the piercing sword of divine justice that we might be acquitted, of being condemned and drinking to the last bitter dregs the cup of loneliness and woe in order that we might drink forever from the well-spring of salvation; in order that under the overflowing fountain might be written for you, "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come and drink, without money and without price, since Jesus on the Cross, said, 'I thirst.'" Let this mind be in you. I take the example of the Lord and lay it right down before you. Can we sincerely sing, His track I see, and I'll pursue, The narrow way till Him I view? Who would be ashamed to follow Jesus, ashamed before an evil and perverse generation? Ashamed to admit that you have the Spirit of Christ, ashamed to look the proud ones of this world in the face and say, "I am a Christian?" Oh, the light that there is following Jesus! "Ye are lights shining in a crooked and perverse generation," but "if the light that is in you be darkness, how great is that darkness!" Oh, how great! Are you despondent? He tells you to "rejoice." Are you anxious? "Be anxious about nothing." What have you a right to summon? Summon courage. Summon unity. Summon humility. Summon unselfishness. Summon joy. Summon contentment and peace, under the promises of God, and go out and do the work that the Master has given you to do. Now I close what I have to say by making this application: When Jesus had that mind not to regard His own greatness, but lay aside His crown and stoop stoop unto obedience, stoop unto death, unto the death of the Cross, it was with a view of saving other people. What, then, I want to say is this: That is the only way that you can save other people. I do not know of any other way. I have never known a case of any man being saved by human instrumentality in any other way. You may, through the paths of pride, get people to join the church, but that does not save them. I say that if you look to the salvation of men, if you look to the forgiveness of their sins, if you look to the regeneration of their souls, if you look to the consciousness of the divine presence and blessedness, if you want to give them not vain conjecture, but sight of heaven and its glorious shores, this is the way you must do it. If we can be of one mind! Oh, that heaven would make us harmonious in this-that in unselfishness and humbleness we would address ourselves to the work of saving men! My own heart aches for the salvation of some soul through the ministry of this church. And I charge you to put away pride, put it away. Be humble. Have this mind in you that was in our Lord Jesus Christ. Stoop! Stoop low, lower, Brother, Sister. Come together. -Hunger and thirst after righteousness. Feel the poverty that is in your spirits and find God's blessing, for "Blessed are the poor in spirit." That is our way of access to their hearts. I do not know any other way. And as for me, pardon me, if I say that I occupy the standpoint of Paul. I say that, as between me and the fifth of last November there rolls a shoreless ocean, and it hurts inexpressibly to go back to the affairs of a bygone world. But if I go back I would speak no trifling words. I would speak to save men. I do not say that I would be willing to die that you might have a revival of religion, but do say a harder thing I would be willing to live. Shall we have it then! If so, we must get down low, down like our dear Lord. There must be in our souls a thirsting for the salvation of men that will not be appeased till they are saved. I summon you to it as more important than the autonomy or independence of Cuba, than the annexation of all

the islands of the Pacific, than the election of a thousand United States senators or presidents, than the acquisition of uncounted millions that we gather souls to God, for if we get just one it outweighs the world. “For what will it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” I speak then for a jewel brighter in its luster than the beams of the sun or the sparkle of the stars or the sheen of the moon the jewel of a soul dimmed by sin, and in the deep darkness of mountain quarries it lies embedded; and we must search for it as for a hidden treasure, and bring it out and let heaven’s light touch it with luster, and let it sparkle with the glory of God. Now who will help us in this work? We are a long way from being in a condition to do this work, a long way. Oh, the pride! Oh, the lack of unity! Oh, the despondency! Oh, the anxiety! Oh, the selfishness! Put them down. Put down the weights that sink you, and buoyantly stand up erect as God’s people and let us go out to carry the tidings of freedom of the world. Others are bound in shackles of spiritual slavery, hand and foot, at the mercy of the Devil. Let us rescue them. Will you seek this mind that is in our Lord Jesus Christ? Promise me that you will do this, that you will make an honest effort. You will if you so promise, and I do not want you to promise unless you are determined to make the effort. Feeling as I do now, looking as I do now at death and heaven and the peril of souls, I would not be willing as a Christian man to leave this house tonight without praying that God would put within me the mind that was in the Lord Jesus Christ. Do you also covet that mind? I would not commit you unwarily to a long promise, nor engage your future to obligations you may not have sufficiently considered. Saying nothing, therefore, of tomorrow or next week, or next year, I do call for an expression touching the immediate present. You Christian people then, all of you who are willing, now and here, to seek by prayer the mind that was in our Lord Jesus Christ, stand up for a moment. It is a multitude standing! Let us then pray devoutly for the mind of Christ.

Chapter 89

# S. THE BEWITCHING POWER OF SATAN

THE BEWITCHING POWER OF SATAN

TEXT: O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? - Galatians 3:1.

I wish to make a few statements before discussing the text. The first relates to peoples. There is a difference in the characteristics of peoples. "Galatians" ¾ that is what a Greek would say. A Latin writer would have written it "Gauls." A modern writer would have said, "Frenchmen, O foolish Frenchmen." That is to say, the people to whom this letter was written were French people, or Gauls. The history of their migration from France to Asia Minor is a wonderful history. Some time look it up and read it. But in their wanderings they always retained their national characteristics, a mercurial people, easily excited, easily cooled off again; now way up yonder and now way down there; fired one moment by enthusiasm and suffering deep mental depression another day. You will find that to be the character of these people, whether you read Caesar of Thierry. The second statement which I wish to make is one of philosophy. This text speaks about the presentation of a great tragedy, and the statement I wish to make is that nothing ever deeply influences the human heart but tragedy.

It is utterly impossible for comedy to strive against tragedy in attracting human attention and in holding it. A comic speaker pleases the first time you hear him, but woe to the man if he tells his jokes over a second or third time. You can go to the theater and listen one time to Shakespeare’s "Comedy of Errors," but you cannot go and hear it three times in succession. But you can hear "Richard III" or "Macbeth," or any other in which there is some tragedy, a thousand times.

Hence the great sculptors and painters have found their immortality when their subjects have represented some mighty tragedy, such as Prometheus chained to the cold rocks of Mount Causasus, the Last Supper with the shadow of the coming tragedy resting upon the brow of the Son of God, Laocoon around whose: body and the bodies of whose children the serpents from the sea have wrapped themselves and are crushing them to death.

These and other great masterpieces show that if you want to attract the attention of mankind, you must present to them a tragedy and not a comedy. It is a pity that public speakers do not pay more attention to this. It is an exceedingly small ambition, the ambition to be a witty speaker.

There was presented a tragedy to these mercurical Galatians nearly two thousand years ago. Christ Jesus crucified was evidently set forth before them, and the effect of it was wonderful. That same tragedy presented now has a wonderful effect, and it will have until the subject of the tragedy shall come the second time, without sin unto salvation.

Now my third statement is this: One of the most ordinary incidents of religious life is the lapse, from an early profession of religion. We hold a meeting of many days and by varied service, of sermon, song and prayer, we seek to convert our hearers. An interest is awakened, crowds attend,

and in the course of time quite a number profess to be converted. Time passes on and there is a lapse on the part of many who profess to be converted. A second meeting comes, and not all ¾ never all ¾ of those who had lapsed, but a considerable number of them come back and are restored again, some of:whom lapse again. A third meeting, and not all of those who were restored that second time ¾ never all of them ¾ but a considerable number of them are restored a third time. And so the matter goes on, meeting after meeting, and each period of falling away that follows the meeting eliminates some of the number who originally made a profession of faith. The sifting process that follows a protracted meeting eliminates some forever and ever. They never do come back.

Now, did you ever think of this, that there is never any lapse from an intellectual profession of faith, never any lapse on the part of a ritualistic professor of faith? Never. The lapses always take place in those denominations which insist upon a supernatural faith in Jesus Christ, and who insist upon what is called regeneration. There are these two distinct elements in the profession of faith: I not only profess to personally believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is my Savior, but I do profess that I have been changed internally in my disposition and spirit. Now the lapse indicates these two distinct elements. Generally it is on the second element; that is, the evidence that relates to the internal change and it comes in this way: The reason that I professed to be a Christian was I had certain emotional evidences - evidences that touched the affections. I had certain peace of mind. I had certain joy of heart. I had certain fervor of spirit. Therefore I professed to be changed. Now in the course of time that peace seems to be gone and that fervor seems to be gone, and that joy seems to be gone, and as the original profession of the change was based upon their presence, so their absence leads me to doubt my conversion.

I say that the lapse takes place oftenest on the second element of the profession, that which relates to an internal change, whose symptoms or evidences are of an emotional kind. Hence that song, "Where is the blessedness I knew, When first I saw the Lord? Where is the soul-refreshing view Of Jesus and His Word?

"What peaceful hours I then enjoyed, How sweet their memory still; But now I find an aching void The world can never fill."

Now this text has to do with the question of falling away. The Apostle Paul, on his way through Asia Minor, in a very disappointing way to himself, was taken very ill, and while suffering great bodily illness and from the interruption to his journey, he commenced to preach in Galatia, and he preached so as to establish quite a number of churches, the churches of Galatia. And he was astounded at the warm reception of the gospel and how gladly the people heard it; how they stood and listened to every word. And he held up before them as a plan of salvation a tragedy, Jesus Christ on the cross, and he pointed to them the blood that flowed from the veins of the dying Son of God as the basis of eternal life. He pointed them out a salvation which was by grace through faith, and assured them that faith in that dying Redeemer would bring them internal evidences of peace and rest and joy, and they had it.

Now, Paul went on his journey and soon word came that there had been a fearful lapse all over that section of country. They had turned away from that gospel which he had preached unto them, of salvation by grace through faith, of salvation through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. They had turned away from that and had taken up the Old Testament ceremonies as a basis of

salvation. Now this provokes his letter and this brings out his question, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you … before whose eyes Jesus Christ was set forth evidently, crucified, among you?" Notice that to change from the gospel that he preached to them to the ritualism that they adopted after he left, was a marvel to him. He says, "I marvel; it is a wonder to me; it is a phenomenon. I marvel that you should so soon be removed from the gospel which was preached unto you unto another gospel which is not a gospel." He says it was not only a marvel, but it was a folly: "O foolish Galatians!" There was something irrational and illogical in it.

Now let us very briefly consider the elements of the folly. What are the things that made it an extremely illogical and irrational thing to do? First, he says, "You are fallen from grace. I presented unto you a plan of salvation by grace and not of works. It comes from the favor and mercy of God. And now you have turned back to a system of salvation by works. That is foolish. You don't commence with grace and end in works." Not only this, but he says, "When I preached unto you salvation by grace you received the Spirit. Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? And if you receive the Spirit by the hearing of faith then let me ask you, what is the reason that you should go back to the works of the law that never could confer the Spirit? It is unreasonable. It indicates that you are fools to think that you could commence in the Spirit and make yourselves perfect in the flesh. It would be as if you had commenced to fly and then turned back to crawl."

He says it is foolish in that it is the voluntary surrender of freedom for bondage. "You have replaced a yoke on you your fathers could not bear and which no man was ever able to bear. You were freed from that yoke, and now, when I left you as free men, shouting and rejoicing in the glory of that freedom, I hear that you have voluntarily put on yourselves the chains of bondage again. It is wonderful that men would do that. It is foolish that they would do it. Not only does the folly consist in this, but you have gone back from the older covenant of God to the younger. That covenant of grace which antedated the giving of the law, that covenant of grace which reaches back to the Garden of Eden, you have laid aside, and have left Calvary to stand under Mount Sinai. It is foolishness.

"Not only this, but you have given up the estate of sons in order to go back and be servants, to be under tutors. Those ceremonial requirements served their purpose in their day and time. They were to he kept up, even by those who saw through them, and had true faith, until the object of faith should come, the Lord Jesus Christ." For Paul says in the context: "The law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come (i.e., Jesus, the object of faith) we are no longer under a schoolmaster (i.e., of types and shadows)." Then, indeed, "the heir" being a child, "differed nothing from a servant but was under tutors and governors." But now to go back and observe the days and months, and new moons and seasons and years, that pertain to a ceremony of types and shadows, after the Substance has come, is profound folly and stupidity. Not only this, but your folly is manifest in the waste of your sufferings. You suffered a great many things in order to believe in Jesus, Christ as your Savior. It was not popular. You were persecuted for becoming Christians. All that suffering was in vain, if your present course is the right course.

Finally he said their folly consisted in this: If your object in going back to that practical and personal plan for salvation is to secure practical and personal righteousness, then you have made

yourselves bigger fools than in the other particular. Perfect righteousness is only to be attained by faith in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. But if you want to be more nearly conformed to the Ten Commandments in your own actual life, you can do this more readily by starting from the standpoint of a regenerated nature than you can by any covenant of works. The idea prevails even in this time, as is evidenced by an evangelist calling upon a congregation to leave the gospel of Jesus Christ and go back and stand upon the Ten Commandments. If you want to rightly perform the Ten Commandments the best and only way for you to keep them is after your souls have been regenerated by God's Spirit, and after your sins have been washed away in His blood. First, make the tree good.

Now all this is introductory to my main question. Here is a phenomenon, and it is not an extraordinary one, but an ordinary one; it happens every day; it happens right here in this congregation; it happens after any meeting anywhere and by whomsoever held. You see people who profess to be Christians, and they give credible evidences that they are Christians, and who ultimately prove to be Christians, who yet temporarily fall away and seem to, seek other methods.

I surmise that some of these people in this case were genuinely converted. All of the professions made by these Galatians were not false professions. Therefore you have to assume that genuine Christians who were led to Christ by Paul's preaching did lapse from that profession and go back to seeking peace of mind through a different method.

Now my question is: How do you account for such a phenomenon? An effect is bound to have a cause. If you see only one incident of a strange kind, and that is an isolated case, you are not especially called upon to explain it. But if you see in a whole province, like Galatia, a wide-spread profession of religion, and then in a very short space of time you see a lapse that corresponds in magnitude with the original profession - you see men by the' multitude doing things that are so utterly stupid and irrational and illogical that it marks them as fools, how do you account for it? Hence Paul's question: "Who hath bewitched you?" I tried for a long time to get rid of that word, bewitched, but there it stands, and it means the same thing in the Greek as it means in the English. It means an irresistible spell cast upon one by another, what is called "smiting with the eye." It means bewitched in the old fashioned sense of that word. It means that a power had intervened, casting an irresistible spell over the minds of these people. And this question tries to find him! "Who hath bewitched you?" Who hath done it? Here is a wizard's work. Where is the wizard? Here is the witchcraft. Where is the witch? Who is it?

Some of you were startled two Sundays ago when I stated that the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ could be as sensibly felt and realized as could the presence of a friend to whom you were talking. Now I say to you that there is another presence which can be as vividly and as sensibly felt as any earthly presence can be realized and felt. I stop at no halfway explanations. I go for a solution of the problem to the father of witchcraft, the devil, and I say that this lapsing work in Galatia, was the work of the devil; that a hallucination was cast over the minds of the people. Such folly is not otherwise explicable. Such consequences cannot otherwise find an adequate cause.

"Who hath bewitched you?" Why, I venture to say that you older Christians have almost unconsciously used the very words of the Apostle Paul in looking at some case or a profession of religion, where there had been a speedy lapse: "I marvel! It astonishes me! How is it to be accounted for?" You say, "Why, I sat there and heard that young man tell about God's dealings

with his soul. I saw the tears roll down his face. I felt the tremor in his tone, the vibration of intense feeling in every expression that fell from his lips, and I marvel that he is so soon removed. What on earth is the explanation of it?" When you go home today read Webster's definition of "bewitched," and when you get the Greek word and in all of the best lexicons read the definition there, and you will see that this means here just what it says. Who hath cast a spell of fascination, an irresistible spell, over you, that you should do a thing so incredibly foolish as that which you have done?

Every intelligent man is bound to take notice of marked phenomena that occur around him; especially is he bound to notice such things as I have just told you. Now you are also bound to account for them, and your explanation must be commensurate with the fact. But I defy any man to give an explanation of many of the lapses from a profession of faith in Jesus Christ except upon the hypothesis of a devil.

Incidentally, this leads to a cognate thought. There is here in Texas some preaching of a kind, as expressed in the last Baptist Herald. I quote that to bring out the thought. The writer of an article says, "There are in Texas two families of the Baptists, the assurance-family and the anti-assurance-family." He closes his article with this tremendous statement: "These two families cannot stand together on earth or in heaven; in this world or in the world to come."

If he would read the Philadelphia Confession of Faith or the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, he would very easily see that at least his part of the family is not Baptistic. But what I want to say is this: Suppose such a theory as he advocates was applied to this case of these Galatians. Here is a vast number of people that with remarkable evidence of genuineness make a profession of faith. Now here is a sudden lapse and they go back for a while at least from a plan of salvation by grace to a plan of salvation by works. They go back from a commencement in the spirit to a consummation in the flesh. They go back from a state of spiritual freedom and seem to prefer a state of spiritual bondage. They turn their backs upon the splendid light of the New Testament and seek to hide themselves in the mists and shadows of Old Testament times. And you want to account for that fact. According to his theory none of them were ever converted. In that case there was no necessity for bewitching to take them back. There was no room for marvelings or astonishment. There was no phenomenon at all. But Paul does not treat the case that way.

It shows this, that when one is converted, he is not a full grown Christian; that when one is regenerated he is just a child in Christ Jesus, just a baby, and that this babe must be developed into spiritual manhood or womanhood, and it is in the power of an enemy, where the means of spiritual growth and development are neglected, to cast a spell over the mind of that babe in Christ. Such an explanation harmonizes with Paul's effort is restore them and with all our own observations of the facts concerning religious meetings.

Now, I have very carefully avoided today discussing the question of a permanent lapse from a true profession of faith in Christ. That is outside of the subject before me, and you know well enough what would be my reply to such a question as that. I am just taking a large group of professions, such as are made in ordinary meetings, and I am calling your attention to the fact that a considerable number of these lapse after the meeting is over, and that not all those who lapse are restored in the next meeting, and that not all of those who are restored in the next meeting are restored in the third meeting, and that each sifting of restoration eliminates some of the original number who are eliminated forever. They never do come back. Those that never do come back, I

am not discussing at all; but I am discussing those who do come back, who are restored, and who afterwards show that the root of the matter was in them; that they were, when they professed originally, God's children ¾ God's children for a while under an eclipse, under a spell. An enemy had come in and seduced them for the time being from the beauty and holiness and simplicity of the plan of salvation in Jesus Christ. That is the class I am talking about. The conclusion of it all is just this: That our people have managed, by some sort of intellectual legerdemain, to sidetrack out of the sight of human consideration one of the mightiest factors in human life. I mean the devil, not thinking of him as a personality, not thinking of him as once an angel of light, not thinking of him as having power, where a Christian is unwary, to bewitch him, to cast a spell Aver him, to lead him temporarily from the truth.

I am afraid that I cannot get quite close enough to you the thought that I am endeavoring to impress upon you, and in order to do it, I will tell you a dream. Understand, it is just a dream. I am not telling it as Scripture. The sole object of the dream is to be an illustration of a thought. I had this vivid dream. I dreamed that I was on the cone of a vast mountain range, back of which was a higher cone, whose summit was lost in the clouds of heaven, and looking down from the edge of that mountain range was no horizon. In my dream, I tried to see a horizon. I could not see it. It was ever and forever a stretching away of space without a boundary, While sleeping I seemed to hear a voice which said, "Open your eyes and see from what you have been guarded." I opened my eyes. I saw nothing. I kept looking all around seeing nothing but feeling a presence. At last a shape outlined itself, and if a painter could paint that shape as I saw it I think he would win immortality. It was a shape, something human-like, whose height could not even be guessed at. It seemed to be of porcelain, translucent but not transparent. But even in that translucent state there seemed to be a hint of having once been transparent, and also a hint that it would ultimately be entirely opaque. In other words, it had a prophecy of becoming darker and denser, as well as a memory of having been brighter and purer. It was the most beautiful form I ever saw. As my eye went up and up the symmetry of that strange figure, I saw the eye looking at me sideways, and it was in the eye that the thought of the devil came into my mind. It was the eye of despair, the eye of malice, the eye of cunning, the eye of undying hate, the eye of the murderer. It all flashed into my very soul from just one glance of that eye as I shivered that this was what the voice meant when it said, "Wake up and see from what you have been guarded." The basilisk gleam of that eye made the blood run cold. The look seemed to say, "I would destroy you, if I were not hindered."

Now, that was just a dream, nothing but a dream, but it serves as an illustration; that just as sure as there can be a presence of God that we can feel, so there can be a presence of the devil that can influence us; so there can be a power of an evil one that can cast a spell over the mind and cause the subject of the spell to do irrational, illogical and foolish things.

O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, you who saw Christ on the cross; you who received the Spirit; you whose hearts have been made to throb and dilate with the internal presence of the divine consolation? O Christians, what can be the power that could in a short while, sidetrack you to go grovelling in the dust again? Oftentimes I have seen joyous young Christians, oh, how happy, how precious the light in their faces, how inexpressibly sweet the melody in their hearts! How every old Christian in the house would have his heart. melted when some dear loved one for whom he had prayed, for whom he had labored, would stand up and say, "I have found favor, and my heart is glad and there is peace in my soul." O, the joy of it! And then, maybe in a month, in

one short month: ¾ O, the marvel of it the marvel of it to have to say, "Where is the blessedness you spoke of? Where is the soulrefreshing view of Jesus and His Word?" Somebody has intervened. Some power has come in here and eclipsed the bright day and made it night. The Apostle Peter says, "Beware of the devil." The Apostle Paul admonishes Christians to beware of the devil. The Lord Jesus Christ admonishes Christians to beware of the devil. He is back of all the sinister instrumentalities that are employed to weaken the usefulness, to dim the light of hope, to minimize the preciousness of the peace which you had when you professed that you were a child of God. Your war is not against flesh and blood.

Now, you may talk about the weakness of the flesh. There is a good deal in that. We have in our members a law that wars against the law of our minds. We know that. But there is a force so much higher than this that when you go to think of this higher force you scarcely mention the other. We rear not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers in high places.

There is a Satanic, a diabolical malice that seeks to worry the child of God, to handicap him in his usefulness, to throw a spell over him, to have siren songs divert him from the path of his life, to lead him away where he will live unheeding the boom of the artillery of the great war that is going on, not seeing the dark clouds that are gathering over him, and the bright vistas that are opening up to brighter and heavenly light. It takes a spell like that to account for the fact.

Now you can understand in the light of Paul’s question the earnestness of those old Puritans on the subject of witchcraft. They were wrong, as they dealt with the subject, but under the phenomena of that day, and under similar phenomena in the

Old Testament days, there is a stupendous truth without which such things would never have marred the fair page of American history as the witchcraft days in New England. Who hath bewitched you? and you? and you? I am inquiring for the wizards. I am looking for the witch. I am not looking at the spell itself. I am not looking at the web of the spider, but where is the spider? Where is the one that wove the web? Who hath bewitched you? Now, do you go home and say right down to the very depths of your heart, "There is a devil, and he goeth about and he seeketh evil, and the track of his march can be traced just as plainly in the records of the past as you can trace the hand of God in history."

You can stand in the ashes of ancient cities, and look where a broken column falls and mingles together in historic dust, and you say, "Surely I can read the handwriting of God in history." And I will stand in these same ruins and I will say, "Surely I can read the handwriting of the devil in history." Are any of you today feeling the power of this old song, "Where is the blessedness I knew, When first I saw the Lord?"

O, thou bewitched Christian, let me ask you to go back to the Spirit and not trust in the flesh to consummate the Spirit. As it was salvation by faith in Christ that gave you that spiritual evidence, so it will be the cross of Christ, lifted up all the time, that will give you the continued life that is to be manifested by your conduct here in this world.

There was a devil that worked in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and the magistrates said, "Who hath bewitched these people?" and they made an inquisition for the witch and left out the wizard.

It is the object of this sermon today to call your attention to the devil. It is the purpose of this sermon to impress upon your minds today that there is a power, not flesh and blood, that will walk around you, and consider you, as he walked around

Job and considered him, and that your eyes ought to be opened to it, and that the consciousness of that presence ought at all times to make you desire to feel a nearness to God and reliance upon the divine help.

Chapter 90

# S. THE CASE OF SIMON MAGUS

THE CASE OF SIMON MAGUS SCRIPTURE READING: Acts 8:5-24.

TEXT: Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done. - Acts 8:13.

We have presented to us here the conflict between the miracles wrought in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and the so-called miracles wrought by sorcerers and necromancers. I do not know anything so silly as the supernatural claims of those who deny Christ, and yet go around pretending that they are able to work miracles, through spiritualism, or through sorcery, or magnetism, or anything of that kind. But here you find the gullibility of the people. You would hardly think that if a man should come and claim to be a divine healer that the people would run after him, and yet they did run after this blasphemous man, Simon Magus. And right here in Waco, if a man were to come and claim he could do supernatural things, they would pay money to see him and quite a number of them would believe it.

"Then Simon himself believed also: and when he was baptized he continued with

Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done." Now if he had been performing real miracles it would not have excited any wonder that another man could perform miracles, but he evidently saw that Philip was doing things that he knew he could not do, and it excited his astonishment.

During this last week I have read over two or three volumes of matter written by

Alexander Campbell, and particularly containing his views upon the Holy Spirit. His theory was that the demonstration of the Spirit that precedes baptism was merely the miraculous display of divine power that accredited the Word, that after a man believed and was baptized, that then he did receive the Holy Spirit, but that the only work of the Spirit on the man or in the man prior to his baptism was the miraculous display of divine power that accredited the Word; and that as the Word was sufficient to confirm, and that anybody had the ability to believe, that it was a metaphysical delusion to talk about being enabled to believe by any Spirit-power.

Well, here we have a case. Simon Magus himself believed also. He believed upon these miraculous displays which confirmed the evidence, and there was no other touch of the Spirit in his case. Now let us see how his case is distinguished from the others.

"Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (for as yet He was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." The Holy Ghost which they here received was the power to work miracles themselves, to speak with tongues, to do supernatural things. Now Simon had not yet seen anything like that. He had seen Philip working miracles and heard him speaking with tongues, but

he had not seen that power communicated by any sort of a process to anybody else. Now he witnesses the apostles communicating the powers they had to other people, and communicating it by a kind of rite, or ceremony, or laying on of hands, and when the apostles laid their hands on them they received this gift of the Holy Spirit. That suggested an entirely new thought to Simon: "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, 'Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost.'"

Here seemed to this man to be an exceedingly lucrative power; that if he had the power, by just putting his hands on a man, to make that man speak with tongues, or to make that man work miracles, or to make that man have the gift of discerning the Spirit ¾ if he just had that power, what a good thing he could make of it. And so it instantly occurred to him to buy that power. And he offered money for it, but Peter said unto him, "Thy money perish with thee." The original here shows that there is only one verb, and it means, "Thy money and thou perish," that is, "You will perish and your money will perish, and may you perish together, because thou hast thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money."

Here I want to say two or three things. The world is running wild on money, more than on everything else put together. There is more worship today of Mammon than perhaps at any previous period of the world's history. But there are some things that money cannot buy, I do not care how much of it you have. "Thy money perish." It is a perishable thing. "Thy money perish with thee, because thou didst think that the gift of God could be purchased with money."

There is nothing that God gives us that we can buy. That is a sweeping statement, but there is a more real, substantial joy in the Christian's heart than ever could have been obtained by any outlay of money.

Let us look at some of the things. What a great thing it would be to rich people if, just before they die they could buy repentance; if instead of having to repent themselves they could buy it. The church so-called, which has encouraged rich people to believe that, and that by great donations made in their wills, or just about the time that they are passing away, that there is some value in these good works in securing the gift of God, has helped to perpetuate the thought in the world that while you cannot buy repentance outright, yet by a sufficient outlay of money you can indirectly get in. The whole of it is false.

Take the thought as it is presented in the question of indulgences. You know that indulgences were advertised and auctioned, sold openly in the market, in Germany. A man would want to commit an offense or he would want absolution for an offense that he had committed. Now, by purchasing an indulgence he would secure the gift of God absolutely, for God only can forgive sin. "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God can be purchased with money."

There is no way to purchase anything that relates to religion. You cannot buy a substitute. You may hire a substitute in the case of war, human war, but you cannot hire a substitute in religion. You cannot have a proxy. Your father cannot stand for you, your mother cannot, your wife cannot, your brother or your sister cannot. If your brother were to die, you could not buy one hour of life for him. No man can ransom his brother from the grave, and the redemption of their souls is precious

and it ceaseth forever.

Such is the testimony of God’s Word, showing the limitation after all, that there is in the power of money. How narrow its scope! How few things it can purchase! And, after all, how immaterial these things are! They do not count for much. You cannot buy faith in Jesus Christ. If you were to propose tomorrow to give a million dollars to endow an orphanage or a school, or to build a church, you could not purchase one hair’s breadth of the divine favor with that million dollars. And so far as obtaining that favor is concerned, you are just as near to getting it by standing in absolute poverty, and not even able to give one nickel. That is one place where .the rich and the poor meet together-when they touch the divine privileges, the privileges of God, the gift of God.

I was in a church once, I won’t say where because I do not desire to be too personal, and do not desire to wound any one, but I was in a church once, a very large, fine city church, every bit of it given by one man. He gave every dollar of it, and the idea in his mind that prompted him to give it was this: He had a wayward son. That son had died in his dissipation under circumstances that left no reasonable hope of his salvation. Now this man built that church with the superstitious idea that if he took all of that son’s part of the property and put it in the church, that in some way it might affect his condition in the other world. That was a great mistake. No money given to such a thing can accomplish such a result.

We now come to look at the case of Simon Magus. He had everything that

Alexander Campbell said is needed. He had the miraculous display of divine power that confirmed the Word, and on that confirmation of the Word he believed. But he was not right. Now what was the matter with him? What was it that he lacked? Let us see! "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter." The word "matter" here in the Greek is "word." "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this word," that is, the gospel which we preach. Thou hast no part in it. Thou hast no lot in it. You believed it with such faith in you as you had, and you were baptized upon that faith, but there was no virtue in it and you have no part nor lot in this word that we preach. Why? "For thy heart is not right in the sight of God." Thy heart is not right in the sight of God! This leads us to the solemn thought that to have a part, to have a lot, in the Word of the gospel, there must be rightness of heart in God’s sight. Now I put out a question. What is it that makes any man’s heart right? What power is it? "I will take away your stony heart. I will give you a heart of flesh," saith the Lord; that is, a heart that can feel. "And I will put my Spirit in you and then you will keep my commandments." Our Savior says that out of the heart proceed evil thoughts and blasphemy and murder and everything of that kind. They come from the heart.

Paul says ¾ I am not going to quote the precise words-he says that there can be no bodily sin, no sin of the body. There cannot be any sin of that kind. He says that all sin is without the body. What he means is, that the body in itself possesses no intelligence-that sin is a transgression of the law, and that the body cannot transgress the law. The mind, the heart, the soul of man, must commit whatever sin is committed. It is true that he may make his body an instrument for sin, but the sin must come from the inside. It must come from the thinking, rational part. It must come from that spiritual essence which was communicated when God breathed into man’s body the breath of life and he became a living soul.

Now, unless the inner man is made right in the sight of God then he can have no part or lot in this matter. As our Savior says, "Except a man be born from above, except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Now that was a matter which Simon lacked, and just one scripture, if there was not any other scripture, answers everything that was ever said upon that subject by Mr. Campbell. It says that in order to believe, in the gospel sense of that word, that the man's belief must be from the heart: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." That it must not be simply an intellectual conviction based upon the testimony; that there must be a transformation in the mind.

Let us look at the case a little further. Now comes an exhortation: "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee; for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." Now when he offered to buy the gift of God with money it revealed to Peter his true condition. He was a member of the church, but that was a revelation to Peter showing his standing in God's sight, and Peter described that condition by two phrases, "the gall of bitterness" and "the bond of iniquity."

According to all the ancients the gall was supposed to supply the venom of serpents and beasts, and as you all know it is exceedingly bitter; the bitter gall, the gall of bitterness. That refers to the principle in the man, but the "bond of iniquity" refers to the habit of life. "I not only perceive that in thy heart there is all the malice and venom of opposition to God, but I perceive that in your life and practice you are in bondage. The fountain is impure and the stream is impure. The source of your thoughts and of your motives is all corrupt, and the thoughts that are the fruits of those motives and desires are also corrupt." That being his dreadful condition he gives an exhortation, and while it seems that there are only two thoughts in the exhortation there are really three. "Repent of this thy wickedness." Every scholar, judging the original language, knows that there is more in -that expression than "repent," for the word "repent" does not take an "of" after it. It is equivalent to this: "Repent and turn from thy wickedness." In other words, it expresses both conviction and repentance, and conversion in its etymological sense, conversion meaning to turn around; just as if he said, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," and just as is expressed in the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah. There is just one verse of it. I want to read it to you because it presents that thought so clearly, about repentance: "Let the wicked man forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. Seek ye the Lord while He may be found. Call ye upon Him while He is near."

Now there is in this exhortation in Isaiah precisely the three thoughts that are in Peter's exhortation. One is a change of mind, of the thought; another is a turning away from the wickedness, and the third is a calling upon God for forgiveness. These are the three things that he calls on Simon Magus to do: "Repent and turn from your wickedness and pray God." Pray for what? Why should he pray? "If the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." We cannot understand his going to God and asking for anything else but forgiveness. "God be merciful to me, a sinner. God forgive me for this misunderstanding of thy gift and of thy religion. I repent. I turn from my wickedness, and I pray God to forgive me." That is the thought, that is the critical thought.

Why then does Peter put in this word, "perhaps?" The Apostle Paul brings it in in a somewhat similar connection, although not in quite so intensive a form, in one of his letters to Timothy. He is

giving directions to preachers how to bear with certain incorrigible cases. He says, "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth," that is, a man who goes out after a case of this kind does not go out with the certainty that he does in some cases of wickedness. Here the wickedness is so extreme, it has taken such an extreme form, that an element of uncertainty attaches to it. But as you don't know the power of God you go out, thinking that peradventure God will give that man repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.

Now, Peter struck just such a case as that in Simon Magus. This sin which he had committed seemed to be a sin against the Holy Ghost. It was a question in Peter's mind whether it amounted to that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost which has never forgiveness, neither in this world nor in the world to come. You know there are some things forgiven as to the next world which are not forgiven here. For instance, David's sin was forgiven as to eternity, but he had to bear the consequences of it in time. "But the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness." It is different from any other sin in this, that from the time it is committed He is gone forever; gone here and gone yonder. "It hath never forgiveness." Chastisement won't reach the case. So Peter did not know, but thought maybe this man had committed that sin. It seemed to him at least possible that that unpardonable sin had been committed, but as he was not clear in his own mind that it was a case of unpardonable sin he gives him the direction that all preachers should give to every sinner, "Repent, turn from thy wickedness and pray God to forgive you:'

Now let us see how that affected Simon. Here was evidently a power displayed by

Philip that he (Simon Magus) never had, and it was evidently supernatural. Here was a still greater power displayed by Peter, by which he could not only himself work miracles, but by the laying on of his hands he could impart that power to others to work miracles. And when this man said to him, "Thy money and thyself perish; thy heart is not right; thou art in the gall of bitterness; thou art in the bond of iniquity"-that awful denunciation hurled against his guilty soul made him tremble, but it did not make him pray. Here is what he says, "Then answered Simon and said, 'Do ye pray to the Lord for me, that none of these things which ye have spoken come upon me.'"

Right there the man's history stops. I mean the Bible part of it. Right there, on that "perhaps." We can only conjecture as to the ultimate fate of this man. It does seem that if he had gotten down right there and cried to God for mercy, that there would have been something said, there would have been some intimation of it. There would naturally appear some record that would lead us to hope that this man was saved. But it stops and draws a veil over the case and makes it inscrutable to our sight. While the Bible does not refer to him again, Josephus does describe a sorcerer named Simon, that has led many men to think that it was the same man and if the Simon the Sorcerer whom Josephus tells us about is this man, then we know he is lost, for there was present, working his evil ways and endeavoring to thwart all the purposes of God, and one of the great instruments that led to the destruction of Jerusalem not a great many years afterwards, a certain Simon the Sorcerer. I do not know that it was the same man. History does not make it right clear, but it does make it probable that he was the man, and if so, then this profane history flashes a light on this case that supplements the testimony of the Word of God.

Now you have before you this lesson on prayer: that a man must repent; that a man must turn away from his sins, forsake them; that a man must pray that God should forgive him. And how can I enforce, any more than the mere presentation of the thought has enforced itself, this sublime

exhortation of the prophet? I, do not ever know what to tell anybody more than that-that he must repent, that he must forsake his sins, and that he must pray to God, through the virtue of the atonement, to forgive his sins.

If you cannot get a man down on his knees, I do not see how you are ever going to get him up into heaven. If the spirit of grace and supplication never comes upon him, I do not see any hope for him. Do you pray? Particularly when you feel your sins, do you pray? Do you pray that

God, who puts His power and His omniscience and His love where the blood is, do you pray to God to meet you there, at the mercy seat, and take the burden and the guilt and the defilement of that sin off of you?

I venture to say that a work of grace never obtained in any community that did not have this accompaniment, and the sinners prayed. You hear me sometimes, when people come up to join the church, ask them an occasional question, "Did you feel that you were a lost sinner in the sight of God?" "Yes." "What did you do then?" That is the next question, "What did you do when you felt that?" Now if there has been a genuine conversion you may rest assured that whoever felt that kind of a conviction, prayed, and they nearly always answer, and always do in the case of a true conversion, if they understand the object of the question, "I prayed to God for Christ's sake to forgive me." As Paul says, "Forgive ye one another as God also for Christ's sake has forgiven you."

Now when they do pray for forgiveness, and pray for it through Christ, that sort of praying has in it the element of faith, for while the word, "faith," is not referred to by name in the case of the publican, the word, "justification," is. Jesus says, "That man went down to his house justified." The Bible says, "We are justified by faith." It is through faith that we reach justification. If I come up to the place where the blood of the atonement has been sprinkled, I feel that my only chance for forgiveness is through the virtue of that blood of my Substitute, I look at that blood and I say, "0 God, for Christ's sake forgive me," then have I not faith in that blood? So we find what our Articles of Faith state, viz: that repentance and faith are inseparable graces. Wherever you find true repentance, you find true faith, and sometimes they shade into each other so that it is difficult to analyze as to the order of their coming, as the whole exercise of the mind is sometimes merged into such a short space of time that it is hard to distinguish the order of the exercise. But wherever there is true penitence, true penitential prayer, then there is salvation.

I close by .giving one other scripture: "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" So you see that the calling upon Him is intimately connected with faith. Faith comes by hearing, hearing by the Word of God. Whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, but how shall they call upon Him in whom they have not believed? That publican looked to that. He did not ask pardon outside of Christ, but in Christ. He did not ask pardon on account of any good in him, for he was all evil, but he asked 'pardon on account of the good in Christ, for He was all good. The sinner's prayer is, "In Christ, have mercy on me." And so then Peter tells this man to repent and turn from his wickedness and pray God for forgiveness, which is equivalent to saying, "Repent and pray and have faith," for they are all involved in it. Now I submit this case to you. It shows to what particular object we should address ourselves in dealing with sinners. What is it? When Philip went down there among those sinners, what did he do? The Scriptures say that he held something up before

those people. What was it? He preached Christ unto them. And that connects back ith what Luke says, that through His name repentance and remission of sins should be preached.

Let us hold up Christ before the sinner, because if he is to be saved, he is to be saved in Christ. If God’s power reaches him, or God’s omniscience reaches him, or God’s love reaches him, it reaches him where that blood is and nowhere else. Hold up Christ then as the object to which he should look.

Then we should preach repentance and turning from sin, producing works meet for repentance, or reformation; faith in the divine Redeemer, that faith evidenced by calling upon the name of the Lord, by asking God for Christ’s sake to forgive sin. That is the order of the gospel.

I don’t know who of you here are not converted, that have perhaps mere nominal church connection, or maybe you don’t belong to any church. I do press this thought on you-that if your heart is not made right in the sight of God, nothing avails you; that no man can see the kingdom of God that is not born from above; that no man can find forgiveness of sin outside of the atonement made by Jesus Christ, and that no man can get that who won’t ask for it. You have got to ask for it. The Word of God declares that the wrath of God is poured out upon all men that call not upon His name.

Now this is a question of your needs. Do you, as a sinner, not as a righteous person, get down on your knees and ask God to forgive you? You say, "Yes, I do that." On what account do you ask it? I press that question on you. Why should He forgive you? I assure you that unless your faith takes hold of the blood shed in the atonement by the Lord Jesus Christ though you should pray until doom’s day, your prayers will avail nothing. Your prayer should be, "God be merciful to me a sinner, through the propitiation for sin, for Christ’s sake."

Chapter 91

# S. THE EVILS OF RELIGIOUS COMPROMISE

THE EVILS OF RELIGIOUS COMPROMISE I wish to illustrate the evils of religious compromise by considering the four consecutive propositions submitted by Pharaoh to Moses, and will read them in the order in which they were proposed. God through Moses had demanded of Pharaoh that His people should be allowed to leave Egypt and go three days journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to Him. Pharaoh peremptorily refused. But after four plagues in succession had fallen on Egypt, he began to propose compromises.

Compromise 1.

"And Pharaoh called for Moses and for Aaron, and said, Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land." (Exodus 8:25.) Which Moses rejected.

Compromise 2.

"And Pharaoh said, I will let you go, that ye may sacrifice to the Lord your God in the wilderness; only ye shall not go very far away." (Exodus 8:28.) Moses rejected it and brought on Egypt three additional plagues.

Compromise 3.

"Go now ye that are men; and serve the Lord; for that ye did desire. But let your little ones remain." (Exodus 10:8-11.) Moses rejected it and brought two plagues more.

Compromise 4.

"And Pharaoh called unto Moses, and said, Go ye, serve the Lord; let your little ones also go with you; only let your flocks and herds be stayed.*** But Moses said, Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not an hoof be left behind." (Exodus 10:24-26.) These four propositions may summarily be expressed thus:

1. You may serve God, but it must be here in Egypt.

2. You may leave Egypt to serve Him, but you must not go far away.

3. You may leave Egypt to serve God and you may go as far away as you please, but you must leave your children in Egypt.

4. You and your children may go out of Egypt and as far as you please to serve your God; but you must leave your property behind. The devices of Satan in endeavoring to prevent a clear testimony to the truth on the part of God’s people, are remarkably alike in all ages. The first device of Satan with reference to the truth is to persecute; to see if it cannot be destroyed by persecution. If that fails, his next device is to imitate the powerful works of the truth, and to make it appear that his servants can do similar things; and when that fails, then he falls upon his last expedient, the expedient of compromise. And there are presented here the four compromises with which he

usually attempts to seduce the people of God from perfect allegiance, from complete obedience.

I want to examine these four compromises. The first one is this: God had commanded His people to separate from the Egyptians and that the separation should be an actual and a complete one. They were commanded to come out from among them. They were commanded to go to a place that He would give them.

Now, the compromise proposed is this: Worship God as you choose, but don't separate from us. Offer your sacrifices here in the land. Fairly translated, this proposition means about this: We are willing to acknowledge that Jehovah is one of the gods, but we have gods also, and now let there be a mutual recognition of the claims of these several gods. We are willing that Jehovah shall be one, but ours must also be recognized among the number. Be charitable. Don't monopolize.

Put the several gods of the several nations upon an equality, and let us meet in a

Chicago World's Fair -parliament of religions, and let this quasi acknowledgment of equality be general. Here is Jehovah and there is Buddha, and there is Confucius, and here Mahomet. All religions are good and any religion is good and it doesn't make a great deal of difference. Indeed what is the difference?

It was the device of the ancient Greeks and Romans. They were perfectly willing to give Jesus Christ a niche in the temple of their gods. They were willing to recognize Him as a deity, but He must also recognize Jupiter, Pluto, Mercury, Saturn, Venus, Bacchus and all their other gods. This was the proposition. And just here it would be well to answer a question: Did the representatives of the

Christian religion do right in that parliament of religions in placing Christianity in an attitude of receiving the other religions as guests and upon terms of equality, and receiving them as guests by a host so polite as not in any way to reflect upon their claims, but allow them on the hearth of the Christian religion and at its own hearthstone and altars to reflect upon the Christian religion? My deliberate conviction is that it was the most disgraceful and treasonable surrender of the truth that this world has ever known.

Consider its effect on the false religions. The followers of Buddha went home and said to their disciples who had been shaken by the missionaries of Christianity: "You are foolish to be so shaken by these missionaries. We have just returned from their home and our religion was put by the side of theirs, and if anything, we had the advantage, and they are much more ready to accept ours than theirs." Never since Christ gave the great commission has there been such a backset to the work of the missionaries in the land of Buddha as there has been since the return of these men who were received into the United States in this parliament of religions upon the footing of equality with Christians. That was exactly the proposition of Pharaoh: "Sacrifice to the Lord your God in Egypt. Do not invidiously put one over another. Be broadminded. Be charitable.

Don't run in a narrow groove. We acknowledge your divinity and you acknowledge our divinity."

What if Elijah had been present! He would have stood up and said: "How long halt ye between two opinions; if Baal be God, follow him. But if Jehovah be God, follow Him." Both cannot be. The claims are fundamentally antagonistic and subversive of each other. There could much more readily be a dozen suns in the solar system than there could be a dozen deities governing worlds.

There could much more easily be a dozen different and conflicting laws of gravitation than there could be a dozen deities governing the world.

Suppose Paul had been present, what would he have said? He would have said, "The things which these people sacrifice to their idols they do not sacrifice to God, but to demons, and you cannot partake of the Lord’s table and of the table of demons; you cannot take the cup of the Lord and the cup of the devil." When Washington said in his farewell address to his people, "Beware of entangling alliances," he condensed in that short saying supreme earthly wisdom, and it is heavenly wisdom when applied to questions of religion.

There can no way be selected by which the witnesses of the truth f God can more readily sacrifice the power of their testimony and divest themselves of any practical and important influence over the world than by putting themselves in a position that will make the religion which they represent only one of many and a matter of indifference as to which one the people shall choose.

Moses said, "What you propose we cannot do; our command from God is to come out and be separated. Egypt is not our place. We cannot obey the Lord half way. It is impossible for us to receive any blessing from Him while we trifle with plain and specific commandments which He hath given us."

Then Pharaoh said, "If you won’t separate here in the land; if you won’t sacrifice here in the land, then we offer you this compromise: Don’t go very far away; let it be a little separation. Let the line that defines between us be a dim one. Don’t be invidious, representing yours as clear light and ours as solid darkness. Take a twilight position on it; that is, you are neither all light nor all darkness, but you are mixed light and darkness."

How many tens of thousands of people are caught at the present day by this compromise? "Don’t separate too far. Let it be a matter of some difficulty to determine whether you have separated at all or not. Just a little way."

Allow me to enforce some maxims that will apply to other things as well as to religion. There is no weakness comparable to the weakness of taking a half way position on any matter. You are deprived of all of the power that would accrue to you from a clean cut and decisive stand, and you are subject to all the harm that will result from slightly leaving the camps of either hostile party. In other words, neither the one nor the other can regard you as a friend; both must look upon you with distrust. Neither will put any confidence in you, neither God nor the devil. You are where you have deprived yourself of any benefit from either side and where you have brought upon yourself the suspicion of both sides.

Now let me illustrate the feebleness and folly of all such methods. In the beginning of the Revolutionary war, it was not proposed that there be complete separation from England. Many thought it wiser to fight as British subjects. But after their struggle had gone on for some time, it at last dawned upon the minds of thoughtful men that they had put themselves in a position of exposedness to extreme danger, and a position of unusual weakness. They said:

"If we are not separated from England, then we are rebels. We are in arms against our sovereign. We are not even entitled to the position of belligerents in the sight of the nations of the world. We cannot expect any recognition from foreign powers. We have not the courage that comes from

taking a clear, well defined position. We are deprived of potent incentives with which to stir up our people. We cannot offer them the rewards of true andcomplete independence." And at last this conviction found utterance in the speakings and writings of the leaders. They came out openly and fearlessly: "There is for us not one atom of hope except in complete severance, entire independence, and when we take that position, we may send to any foreign power representatives from our government and expect recognition and help." That is one of the most familiar lessons of the Revolutionary war. The history of Texas is another illustration. When it was proposed to strive against the tyranny of Mexico, what they called a consultation was held-not a convention, but a consultation. This consultation declared for the old Mexican constitution of 1824, and appointed a provisional government, a provisional council, a provisional army, and the object stated was: "We are not endeavoring to separate Texas from Mexico, not at all; we simply ally ourselves with one of the parties in Mexico, and we are fighting for the re-establishment of the constitution which prevailed when we were invited to come here and settle." That was their position. The weakness of it was manifest to many minds. Wise men spoke out against it: "By our own confession we are in arms against the central government." The troops that captured Goliad and that captured San Antonio, all of them, were without regular commissions or any regular authority. They could not in any way be held together. And then they were continually subjected to this possible calamity-that any defeat would put every captive at the mercy of the government of Mexico, and they could be shot down, and legally shot down as traitors and rebels. This lame method was followed to a ridiculous and ruinous extreme. Every letter they sent out, every man they commissioned was with reference to continuance with Mexico.

Even this feeble provisional government, for such a feeble purpose, was rendered more impotent by divided jurisdiction - a governor and a council with vaguely defined and conflicting powers. It was through the unwisdom of this council that so many precious lives were fruitlessly lost-every man whose life was lost under Grant, or in the Alamo, or under Fannin, or under Ward, or under King, making an aggregate larger than the army with which Houston won the battle of San Jacinto.

Thoughtful men inquired: "Why should we send commissioners to the United States? They will say, 'We can't help you while you occupy that position. It would, be interference with the internal affairs of another nation. If you expect sympathy in the United States; if you expect recognition by the American government, you must put yourselves in a different attitude. You must, through the voice of the people in convention assembled, sever forever your connection with Mexico. Come out from them and be separate; locate yourselves, be somewhere; then we will come and help you.'" That is the precise thought involved here. Israel cannot accomplish anything by separating just a little way, and Pharaoh knew it, and that is why he offered to compromise. Neither can Christians accomplish anything by separating only a little way from the world, and the devil knows it. Hence his offer to compromise. Your religious convictions stir within you. You feel impressed to turn toward God, and if the devil cannot restrain that, he says, "That's all very well; have those feelings; pray a little; come out a little; separate a little; but don't go very far; hold on to the world and don't take any clean-cut, decisive position." That is the very compromise upon which the usefulness of over half the Christians in this world today is wrecked. I will make a plain statement. You may regard it as an audacious one. I stand upon it anyhow ¾ nine-tenths of the professed Christians in Waco today are powerless as a testimony for God, because the line of separation is a dim one; because they go not very far away from the position occupied by the devil. They get no

internal enjoyment; they bask in no smiles of God; they are not able to break down the bulwarks of Satan because they cannot ask God's favor, nor can they ask the devil's favor. They are just a little separated; they are in a spiritual twilight that is neither day nor night. Their whole condition is an anomalous one. They may easily be counted both as traitors to God and traitors to the devil. When Pharaoh found that Moses could not be seduced by any such offer and the plagues descended upon him hotter and hotter all the time, he, still fighting for every, inch of ground, makes his third proposition of compromise, which is this: You grown people go into the wilderness; separate as widely as you please, but leave your little ones here with us.

Wherever a man's treasure is, there is his heart, and it would amount to but little for men and women to go off and draw a line of separation between them and the devil and then let the devil educate their children. That was the very compromise which brought on the flood, the very one. The song of Seth married the daughters of Cain. The children followed the mothers. They remained in the devil's camp.

He now says to you church members: "If you think it best to be a Christian, be that, but don't worry your little ones with Sunday School. It is well enough for men of mature minds who are converted-it is well enough for them to go to church and worship God, but don't worry the children. Wait till they are grown; wait till they are converted; wait till they occupy the position that you occupy; but leave them with me in the meantime. You go on now, but leave your children here with me." That is his proposition. He knows that he who educates the children of the people is the master of that people.

I do not know of a more seductive form of compromise the devil's ingenuity could devise than this-never say anything to these little ones about God; just leave that out; hands off of childhood. And mark you, how plausibly his agents put it. They say, "Don't preoccupy the child's mind; let him grow up, and then when he is grown, decide for himself." Which is equivalent to this: "Religion, you let this child alone; irreligion, you preoccupy him. We will take possession of that .pliant mind; we will educate it; we will fortify it; and when we have made a Gibraltar of his heart, and when we have blinded his eyes and deafened his ears and hardened his heart and bound him hand and foot, why, then you may turn your batteries loose on him." That is the proposition. And occasionally you find a Christian, or a so-called Christian, who occupies the position taken by the too chivalrous French Count d'Estaing at Savannah. He came upon that town with a formidable army of both French and Americans. It was easy to take immediate possession of it. The wily British general said, "Give me twentyfour hours to consider your proposition of surrender. I want to sleep on it." And the Frenchman allowed it. The British general did not sleep on it; he stayed awake day and night; he brought up his reenforcements; he strengthened his fortifications; and when the twenty-four hours had expired he was ready to meet any assault that could be made upon his impregnable works. When too late, the assault was made. ¾ It was a butchery-twelve hundred killed and wounded men paid in their blood for the Frenchman's folly.

Well, now, that is just exactly what the devil says to us: "Let grown people be Christians, but don't interfere with the little ones; don't you establish Sunday Schools; don't you try to lead them to Christ; leave them in my school, and when I have fortified, then you may assault if you choose."

Let us proceed with our lesson. When the plagues still descended heavier and heavier and hotter and hotter on Pharaoh, and God's stern and inexorable word relentlessly repeated itself, "Let my

people go," he said to Moses, "I will consent to let you go, grown people and children; let them go as far as they choose, but leave your property behind." Which being translated is: "All I ask you to do is, after you have acknowledged God's sovereignty over your person and over your child, don't acknowledge it over your purse. Take this maxim: 'Religion is religion and business is business.' We will let God have Sunday, but not the other six days; we will let Him be Jehovah in the church, but not Jehovah in the counting-house; not Jehovah in the office; not Jehovah in our property. Let your property stay behind."

There is no doubt in the world that the devil successfully works this compromise on many professors of religion; people who willingly concede that they are under obligations to the Lord Jesus Christ as to their person, as to their wives, as to their children, but draw a line of demarkation when it comes to the question of money or property. "This is mine; I deny that I must give it to God, and I deny that the Lord Jesus Christ has a right to sit over my treasure and watch it. I deny that He is king over the money that I have made."

Well, if you grant that much to the devil, that is enough. He will destroy your usefulness. He knows that God will not occupy a part of the throne. He knows that God will not occupy three hundred and sixty-four days in the year if you deny Him the three hundred and sixty-fifth. He knows that God will not occupy eleven chambers of your heart if you deny Him entrance into the twelfth. He knows that if you take away one hair's breadth from the total of God's sovereignty, you destroy the sovereignty. In other words, if He is God at all, He is God over all, and if He be not God over all, He is not God at all. That is to say, any God whose sovereignty you deny over your property, you may, by parity of reasoning, deny His sovereignty over your person. And if you deny Him Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday and Friday and Saturday, you may, by the same reasoning, deprive him of Sunday.

What was the reply of Moses to this? He says, "Our cattle shall go with us; not a hoof shall be left behind us, not a hoof. We are the Lord's, our wives are the Lord's, our property is the Lord's, and the Lord commands us to come out and be separate and to be wholly separated and to bear undimmed testimony to the sovereignty of Jehovah." It resolves itself into this: Never acknowledge any being as God unless you are willing to acknowledge Him as God over everything. You injure yourself, you put yourself in a position of weakness, you deprive yourself of the benefits of the position you do take if you have a reservation of any kind whatever.

Now, that makes the difference between men; that makes the difference in their success. Let me illustrate this thought by a preacher. Here is a preacher who says that he is called of God to preach; that he is the servant of the Lord; that he is purchased with a price and that he claims nothing as his own. That is his original position. But after such a declaration he begins to reach out and make some kind of alignment with the world, the flesh and the devil. He attempts some kind of compromise, and then wonders why he has no power; he wonders that somebody else, not his equal, is succeeding where he is failing. The truth is simply this: the man never did burn the bridges and ships behind him; the man never did come out and take a clean-cut and decisive position absolutely, wholly and forever committing himself to the service of God as God's minister and relying solely and wholly upon the divine power, and God will not be with him, and will not bless him.

I mean just this: that whenever God calls any man to preach, whatever may be his natural ability, whatever may he the fulness or the deficiency of his acquirements or education, whatever may be the poverty of his purse, if that man will absolutely trust God and will rest on His promise, and will go out fearing neither the world nor the devil, and will preach the truth and rely wholly upon the Spirit's power, then all the powers of hell cannot keep him from being a success. But whenever he begins to put on Saul's armor, whenever he begins to make alliances, whenever in his mind, in his heart, in his secret moments, he leans upon any earthly broken staff, he is like Samson shorn of his locks, and is as any other man without knowing that he is as any other man. It is the easiest thing in the world for the devil to put out his eyes and take away all his strength, or utilize it by making him blindly grind in his own mill. The Apostle Paul, who had profoundly studied this question, and who had been instructed from heaven, addressing the Corinthian people in the language of one of the scriptures that I have read to you, said,

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." (2 Corinthians 6:14-18.)

Here, then, is a lesson that every Christian can very safely apply to himself. Look at these promises: "I will be your God, I will be a father to you, I will be in you and dwell in you; no weapon that is fashioned of hell will prosper against you; when you lie down you will lie down in safety; the angels of God will camp about you; your heart shall be full of gladness even in the days of sorrow, and when you come to die there shall be no bitterness in death to you, and I will take you home triumphantly to myself."

These are the promises, and having these promises, as says Paul, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. Here is Christian power, just as much for a private member of the church as for a preacher. Nothing on earth that you may gain by any compromise will compensate you for the loss of God's presence; for the loss of the power that He confers upon you.

Then, as Christians, he decisive; occupy a definite position; be somebody. Don't be a wandering star. Don't be an erratic meteor. Don't be a restless, roving wave of the sea. Don't be a well without water. Don't be a tree twice dead, plucked up by the roots; but come out and be separate and testify bravely for God, and whatever may be the portion of any other man or woman, you shall have power from on high and a conscious realization of the divine presence while you live and when you die.

Chapter 92

# S. THE NAME, THE EYES AND THE HEART OF GOD

THE NAME, THE EYES AND THE HEART OF GOD

TEXT: My name shall be there, and my eyes shall be there and my hear shall be there forever. - 1 Kings 9:3; Hebrews 4:16. It may be, I cannot recall it, that somewhere I have read a sermon on this text, whose thoughts are blended with my own. Be that as it may, my heart today is full of this theme, “the throne of God’s grace.” I am not referring to His throne as the King and Governor of the world, but to the throne where He hears and passes upon the petitions which His people send up to Him. Because of their necessities, the people intensely desired that God would put His name in some place where they would come to Him and offer sacrifices and make known to Him their troubles, and where they could find an answer suitable to their necessities. Therefore Solomon built a house for that purpose, according to the direction of God, and the sacrifices all looked to the place where God was to put His name. His name was not put at the entrance of the house. His name was not placed in the outer court. His name was not placed at the altar of sacrifices; but His name was placed inside of the veil, where the golden altar was, called the Altar of the Mercy Seat God’s name was there. The blood shed upon the altar of sacrifice was sprinkled there, because His name was to be there. He was to be found there, and nowhere else. Solomon, in his inspired petition, asked that God’s name might be placed at the golden altar, this Mercy Seat, and then went on to enumerate the reasons for making this request. The first was based upon the fact that all men are sinners. He says: “No man liveth and sinneth not.” The people will certainly sin and therefore will be in very great extremities, and we want a place where they may come and find mercy and forgiveness for their sins. Hence, in elaborating his petition: “If the people go to war and are in extremity on account of the number and strength and fierceness of their enemies, and feel that they are in need of help, because not able to cope with such formidable adversaries, then, Lord, if at that time they pray toward this place where Thy name is, hear Thou in Heaven and help them. And if there should come upon the land mildew, drought, plague, famine, earthquake or any general calamity, filling the hearts of the people with trouble and distress, and they feel unable to meet the terrific danger that has come upon them, then, Lord, if they pray toward this place where Thy name is, hear them and deliver them from their trouble. And if the people commit sin, and on account of their sin are delivered into the hands of their enemies, and are led away into captivity, no difference how far, and no difference how deep is the wretchedness of their lot as captives, if far away in alien lands they turn unto this place where Thy name is, and they confess their sins, and ask God to forgive them, then, Lord, hear Thou in heaven and forgive.” I wish to elaborate the thought that is presented in this general way by calling attention to the three separate ideas set forth in God’s answer to Solomon’s petition. He says, “My name will be there.” That is the first thought. “My eyes will be there.” That is the second thought. “And my heart will be there.” That is the third thought. The name of God in the Bible stands for His power, as when Peter says that he healed that lame man through the name of Jesus that is, through the power of Jesus. When the Lord says then, that “I will put my name” in a certain place, He simply means, “At that place I will concentrate my omnipotence.” The reason that the power should be put there was that a necessity

on the part of the people would cause them to go there to obtain the strength of that power. “My name shall be there, right there at that mercy seat shall be all the omnipotence of God, so that it does not make any difference how weak you are, how few in number you are, there is my name, and that represents all power in heaven and on earth, and I put it there for you that pray.” Next He says, “My eyes will be there.” The thought is this: “My omniscience shall be there.” That door will never be closed. It makes no difference what time of the year you come, nor what time of the day you come, nor what time of the night you come. Not only will the door be there, but “I will be there to see you.” Just as soon as you come, God will see you. You need never expect to come and find Him absent. You need never expect to come and find the door locked so that you cannot get at me. “My eyes will be there. Dark as the night may be, and dire as your extremity may be, you kneel down toward this place. My eyes are there and I will see you. You will never get beyond my sight and power.” The third thought, “My heart will be there,” which shows that the omniscience and omnipotence which are to be at that place are there as instruments of His love, servants of His affection, as if He had said: “Omnipotence is the right hand of love, and omniscience is the left hand of love, and the power that is there and that omniscience that is there, are to be exercised by infinite love in behalf of those who seek my help.” Now, very briefly, that, is the very cream of the thought of the text. The trouble will be to get you to realize it. You can take that thought in mentally, but to get you to realize how much it means and how intensely practical it is in its application to us at the present day, that will be the difficulty. The Bible gives us an account of a man who went away from the presence of God.. He did it designedly. He fled from God’s presence, and there came a storm at sea upon the vessel that harbored this fugitive, and in the midst of the storm men began to cast about for its occasion. It seemed such a sudden and awful storm that they attributed it to the direct intervention of Providence, and that He was sending it for some special purpose, and therefore the question was, “Who has sinned? Who has brought this storm?” And by casting lots they ascertained that it was Jonah. He was the one. He was asleep in the hold of the ship. They bring him up and state the case to him. He says, “I am the man. I am running away from God, running away from God’s presence, sinning against Him. Now, the ship will be lost unless you throw me out.” Well, it was a sad thing to have to do that, and they prayed over it and asked God to hold them guiltless if they made a mistake about it. But when they found that nothing else would avail, they tossed that man overboard and he went down, down, sinking until the waves rolled over him, and away down in the depths of the sea a huge fish swallowed him whole, and, having swallowed him, instantly went deeper down to the very bottom of the ocean. The record says, “He went to the roots of the mountains that are in the sea, and the sea weeds were wrapped around the man’s head,” and he was miraculously preserved alive in the body of this sea fish, and away down in the bottom of the ocean, where no man in the history of the world had gone and lived, there he said: “I am cast out of Thy sight; yet I will look again toward Thy Holy Temple.” And God’s eyes were there, God saw this man down in the depths of the sea, and in that awful supernatural extremity, God heard the prayer that was offered, and His Spirit moved the fish to come to the surface and cast up the man on the dry land. How hard it is to measure this fact, “My name shall be there!” It shall be there with power to control the winds and the sea when it is tossed by the winds, and the fishes that inhabit the great deep, and shall reach unto the roots of the mountains in the bottom of the sea, where the sea-weeds are wrapped around the head of a disobedient man. That name has power to reach there. There is no depth that power can not sound. There is no distance so great but the feeblest cry that ever fell from the lips of a sufferer

can be carried just as plainly and audibly to the ears of God as if it had been spoken near at hand through a speaking trumpet, or roared in the thunder of cannon. “My name shall be there and I will deliver him.” The second case which I select is that of Daniel. The people had sinned, one of the very contingencies about which Solomon had spoken in his prayer, and they had been carried into captivity, and there in that far-off land, this young man turned his heart toward God. Every day, three times a day, he would open his window that looked toward the place where was the name of God. His window was opened toward Jerusalem. And three times every day he would kneel down and present his petitions to God, telling Him all his needs and all the needs of his people. O, how wonderful is the story! How that voice, that gentle voice, that trusting voice, spoken through the window, went out across the burning sands of the intervening deserts, went on until it came to Mount Zion, went until it came to the entrance of the Temple, went until it passed the Altar of the Sacrifice, went behind the triple-colored veil and came up to the Mercy Seat sprinkled with blood, and there said: Lord God, help Daniel! And God’s name was there, and His eyes were there, and His heart was there, and the power was given and their: man and his people were redeemed. In the third case selected to illustrate the text, our Savior himself gives an account of a man who was a very great sinner. He was engaged in a business that made him a social outcast, and then, personally, his life had been a miserable and wretched and sinful life, and he felt that he was a sinner. He could not sleep for the awful thought that he was a sinner against God and he concluded to venture where God’s name was, and very modestly, very timidly, he goes just inside. He does not go up close, but standing afar off he smites upon his heart and says: “God be merciful to me, a sinner!” And God’s name was there, and His eyes were there, and His heart was there, and in a moment the decree of justification went forth from the court of heaven. Jesus says he went down from that house justified. On account of human weakness and our inability to comprehend infinite things, God r resented the thought of all this as being confined to a certain spot. “I will put my name there on Mount Zion, there in Jerusalem, and whenever you go away from that place you go away from the presence of God; but if, when away, you will just look back toward that place my name will be there.” It was so expressed on account of our infirmities. But our Savior divests the thought of such local limitations. He says: “The hour cometh when not at this place (meaning in Samaria), nor in Jerusalem, shall men worship God. God is a Spirit and God must be worshiped in the spirit and in truth.” He lifted up and lifted off and put away forever that idea of locality. In the letter to the Hebrews, the Apostle Paul speaks of the imagery of the subject, such as I have discussed it up to the present moment, and says, “Seeing that we have a High Priest who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need.” So, now, Christians who are enlightened know that God’s name in its power is anywhere, everywhere; that God’s omniscience in taking cognizance of human sin and human need is everywhere, and that God’s love, in exercising itself through omniscience and omnipotence in helping His people, is everywhere, and we are no longer troubled with the thought of this place and that place, but wherever the soul is, wherever the need is, wherever the sense of sin is in the heart, wherever the conscience is smitten, wherever God’s Spirit has sent conviction unto an transgressor’s soul, there is the name of God, n there are His eyes an there is heart and there is His love. Now, the last thought I present in connection with the subject is this: Pray to God first for mercy that is, for forgiveness of sins and prayer to God for grace to help in every time of need, no matter what it is, is a supreme test of Christian character. The man who has never found his way to that throne of

grace as a lost sinner, asking God to have mercy upon him, cannot be called a Christian. And whoever claims that he now stands in a state of grace and salvation, and yet did not get to the place where he stands over the road of petition, or prayer to God for mercy, as did that publican, that man convicts himself at once, in the light of the declarations of God's Word, of not being there at all not at all. You have heard me say it before, and I repeat it with all possible emphasis, that no man on this earth has a right to ever conclude himself to be a Christian who did not seek mercy of God through prayer. "All the nations that call not upon the name of the Lord shall be cast into hell." And I regard it as the most soul-destroying heresy that ever fell from the lips of man at the instigation of Satan, that there is a way to God, to that Mercy Seat, without asking, without knocking, without seeking, without crying out, "God be merciful to me, a sinner." If such a man, what need has he for the throne of grace? According to his doctrine and according to his life, it was a work of superfluity that the Lord God should put His name there, that the Lord God should put His eyes there. Why be there to look if this man is never coming? Why should God put His love there, since this man claims to get at the power and at the omniscience and at the infinite love, without going to the throne of grace? It is one of the best tests that I know anything about of practical Christianity, Christianity every day. You may test it right here and now, you may be your own judge and your own witness, and being a witness at the court of your own heart, I press this question on you: Have you found that Mercy Seat, and are you in the habit of finding it? I put it, that way, for l ere there is no habit of prayer, I do not see how anyone can be a Christian. If your soul does not habitually go to that throne of grace to find mercy and grace to help in time of need, then it must rely upon one of these two ' assumptions:That you do not need any aid, or that you find what you need somewhere else. You do not find it from God anywhere else, for He says: "My name is there. I put my power there. I put it where the blood is sprinkled. I put it where the High Priest stands. I put it where the atonement is made. I put it where the provisions of grace are garnered. I do not put it outside of Christ and His blood. It is a delusion if you think you have found it anywhere else. If you have had no sense of the need, then I do not see how you can claim to have been under the influence of the Holy Spirit of God, for that Spirit does bring that sense of guilt and condemnation, and does bring into the heart that sense of helplessness and powerlessness and want, and if you have not wanted it, and if you think you have found the strength anywhere else, it argues a delusion, a delusion of the devil. I sometimes, for an hour at a time, sitting perfectly still, generally at night, have silently fastened my mind upon this thought: At any hour of the day or night His name is there, His eyes are there, His heart is there and for any kind of need, I do not care what, and any kind of extremity. I do wish you would get the thought of the throne of grace before you in its richness, in its power. O bow many men have tasted its sweetness! How many people who felt that they were standing on barely ground enough to uphold their feet, and the dirt crumbling away; how many people have felt that they were actually sinking down into darkness beneath the angry frown of God, with a weight of sin on them, and hell from beneath moving to meet them, and have cried out, "God help me; God be merciful to me, a sinner!" And His name was there, His power, His omnipotent power, was there, and the brand was plucked from the burning, and the fire was quenched in the blood of the Lamb, and it was exhibited in triumph before the Court of God, and the question asked: Is not this- a brand plucked from burning? See how close it was to hell. See where the flames had commenced to take hold upon it. See where it had commenced to crackle under the quenchless fires of eternity, and at the last moment the eye was turned toward the place where the name and the eyes and the heart of God are, and the

petition was sent up to heaven. I do not hesitate to say to you today, with all the earnestness of my soul, that no extremity excluded one from that Mercy Seat. Even though the portals of hell are opened and you have lifted your foot to step inside, if there you will turn around and read the writing, “Ask and it shall be given; knock and it shall be opened unto you; seek and you shall find,” and there lift up your hands and cry, “Lord God, for Christ’s sake help and save me,” then the salvation that found Jonah at the depths of the ocean and at the roots of the mountain, will find you at the gate of hell, and bring you from that deep and dark descent by a sudden exaltation to the heights of the glory of heaven.

Chapter 93

# S. THE WAR BETWEEN THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT

THE WAR BETWEEN THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT

TEXT: And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. - 1 Thessalonians 5:23.

Here is a remarkable prayer which Paul offered for the Ephesian Christians:

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." (Ephesians 3:14-19.) And here is a wonderful statement:

"Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that He might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Ephesians 5:25-27.) And here is a wonderful voice:

"The marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints."

(Revelation 19:7-8.) These scriptures serve to introduce our text, which is a prayer of the Apostle Paul for the Thessalonians ¾ a prayer that they may be completely sanctified; that the sanctification may touch the spirit, the soul and the body, and that it be so complete as to secure absolute blamelessness and holiness.

You will understand at once, then, that what I wish to talk to you about this morning is sanctification. I am led to discuss this theme from various conversations reported as held upon the streets of Waco recently, participated in often by young people, and sometimes those who are little informed upon the subject of sanctification. It has been presented to you on the streets and variously and oftentimes in such a way as, in my judgment, to do incalculable harm. And because I so strongly believe this, and because I do believe that there is a sanctification which the Scriptures teach, I have been led to discuss the subject now. The first thing ¾ always is to know what a word means, and this word, like almost every other word, has a variety of meanings, and the particular meaning has to be determined always from the context. You take a passage of Scripture in which it occurs and you determine from that connection which one of its meanings belongs to that particular place. But any one who takes the concordance and groups every place in the Bible where that word occurs, without examination of the connection in which it occurs, will find himself

confounding its various meanings so as to have a very unintelligent conception of the word. While it has a great many meanings, I want to call your attention now to two of its most prominent meanings. The first is where it is applied to inanimate things. In that application it means to set apart. For instance, God sanctified the seventh day. He set it apart, separated it from the other days. He sanctified the altar. He sanctified the Book. Wherever the word is applied to any inanimate thing that has no soul, no intelligence, it always has that sort of a meaning. Where it is applied to a moral and an accountable being, the other important sense is that it means to make holy. And that is the meaning upon which what is called the "doctrine of sanctification" rests, and that is the meaning which the apostle has here ¾ "I pray God that you may be made completely holy" ¾ holy in your spirit, holy in your body-that is the meaning of the word. The next thing to be determined is, when it starts. It is always best to have the beginning point clearly established. I shall not elaborate anything today, but shall try to speak very plainly and so everybody can understand me.

It begins in regeneration. ¾ A principle, or germ of spiritual life, is imparted to us in regeneration. Our articles of faith say that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind. Well, now, in regeneration is implanted this germ of life, and sanctification is the unfolding and developing of that principle of life. You may say that it is regeneration in its consummation. It is the unfolding and developing of the principle of life put in us when we become children of God, when we are born unto God. This is so well understood by all who have ever made any sort of a study of the Bible that I shall not stop here to present any proofs of a proposition so very plain. The next thought is that as it is an unfolding, developing, a bringing to a consummation of the principle of life that is imparted in regeneration, it is necessarily progressive and not instantaneous. Progressive ¾ that is a capital point. When people come to you and claim a sanctification received like justification, that is, instantaneously, you may know that it is not Bible sanctification, no matter what they tell you about it. Justification is instantaneous, because it relates to our legal state. It is a declaration of the law that we are acquitted. But sanctification relates to our internal and spiritual state.

Now, the regeneration may be instantaneous. It takes place at some particular time. But the unfolding and developing of that must be progressive. Therefore, from the days of the Lord Jesus Christ until now, our Baptist people have always held, without any swerving, even a hair’s breadth, that sanctification commences in regeneration and that it is progressive; that it is the unfolding and the developing of the principle of spiritual life imparted when we become the children of God.

Now, having made those general statements, I want to call your attention to a state of the Christian in this life. That state is represented by two scriptures ¾ Galatians 5:17, and Romans 7:14. If you will have the patience, and I think you ought to have on such a subject as this, suppose we read those two scriptures very carefully. Galatians 5:17 : "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." That is the first scripture. From the very moment that this principle of spiritual life is put in us, a war commences between the spirit and the flesh. They are contrary to each other and they are continually fighting against each other. Now it is the work of sanctification to carry on that fight of the spirit against the flesh, so that, as it is expressed in another scripture, "By the Spirit ye do mortify (that is, crucify) the sins of the body and put them to death."Romans 7:14-25 The other scripture is in the letter to the Romans, Romans 7:14-24 : "For we know that the law is spiritual;

but I am carnal, sold under sin, for that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good (because I say I do not wish to do that). Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am!' who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

Now it is utterly impossible for that language to come from the lips of one who is sanctified, soul, body and spirit. And it is equally impossible for that language to come from the lips of one who is not a Christian at all. Why? Because it says, "I consent unto the law that it is good." No unregenerate sinner could say it. It says, "I delight in the law in the inward man." No unregenerate man can say it. He knows he does not delight in it. I would do the Spirit's commandment, I would obey it. There is not that will in the unconverted man.

So, then, these two scriptures represent a state in which sanctification has not yet been consummated, but in which regeneration has taken place, in which a war is going on of the flesh against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. As sanctification progresses the spirit triumphs more and more over the flesh.

Now, let us look at another point. How is the process of sanctification carried on? It is carried on by the growth (mark the expression), by the growth of our spiritual graces. I will not speak of all of them, but I will take some of them to illustrate what I mean. Faith is one of the Christian graces.

Now, if our faith is weak our progress in sanctification is slow, but if our faith is strong, and keeps getting stronger, then our progress in sanctification progresses as our faith develops. In the second letter to the Thessalonians, in the first chapter and third verse, the

Apostle Paul says, "I thank God that your faith groweth exceedingly." Notice that ¾ "your faith groweth exceedingly." Now, compare that with the prayer once offered to Jesus: "Lord, increase our faith." Not only by the growth of faith, but by the growth of hope, which rests on faith. If our faith is weak our hope will be weak; if our faith is strong our hope will be strong.

Now, in Romans 15:13, the Apostle Paul says, "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Spirit." Now, here is an expansion of our hope. It gets clearer, brighter, broader and stronger as our faith gets clearer, and brighter, and broader and stronger. Not only, then, with reference to the grace of hope, but with reference to the grace of love. Take the passage in 1 Thessalonians 3:12-13 :

"The Lord make you to increase and abound in love, one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you, to the end that He may establish your hearts, unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father (listen at this), at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints."

Now here is an unblamable state of holiness referred to, just like in all the other passages I have read, and the apostle declares one of the principles by which you continously approximate that state of unblamableness in holiness, and he says that that principle is love ¾ love which grows and abounds, and gets stronger and broader, and by the power of that increasing love you go toward that state of unblamable holiness. In his prayer for the Ephesians he had in his mind a mighty consummation, which was that they should be filled with all the fulness of God, and hence he offered that remarkable prayer that Christ might dwell in their hearts by faith, that they might be rooted and grounded in love, that they might be led on to know what is the height and breadth and depth, and to know the love of God, which passeth knowledge. That is the process by which they were to reach it, and hence the Apostle Peter at the close of his second letter says, "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ," showing that it is a growth, that it is a development. Then take what he says, which you have often heard me quote: "Add to or supply with your faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, Godliness, brotherly kindness, charity," and then he goes on to show that this marvelous development is consummated by an abundant entrance into the kingdom of glory. From these scriptures (for it is not at all my purpose to talk at any great length), I think you see by what process sanctification is carried on.

Now, very plainly, I want to answer a question: Is sanctification consummated here, so that a man can say, "I am completely sanctified?" So that a man can say, "I am unblamable in my holiness, in spirit, in soul, in body?" That is the question.

I am exceedingly sorry that anyone should ever have presumed to say "yes" to that question. I am sorry because it directly and flatly contradicts the most positive declarations of God’s Word. In the first letter of the Apostle John he states two distinct propositions: "If we say we have not sinned (with reference to the past), if we say we have not sinned, we make God a liar and the truth is not in us." But there is another proposition. He says, in the same connection, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." That is a very positive declaration. If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves. Now, whoever is completely sanctified is already in the heavenly state, ready to be presented to the Bridegroom, without spot, or blemish, or wrinkle, or any such thing. I will show you directly how awfully presumptuous such a statement is.

Take another scripture, in the first book of Kings, and in the eighth chapter.

Solomon, in offering that wonderful prayer at the dedication of the temple, a prayer that was evidently inspired, for God answered it at its close by a visible manifestation of His presence, and filled the temple with glory - in that prayer Solomon says, "If they sin against thee." And then he adds, "For there is no man that sinneth not." Mark it: There is no man that sinneth not. Then in Ecclesiastes 7:12, the language, is much stronger. Here it is: "There is not a just man upon the earth that doeth good and sinneth not."

Take the declaration in the third chapter and seventh verse of the letter of James, "In many things we offend all." In many things, and the truth is, whoever talks about being sinlessly perfect advertises to the world his ignorance of the exceeding broadness of the divine commands, advertises the fact that he is not near God, for no man can be near God without being overwhelmed with a sense of his unworthiness and sinfulness.

I take some scriptures to prove it. Isaiah was the saintliest man of his time. If any man could claim to be a sinless man Isaiah could have made that claim, but on one occasion God permitted him to get close to Him. Listen at the record: "In the year that King Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple. Then said I, Woe is me! for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts."

Take Job. In the common acceptation of the word, the ordinary worldly acceptation of the word, God has said that Job was a perfect man, and he was a better man than any that I have ever known who claimed sinless perfection. And yet Job was not sinlessly perfect. He contested with pride anything that his friends could say to him, but when the Almighty spoke to him out of the whirlwind, and he stood face to face with infinite holiness, he said, "I abhor myself and repent in sackcloth and ashes." And that is one of the marks that you are becoming sanctified. It is that feeling of deep humility, that sense of your unworthiness, that absence of all proud assurance, arrogance, boastfulness; that lowliness of mind and heart that would enable Paul, the nearer and nearer he got to holiness, to say, "I am the chief of sinners." He would see his own littleness and unworthiness the nearer he got to God. But to meet an objection, consider another scripture. It is alleged that the scriptures which I have cited are all balanced by this scripture, where John says, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." Well, if we take that language absolutely in the sense they allege, then it means that there is no such thing as sanctification in contradistinction from regeneration at all, and that not simply one man is sanctified, but every Christian is sanctified. It would not mean that one here and one yonder has attained to a sinless perfection, but it would mean that everyone is sinless and perfect who has become a child of God at all. That is self-evident. Now then, as it would mean too much in that it would destroy the very distinction that those who claim to be sinlessly perfect are seeking to establish, and wipe out all lines of demarcation between the children of God-therefore it cannot be used in this connection. In that connection, John speaks of sinning unto death, and he says, "There is a sin which is unto death and there is a sin which is not unto death, and whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." Hence it may mean that whosoever is born of God cannot commit that sin that is unto death-that is, the unpardonable sin-but he may commit sin which is not unto death. But you are not forced even to take that interpretation of it, but you may take the interpretation held by many pious men, that when John says that whosoever is born of God cannot sin, it means that the inward spiritual man, though a sin is committed, that the inner man never consented to it. It may mean that, as when he says, "It is no longer I that do it, but sin that remaineth in me." It is susceptible of that interpretation, or as others plausibly allege, it may mean that whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin habitually, i.e., as a rule of life. So that there are many ways of explaining that particular passage of scripture without putting it in the pathway of the unmistakable declarations which I have read. To recapitulate: First, I answered the question when it started. Then I showed what it was an unfolding and developing of the principle of life imparted in regeneration, then how it is unfolded, and what principles operated in the unfolding.

Now, in conclusion, I squarely meet the question as to its consummation. When is it consummated? For that every one of God’s children will one day be wholly sanctified, I haven’t a shadow of doubt, but the question is, when? I will ask Paul to answer. He says: "Brethren, I have not yet attained it, neither count I myself yet perfect. Not yet. But there is one thing I do. I forget the

things which are behind, and I press forward to the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. I am going after that." What is that high calling? What is the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus? It is that your spirit is to be made absolutely perfect, and that your body is to be made absolutely perfect, and that the united and glorified spirit and body, so made perfect, shall be without spot, or blemish or wrinkle, or any such thing, in the presence of God.

Now, then, when? In Hebrews 12:1-29 we find an answer to a part of it. Paul says to these Hebrews, "You are coming (you are not there yet, but you are coming) to God, the Judge, to an innumerable company of angels, to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the spirits of the just made perfect." Where? Yonder. You are not there. Yonder the spirit of the saint is made perfect.

I mean to say that when the soul of the Christian is separated from his body, that spirit is then perfected and so enters heaven. This side of death you cannot find it. The other side of death you see it and you are invited to approach unto it. But this is only a part of sanctification. The marriage has not come yet, and the marriage will not come until the whole man is without spot, or blemish, or wrinkle, or any such thing.

Well, when is the rest of it consummated? Paul says, "Behold, I shew you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." Here is the change that takes place in the bodies of those that shall be alive when Christ comes. Those who live at that time, the Christians who are alive when He comes, instantly experience a change, a marvelous change of body. Corruption puts on incorruption, and mortality puts on immortality. Death is swallowed up in victory, and the body is glorified and made like unto the glorified body of our Lord. At the same time, the bodies of those spirits made perfect the spirits perfect in heaven and their bodies imperfect in the dust-then the omnipotent power of God passes upon the realms of death, and wakes the sleeping saints. They rise; they go forth; they put on immortality and glory; and there is the sanctified body. Now Christ brings with Him, says the Scripture, the. sanctified spirit when He comes, and puts the sanctified spirit into the glorified body, and then, and never until then, is sanctification completed. Then ring the bells of heaven. The marriage is come and the bride is made ready. There is now no blemish in her. There is no spot in her. She is unblamable in holiness, then, at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and then presented. Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, that He might present it to himself as without blemish, or spot or wrinkle or any such thing, unblamable in holiness. That is the Bible doctrine upon that subject, and it is a glorious and a wonderful doctrine. But it is a sad thing that the minds of children should be poisoned with a view that would make a sinful man, yea, even while he is lying, claim to be sinlessly perfect. It is an awful thing. Brethren, I do think that there ought to be a waking up such as has not been in our history, upon the subject of teaching the true doctrines of God to our children. The older I become, the more the importance of the Sunday School rises in my sight. You ought not to permit one single child that comes to the Sunday School to be ignorant of what is sanctification. He ought not to have to go out without armor to meet an adversary on the streets or anywhere else. He ought to be taught what is sanctification, when it commences, how it is unfolded, what are the principles by which it is accomplished, and when it is consummated in spirit, and when it is consummated in body.

What a grand lesson would that be, and yet, how few of our young people know anything about it! To me sanctification is one of the sweetest and holiest doctrines of the Book of God. Spiritually oftentimes it makes me almost faint with desire. Lord Jesus, I want to be perfectly holy. I want to be pure in my heart and in my body. I want to get rid of all defilement, all sin. I want the war between my spirit and my flesh to come to an end in which victory shall be counted with the saints of God.

Chapter 94

# S. THE WAY OF CAIN

THE WAY OF CAIN

TEXT: Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. - Jude 1:11. The author of this letter was a half brother of our Lord Jesus Christ, as was also James, author of another New Testament letter. In His lifetime the half brothers of our Lord did not believe on Him as the Savior, but were converted by the cross and the resurrection and later became very prominent in the church. Paul refers to them and their standing. One of them became the pastor of the First Church at Jerusalem, and presided at the famous conference recorded in Acts 15:1-41; the other is the author of this letter. The object of the letter is thus stated: "When I was giving all diligence, to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that you should contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." The letter then is an exhortation to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. The occasion of it is thus stated: "There are certain men crept in unawares who were before ordained unto this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our Lord into lasciviousness and denying the only Lord God, our Lord Jesus Christ." Mark well this occasion. There had crept into the church men who denied not merely the divinity of Jesus Christ, but the necessity of the death of Jesus Christ as the ground of redemption.

Now as the author of this letter had obtained his salvation through faith, excited not by the life but by the death of our Lord, as he himself found salvation in Jesus Christ dying upon the cross, he regarded that as the faith once delivered to the saints, and held it needful that he should himself contend earnestly for it and exhort others to like contention, evidently regarding it as fundamental and vital, in both its doctrinal and practical form. It was treason to deny His divinity and His sacrificial purchase-it was slander and sacrilege to turn this grace into lasciviousness. But note particularly that to deny the divine purchase as a doctrine, or to wrest its grace into an excuse for lawlessness, is here called "going in the way of Cain." The passage, therefore, flashes great light upon the brief and obscure Old Testament record of Cain. In this light we see the life and sin and ruin of Cain, and by contrast, the life and righteousness and glory of Abel. It is first of all worthy of remark, that Jude’s comment makes the Genesis account of Cain and Abel a simple, straightforward historical transaction. Indeed it seems impossible to credit any man with any proper respect for the New Testament who persists in regarding the book of Genesis as an allegory, myth or poetry. The New Testament treats Cain and Abel as real persons, actually doing what is attributed to them in the Genesis narration. They were sons of Adam and Eve, the first human pair. They did, according to revealed law, come up before God with offerings. There must have been a law prescribing it, obedience to which was righteousness. One offering was accepted ¾ the other rejected. God himself discriminated and testified. Because of the divine discrimination, Cain was exceedingly angry. His anger burned also against his brother, even unto murder. I suppose there were many children and grandchildren at this time-thousands, doubtless; there could have been easily half a million ¾ and this transaction made such a solemn impression that

in the fifth generation after, we find a descendant of Cain quoting what God says about Cain: that whosoever slew Cain should be avenged seven-fold. And this wicked man was drawing a deduction from it. His deduction was that if God would avenge seven-fold one who slew Cain, who without provocation killed his brother, then He ought to avenge seventy-fold anybody that slew him for killing one who had grievously injured him, and wounded and bruised him. That was the argument of Lamech. The first impression then that ought to be received by our minds is, that the account in Genesis is a simple, historical transaction, or you simply reject both Testaments. You adopt an arbitrary method of interpreting the Bible which has no fixed boundaries. Turn away from the simple, straightforward story of fact and begin to treat it as legend or poetry, and you break down all barriers in your treatment of the Bible, and leave nothing certain concerning anything that is in it. It is infidelity to treat the Bible that way, even though the man be president of a theological seminary. The next thing necessary to an understanding of this transaction is what is called the right of primogeniture. It has had a great deal of influence in this world. There is scarcely a nation upon the face of the earth but has today the impress of the ancient law of primogeniture. By it kings rule and dynasties are established. To get at it a little more clearly, in the early days of the world's history, in what is called the patriarchal dispensation, the first-born was the head of the house. All authority was vested in him. He was, first, the ruler, just as Abraham was ruler over all his household. The second point is that by the right of birth he was the priest of the family. It became him to make the offerings for the family. The book of Job refers to patriarchal times, and Job says that he made an offering for his children lest even unthoughtedly they should have committed a sin against God. The power of ruling men, the power lodged in the priesthood, for the head of the family was both head and priest and ruler, was so great a power that some of the most remarkable struggles mentioned in the Bible have reference to this primogeniture-business. What was the trouble between Ishmael and Isaac but this? Hagar fondly imagined that Ishmael should have the right of primogeniture, and when Isaac was born, born of the true wife and not the bondwoman, and his birthday celebrated as being the birthday of one who was the head of the house and the future priest, just as a king celebrated the birth of the prince who is to succeed him, Ishmael mocked at the whole proceeding, and persecuted the infant child whose title to the primogeniture was thus publicly recognized.

You remember the story of Jacob and Esau. What was the issue between them? They were twins. The issue was, who should have the right of primogeniture? Who should be the head of the house? Who should have the right to rule? Who should be the priest of the family? Esau irreverently sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. God, however, had predetermined that the birthright should vest in Jacob and not in Esau. This brings us to the third and greatest point involved in it. The original significance of the primogeniture was this. That in that line the seed of the woman to bruise the serpent's head should come, and this office became important on account of the expectation that any firstborn son might be the one appointed of God for the redemption of the world, and he was to have sovereignty, not only over his own immediate family, but over the whole world. The seed of the woman should become earth's future deliverer and Savior.

I mention one other historical incident to illustrate it. Reuben was the first born of Jacob, and the Scriptures show us when, where and how he lost his birthright. By that great sin which he committed against his father the birthright was taken away from Reuben and vested in Judah.

Now let us read again in order to see what the issue was between Cain and Abel: "And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground. And in the process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord, and Abel, he also brought the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering."

Literally, the Lord kindled; as it is implied in other places, he sent down fire to consume the offering; or, as it is expressed in the letter to the Hebrews, God testified; He tested by fire that this was the right kind of an offering, an offering of the firstlings of his flock, an offering which pointed to the redemption that should come from the blood of the Lamb. "By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." "But unto Cain and his offering He had not respect."

There were the two offerings. Fire was burning that Abel made. The offering of Cain was disregarded. He stood there and looked at it. Why was he angered? Why did his countenance fall? Let us read the next verse and see: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" Or, rendered according to some of the best Hebraists in the world: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not have the excellency? That is, shalt thou not have the right of primogeniture, and unto thee shall be thy brother’s desire and thou shalt rule over him." When God said that to Cain what did He mean? He meant to show Cain that he had misconceived what followed from that transaction of God’s accepting one and rejecting the other. Cain understood the preference for Abel’s offering to indicate that he had lost the right of primogeniture; that he was not to have the rule over his brother; that he was not to be the priest in that family. His countenance fell, and he was very angry.

God said to him, "If you do well, you shall not lose this position of rule. If you do well, you shall retain the priesthood in your family. And if you do not well, a sinoffering lies at the door. You have brought me the fruit of the ground. I have required a sin-offering. I have required the firstling of the flock that shall point to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Here in the presence of your rejected sacrifice, and when your right of primogeniture is hanging in the balance, and is about to he taken away from you forever, I show you how it may be retained. Go, bring the right offering, and the desire of thy brother shall be unto you, and thou shall rule over him."

Cain refused to do it. There had come an eventful time in his history. He had determined in his heart that he would not seek the forgiveness of God as a sinner whose sins were to be expiated vicariously. What does it mean? It meant that he denied the Lord. It meant that he stood as a deist. He denied the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head. He denied that he needed any atonement, but he stood upon his own record before God, and not as a sinner at all.

Now, says Jude, the author of our text, "When I was about to write to you concerning our common salvation, I found it necessary that I should exhort you to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." Why? "Certain men have crept in unawares that deny the Lord Jesus Christ, that deny the necessity for any atonement for sin, and they have gone in the way of Cain." Which shows that there in the first family Cain went the way of the deist. Cain denied the necessity of an atonement. Cain would not offer of the blood of the firstling of the flock unto God. And there was also the way of Abel. By faith in the coming Messiah, in the seed of the woman that was to bruise the serpent’s head, in the One by whose shed blood the remission of sins should come, by faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, and God testified of his gift, and by that

sacrifice Abel being dead yet speaketh.

Now that we have before us the reason of the hatred of Cain for Abel, to what purpose does one read the history of royal families if he fails to note their jealousy of each other, and how, when one stands nearest in the line of succession, he becomes instantly the object of hate, of stratagem, of every kind of conspiracy? How often has the assassin's knife sought to win the way to a place of rule, of power! How, like a mounting devil is this ambition to rule, to have supremacy! And when that man stood before God's altar and saw the right of primogeniture being wrested from him; when, like Reuben, unstable as water, his birthright goes to Judah; when, like Esau, irreverent and profane, it was sold for a mess of pottage; when, like Ishmael, the son of a bondwoman, that yet coveted it and persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, so in this case Cain determined to kill the one that was to have the rule, the one that was to be the priest unto God.

We now come to a sad thought. What is it? That whenever a man is out of proper relation with God, that man gets out of proper relation with his brother, with his fellow men. And I Wish to say here today that no scheme of socialism that leaves

God out can succeed in its object. Herbert Spencer may write on the subject until his pen drops from his pulseless fingers, and John Stuart Mill and other humanitarians may attempt to devise their schemes of even justice to our fellow men until Gabriel blows the trumpet that announces the judgment, and it will yet always remain true that there can be no right feeling toward our fellow men when our feeling toward God is lost. Bottomed upon harmony with God is all hope of harmony with our fellow men.

Whoever in his heart turns away from the offering of Jesus Christ may seek cheap fame by telling how he will work for the amelioration of the human race, but the fact remains that into the thinnest air vanish all such vain dreams of benefiting men when we reject the gift of God. Cain, being astray from God, hates his brother. Mass together the regular and disciplined armies of the Old World; let the million of Russia join the million of Prussia, and the million of France and the possible 750,000 of Italy; add to them the standing army and navy of England; and you never can by bayonets coerce humanity. You plant your cannon on a thin crest of a volcano and each jar that comes may break the crest and precipitate an eruption that shall sweep down every barrier that human might interposes against the excesses of a maddened populace. There is no hope for government nor for society when you break the bonds that unite to God.

Mark you, how God deals with this man before he is forever rejected. He expostulates with him and points out to him how he may retain his high estate. As if He said, "I will not send the fire of acceptance upon the mere fruits of the earth when you deny the Lord God, who is to purchase your salvation. When you turn away from expiation for sin you cannot come into my court. But if you do well you shall have the excellency. I will not depose you. The desire of your brother shall be unto you, and you shall rule over him. The sin-offering lies at the door." And see him turn and look upon the firstling of the flock and hesitate in the presence of one sacrifice smoking, and one unaccepted, and the whole future of his life resting upon his decision: "Shall I bring this lamb and offer it upon the altar and say I am a sinner? If I come before God, I come as a sinner. If I come before God I must come seeking remission of my sins in the blood of the Lamb that is offered. Or shall I thwart God?"

Well, he made his decision. The record says that he told Abel about it. Now imagine that conversation! "Abel, God tells me that if I will do like you do ¾ if I will offer a lamb I shall not lose my right of primogeniture; I shall be the priest; I shall have rule over you. He intimates that if I do not do this you will have the rule over me. Now I see a way out of it ¾ I will kill you. When I have smitten you down, how can you rule over me? When I have taken your life, how can you enjoy any right of primogeniture? Here is a way to evade God's requirements. I will not offer the lamb. I will not submit to Abel. I will not be deposed. I will fight for my rights. I will kill the usurper who would take my place." Who told him that? Who suggested that move? "He was of that wicked one." The same serpent that beguiled his mother spun his fine web of sophistry around the feet and hands of Cain and entangled him in a net of delusion that by a short road of murder he could defeat the purposes of God and hold on to his primogeniture. And so he rose up against his brother and slew him. Now imagine him dragging him into some thicket and washing his hands and saying, "Who is the priest now? Who has the rule now? I will go back and make an offering. Who saw me do this? I will go back and see if there is another altar to gather the fire of acceptance to my offering." So he comes up before the Lord to make his offering by himself. There is just one man this time, not two. And he builds his altar, puts his fire on it and from out the Shekinah God speaks: "Where is thy brother?" As has been said by a distinguished minister of South Carolina, "If there was anything on this earth that Cain did know it was where his brother was. If there was one spot more localized in his brain than any other it was that bloody spot that was sucking up his brother's blood. If there was one place on this earth that never left his sight, on which more light blazed than any other, it was the place where the dead body of his brother lay." But listen at him: "I know not." The bold, brazen liar! "I know not where is my brother. You have made him head of the house. You have appointed him as my priest. Now, am I my brother's keeper?" You see what his object was. His object was that when he came to offer again, and not again offering the lamb, with his brother being nowhere, and he not being responsible to produce him, God would be bound to accept his primogeniture. And thus are men today, thousands of men, who have just that kind of light; that really believe, or at least persuade themselves that they believe, that they can go contrary to the plain teaching of God's Word and yet be saved, and that they can remove the obstacles out of their way with a high hand. Now let us see if he gained the primogeniture. God said to him, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth out to me from the ground. You have been a tiller of the ground. Now I tell you that you are accursed from the ground. The earth has been made sick with the blood of thy brother. That earth shall not yield her fruit to thee. Thou shalt cultivate it in vain. Thou thoughtest to usurp the rule and the priesthood. Thou shalt never come into my presence again. Thou shalt never establish an altar. Thou shalt be a fugitive. Thou shalt be a wanderer."

See the two thoughts: One fleeing and one wandering; always on the wing; always at unrest; never having a fixed habitation, and "my face no more forever shall you see. Go out from my presence."

Now let us see what Cain said to that: "My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the ground. I had been making a living as a farmer. Thou hast cursed me from the ground. My brother's blood on the ground has dried up its fertility toward me, and from thy face shall I be hid. I will never be able to pray again; never to go where God dwelt eastward of the Garden of Eden between the cherubim and kept the way to the tree of life. Never to approach the place where prayer is wont to be made and sacrifice for sin is offered.

From thy face I shall be hid and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer in the earth, and it shall come to pass that whosoever findeth me shall slay me."

You remember the tribal law, that if one killed another there was an avenger of blood, the next of kin, and that avenger of blood could smite the murderer wherever he found him. And there was not yet appointed a city of refuge unto which the murderer could fly. And Cain reasoned, "I can never be still. If I lie down at night I can hear the barking of the dogs of pursuit. If I rise up in the morning, I shall hear the shouts of the huntsmen of man. Wherever I go I shall expect to see the sword drawn to smite me and the avenger on my track, shouting, 'Blood! Blood! Blood! Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed!'" And God says, "No, not that. That does not apply to your case, not your case. No need to summon the sheriff when the unpardonable sin is committed. No need to invoke the puny arm of human law when God Almighty smites. I will put such a mark on you; I will establish such a sign, that the most indignant man on the earth that will see you will sheath his sword and say, 'Let him go. God hath smitten him. He is in the hands of the Almighty. See him fly. See him wander. See the traces of despair in his face. See the man that cannot pray, and is not allowed to come into the presence of God. Banished forever! Oh, who will attempt to put one drop in the cup of wrath that God has mixed and pressed to those pale lips of despair? Let him go. He has God's mark on him.'" And as the brand in the French courts fastened upon the flesh the stigma, the ineffaceable stigma of shame, that told to every one that looked upon it, "This is a convict doomed to the galleys and outcast from men," so this mark of God announced, "Whosoever shall attempt to kill Cain, I will avenge his death seven fold." Kill him! Why, who would raise a gun to shoot at the rich man in hell? What orphan that he ever defrauded, what poor man whose hard labor was unrequited, what weak man that he had ground under his tyrannical feet, would come up to the precipice of hell and look where the flames wrap him and behold the scorpions stinging him and the undying worm devouring him, would shoot at him? He is in the hands of God.

I speak to the young people here today, and particularly to the young people who are fascinated with the intellectual attainments that have startled the world; who are disposed to pay the tribute to mere human genius, and because a thing is smart, because it is well said, because it is grammatical and rhetorical, because it is daring, you admire the authors, be their names ¾ Tyndall, Huxley, Spencer, Darwin, Ingersoll, or what not, though they deny the Lord Jesus Christ and the necessity for an atonement.

O young people, see the first man that went that way! Will you go in the way of Cain? I ask you, go and stand where that road forks. See where Abel's feet led to a Redeemer. See where Cain's turned aside to wander in endless despair. Hear him cry out, "My punishment is greater that I can bear. Earth has spewed me out of her mouth. Man turns away from me. God's face is hid from me. Deep and dark and endless hell waits for me. I am accursed from above and below and all around." Oh, see the way of Cain! That way whose steps take hold on death and hell. I ask you if you want to walk in it. The brother of Jesus, the brother who himself for a while walked in the way of Cain and did not believe in a Redeemer, yet who was converted as he looked upon Christ as the Lamb of God, with the sins of the world on Him and found Him to be his Savior, says, "I exhort you to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. Beware of those who have crept in unawares and that deny the Lord Jesus Christ, and that have gone in the way of Cain. Follow them not. Follow them not."

It may be fashionable, but it is deadly. It may give you an air, of singularity and oddity. It may call forth the plaudits of the-thoughtless and-the foolish and the scornful and the ungodly, but it is the way of Cain. It leads down to eternal death. Jude, our Lord's brother, piled up image on image in warning, as in the fiery stream of exhortation he appealed to men not to take that road. Look at his images; a tree, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; ocean foaming out her shame, in vain trying to batter down the granite barriers with which God stayed her encroachments and said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther." See these waves dashing out their own shame. See yonder brilliant meteor flashing across the sky for a moment and going out into darkness; wandering stars, look at them. Clouds without rain; wells without water. Oh, walk not in the way of Cain!

I close with this application of the exhortation of Jude: That if you do not wish to be a fugitive and a wanderer, if you do not wish to have God's face hidden from you forever, if you do not wish to perish utterly, then do not go that road at all. Count these men as the enemies of God and the enemies of their fellow men, that under the guise of learning or philosophy would beguile young men to walk in the way of Cain; Satan's advocates, Satan's advertisers, Satan's couriers, Satan's panderers. They stand at the forks of that road and say, "Young men, walk in the way of Cain. Deny the Lord Jesus Christ. Deny the necessity of the atonement. Deny that you are a sinner. Deny that you need any blood shed for the remission of your sins; walk this road."

Now, these men, with. all their high sounding claims, are themselves as blind as a bat. Satan has put thick bandages around their eyes. They are the blind leading the blind. They pride themselves on the fact that they offer you liberty when they themselves are the slaves of corruption. What man in bondage can make another one free? What slave can confer freedom? The truth of God alone can make you a free man in Jesus Christ.

Turn away from them. I tell you their shadows are baleful. Their communications are corrupt. Their beguiling came authoritatively from the wicked one himself, and they are but the plagiarists of the devil's doctrine when they ask you to walk in the way of Cain. They may call it nineteenth century light. It is not light at all, but darkness all over. It came from the devil. It was whispered in the ear of Eve. It became the guiding influence of Cain and led him to become a fugitive and a wanderer, and it will make you a fugitive, and your lips one day will be parted with this despairing cry, "My punishment is greater that I can bear."

Oh, may God, in tender mercy to you, lead you to walk where Abel walked, a better path. He being dead yet speaketh. Cold is the corpse where the murderer shrouded thee, thou younger brother; all still and pulseless thy dead body lies; but Abel spoke, and not only God in heaven heard his voice when it cried to him, but ever since that time men hear the voice of Abel: "To the right! To the right! Keep to the right! Walk up to the altar of sacrifice, where the blood of the Lamb is shed, and heaven's approving fire comes down, and find peace and redemption and remission of sins." Oh! hear the voice of Abel! Let us pray.

# S. THE WAY OF THE CROSS

THE WAY OF THE CROSS

TEXT: Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. - Romans 10:1-3. My mind has been wonderfully impressed with the appropriateness of this scripture for this night's service, from a very touching conversation that I have had this evening with one who for years has been trying to be a Christian, and in that trial has been baptized, and has been confirmed, and has partaken of the Lord's Supper, and has studied the Word of God, and taught in the Sunday School, and yet, all the time, has been afflicted with a sense of deep dissatisfaction with the attainment reached. And every now and then the darkest doubts have come into her mind: "Is there anything in this? Why is it that I do not get any personal enjoyment out of it? Why is it that I have no sense of sins forgiven, no peace, no rest? I try very hard, and I pray and I double my duties, but I do not make any progress, and the thought has come to me that I might just as well quit the whole thing."

Now, that is the substance of the conversation held today. I felt an intense longing to offer a prayer for that one, just as Paul felt it here ¾ "My heart's desire." O, how keenly I felt the desire that she should be saved, for I saw that she was unsaved. And how earnestly my spirit spontaneously prayed, "Lord God, may not this one be saved? See what a zeal. See what a disposition to do. See what a long-continued effort and how zealously she has busied herself to establish a righteousness that would be acceptable to God. And every time she builds her house up, it falls down; and she tries it again, and rebuilds it, and it falls again; and her religion is full of holes, and there is nothing personal in it."

Unfortunately this is not the only case. But a week ago an inquirer came to me in great trouble. Our conversation was about as follows:

Pastor: "What troubles you?"

Inquisitor: "I have been attending this meeting. I cannot fail to see that there is some great power here at work. But what troubles me most, I see plainly these people have something I never had. What is it? Why cannot I feel it, too?"

Pastor: "Tell me your Christian experience."

Inquisitor: "Well, about sixteen years ago I joined the church and -"

Pastor: "Excuse me, you misunderstand; I knew you were a prominent member of one of the city churches. Tell me what exercises of your mind led you to join the church?" Inquisitor: "Oh, as to that! When I began to be a young man I had some thought about religion. It seemed to me people ought to live right. So I made up my mind to live right, and thinking I could best live right in the church, and by taking hold of church work, I joined the church and commenced earnestly to try to

save my soul. I soon became a very active church member and was naturally put forward when any one was needed to lead. That was sixteen years ago. In all that time I have been honest, earnest and persistent in my efforts. But while people praise my zeal, I have no comfort inside. What so many of your people show in their very faces is a stranger to me."

Pastor: "My dear friend, you are all wrong. You started wrong and have been going wrong ever since. Let me show you the way."

Let me say to you tonight, and in all solemnity, that there are a great many people here in Waco in that condition. They have a zeal toward God. They are willing to do a great many things, and they do a great many things; and if, in order to attain the peace of mind that they desire, it should be necessary to get up before sunrise, go down to the church, kneel on the floor, and pray one hundred prayers in succession, they would do that. They are very much like the poor Hindu, described by one of the missionaries, who set out from a far distant point to reach the sacred Ganges river, believing that if ever that river could be reached, and the devotee could bathe once in its waters, that peace could be found for the troubled conscience; and in order to invest the journey with all possible merit, the shoes were filled with little spikes, so that every step that was taken was full of pain, and the blood flowed from the pierced feet; and when he could no longer walk he got down on his knees, and when his knees were bruised by the stones in the way, he crawled-"I will do anything in the world just to get to that river, and bathe in it and find peace to my conscience."

It is a distressing thing to see people in that condition; with that will-worship; with that busying of themselves to establish some sort of a meritorious ground upon which they can receive from God forgiveness of sins and the salvation of their souls. Sometimes under this desire, if any one in whom they have confidence, will prescribe it, they will fast for ten days, eating just a bare crust, and drinking only a little water; and then if it be necessary, they will scourge their bodies every night. And not only that, but they are willing to devote any part of their property, if by that means they can obtain a ransom for their souls. How full of zeal! How full of sacrifice!

We will look at the, case mentioned in this particular context. Here were people that had before them a law, which says, "Do and live." Here are the commandments written on tables of stone: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me; thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image; thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; thou shalt remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy; thou shalt not covet; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not lie." They look at them; they memorize them; and they say, "Here is the standard of life. Whosoever doeth these things shall live by it." And not satisfied with that they cover these commandments with traditions of men, rites and ceremonies and ten thousand little things. They tithe, not the great part of the property only, but with the greatest niceness and scrupulousness, go into the garden and take a tenth part of the mint and of the anise and of the cummin. They will even tithe to the ninth part of a hair, lest by leaving out some little thing the chain of obedience shall be broken and the soul shall be lost.

Now that was the condition of the people for whom the apostle felt this great desire that they should be saved. "O, that they might be saved." And his prayer, "Lord God, let them be saved."

I want to speak to you tonight very earnestly and very clearly about God’s method of saving souls, and show you that the method that has been described in no sense, in no case, attains unto

salvation. It is imperfect in its motives; it is imperfect in its deeds; it is imperfect in every part of it. It can never justify any soul in the sight of God. And let us see why. In the first place these people, though they live in our towns, though they hear the gospel preached (or at least what is called the gospel), every Sunday, are very ignorant. I do not mean it offensively-I speak it plainly, as dealing with questions of salvation. They are- profoundly ignorant, and it requires one a long time to realize just how ignorant they .are. They have knowledge about a great many things, but as to God's method of saving souls, they are as ignorant as a babe. They are ignorant of God's righteousness, of the kind of righteousness that shall justify a man at the judgement bar. They know nothing about it and hence, religion, after a while, becomes wearisome to them.

What a weariness it is! How tiresome! How long is this to last? How many more pilgrimages must I make? How many more sacrifices must I lay upon the alter? How many more beads must I count? How many more things, piled up already as high as a mountain are necessary to put me in a condition to stand before God justified, and not condemned, in the day when God shall judge the world by the one whom He has ordained? It is like trying to climb to the skies. It is like trying to fathom the depths of the ocean. There is no end to it. And then, it is bondage. It is the work of a slave. It is serving God with an eye to the Master's scourge; if you leave out one little thing the lash will descend upon you and the thunders of the Law will reach you and your soul will be lost. ¾ And the conscience is continually distressed, and crying out for "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."

I want you to pray for such people. They need your prayers. Every good man and woman in this house ought to offer up an earnest prayer to God that any one that has chosen that laborious way, that awfully burdensome route, may be saved. They are going in the wrong direction. They are failing, not only to attain to that which they seek, but are adding thorns and pains of anguish to themselves every foot of the weary pilgrimage that they make. O, that they might be saved!

They, being ignorant of God's righteousness, notwithstanding all that they do, there is one thing that they have not done. They have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. They have not come to God and said, "Lord, what is thy plan of justifying men and women? How may my soul be saved? How can I find in my conscience a sense of sins forgiven so that there shall be a witness in me, and that I may be a personal witness to the fact of redemption, and that I may say, God has forgiven my sins and I am saved? How can this be obtained?"

Paul then presents the true plan. He takes the law of God, and without diminishing one jot or tittle of its claim, but magnifying those claims, making them more exacting than this troubled soul has ever seen, making the commandments broader than they have ever been to the mind and conscience of the one who has trembled before them. There is no diminution of the commandments of God, but he presents as a method of justification, Christ Jesus. He says that Christ is the end of the Law, no matter how long it is. He is the end of it for righteousness to every one that believeth. Whether rich or poor, great or small, if you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and accept Him, you are saved. And you may meet any form of the Divine Law, and hold between you and the claims of that Law what Christ has done, and the Law cannot touch you. Its exactions are met in Christ. Its claims are satisfied in Him and it cannot harm you.

Now I want to see if I cannot get that thought before you, for it is the supreme thought of the plan of salvation. You are not asked to go up to heaven-climb up there. You are not asked to go to the

bottom of the ocean. Not that. But you are asked to look at the plan which God has provided, and the person by whom your soul is to be saved. Now listen to this scripture: "I deliver unto you that which I also received; how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried and that He was raised again."

There are three great facts which help to constitute the gospel. It is the gospel, that Christ, according to the Scriptures, died for our sins and was buried, and rose again from the dead. These are the principal facts upon which the gospel rests. And now let us see if we cannot get hold of these facts and make a personal application of them to ourselves.

First, we are sinners. Do you subscribe to that? I press that question on you. Have you been just? Have you kept the requirements of God's law? Have you fully kept them? In the searching vision of God himself are there not, even with you, some sins against the Lord, your God? When you look down into your heart can you say, "I have kept this commandment, 'thou shalt not kill'?" You say, "Yes, I never killed anybody." Let us see. "Whoever hateth Isis brother is a murderer:' God's law looks at the thought which precedes the act of the killing. It judges the intent of the mind. It goes to the bottom of things, so that it deals with the springs of things, the germs out of which they grow into action; and if you have in your mind, not in deed, but if you have in your mind longed to do anything that is forbidden in that law, you have violated it. You stand, then, before that law a sinner, and your conscience tells you that you are a sinner. You come with that plea on your lips, "I am a sinner against the Divine Law."

Now I ask you: What is your plan of making atonement and satisfaction to that violated law? Is it by anything that you can do? Think! What can you do that will put back again the broken law? I want to use a very familiar illustration, and one that has been used oftentimes before, but it aptly expresses the precise thought here that I wish to impress on your minds. A child was sent to the city, trusted with money, to buy a very costly and fragile vase, and carefully charged to have it packed safely in a basket, and to bring it back very carefully; without stopping by the way. But on his way home be meets another boy, who has a new ball, which he commences to bounce in sight ¾ the eager sight ¾ of the boy with the basket, and saying, "Don't you want to bounce my new ball?" And he says, "I would like to, but I am charged here with a trust and I have promised not to stop; but I will bounce it once." So he puts down his basket and bounces the ball, and becomes absorbed and forgets, and directly the ball strikes the basket, knocks it over, and breaks the vase all to pieces. It is broken.

He looks at the disaster. He is filled with regret. He begins to weep. He realizes the damage has been done, and the first thing he tries to do, is to take those broken, pieces and put them together again. And there he is, taking it, piece by piece, in his fingers, and trying to adjust them, and he gets the bottom of it right, and then he puts one piece up and holds it with his left hand, and adjusts another piece, but when he turns that loose to get another, the first falls; and he tries again, but cannot make the shattered edges fit. It is so badly broken it cannot be put together again; and as the fruitlessness of the undertaking strikes his mind he weeps in despair, "What shall I do?" His father comes along and finds him in that condition, and says, "Son, what is the matter?" So he tells his father the whole story. The father asks, "Why don't you put it together again?" "I have tried but I cannot." "Well, what are you going to do about it?" "I don't know." And he begins to cry again. And the father says, "If you stay here and cry all night will it put that vase back

again? Can any amount of tears that you can shed ever put that back again?" And at once he sees that no drops of grief that he can shed can replace what is broken. The father takes out his check book and draws a check for the amount of that vase and hands it to his son. "Now will you take this and go down to the bank and present it? You need not say a word. Just put it in at the teller's window and he will pay you the money on it; then go and buy another vase." "What, this piece of paper?" "Yes, that piece of paper." The boy looks at it earnestly and directly begins to believe what his father has said. His mind begins to take in that there is something written on that paper that will replace the damage which he has done. And as he trusts to that he dries his eyes; his burden is gone; he weeps no more. He rushes with rapid feet down to the bank, presents the, paper and draws the money and buys another vase and comes home rejoicing.

Now, that substituted work of another is the end of the damage. It replaces everything. He paid nothing for it; he could do nothing toward it; and he might have wept and cried for a year and it could not have touched the question of putting back the broken vase.

Well, now, that is the way people come to the law of God, broken in a thousand pieces, broken a thousand times, and they say, "I am sorry; God will forgive me because I am sorry." How can He? How can sorrow make atonement? How can any amount of contrition of any kind meet the claims of a law that has been violated? There must be satisfaction rendered, and that satisfaction must be complete; it must meet the case. And so, when Paul saw these people busying themselves, going about to establish their own righteousness, and their houses toppling down as fast as they built them up, crying and striving, weeping and groaning, adding burden to burden and labor to labor, and never reaching unto the end desired, his soul was filled with deep concern that they were wasting their lives in a profitless undertaking. And hence he presented to them the Lord Jesus Christ after this manner: God saw you were lost. He saw that the vase of your happiness was shivered in fragments. He saw that you were under the condemnation of His violated law, and He loved you, not because you were good, for you were bad. He did not love you because you were righteous; He loved you as sinners. He did not love you because you were going to be Godly, and while you were ungodly and utterly powerless to justify yourself in the sight of God, Jesus came. And He says, "Put that to my account. I will pay that." How will He pay it? "I will come into the world just as that man came into the world; I will come as a little babe. I will grow up as a boy. I will become a grown man. I will keep every iota of the supreme law of God without failing in one single particular, and my righteousness will be spotless; there will be no infraction, and when it is finished, my life is ended and the microscope of justice is put upon the most minute thought of my life, upon the most insignificant action of my life, there shall be found no flaw in it."

Holy - holy as God is holy-was the life of the Lord Jesus Christ here upon the earth. There it was, completed, finished -not an additional stitch needed. No man living could add anything to its perfection; in every part of it, it was perfect; and the law of God, looking at it, could find no lack of absolute conformity to the most scrutinizing requirement of the law. That is one part of it. And now there is a righteousness that is perfect, that comes up to the standard. "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." There it is. Look at it. Can you find anything wrong in it? As He himself said to His enemies, "Who of you convicteth me of any sin? Did I sin against my Father? Did I sin against my mother? And even back of that, when I came into the world, did I come into the world with a depraved nature? No. I was not of the seed of man. I was born holy, as no man is born. 'That Holy One, born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." The Holy Ghost overshadowed

His mother and He started holy, and lived holy, and died holy. It was an absolutely spotless righteousness. There it was.

Now comes this question: You want to have that put to the credit of a sinner, who stands guilty before the Law; that will make him righteous; but how is that going to pay the penalty of the Law? The Law has said: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Now, if Jesus Christ had sinned in thought even; any one time in His life, then His death, in our stead, could not have atoned for us, because the law of God required that the victim offered should be without spot or blemish. If He had ever violated one jot or tittle of the law of God in thought, or word or deed, He would have been rejected as an offering to be presented in the place of a sinner. But His life having been perfect, the Lamb having been examined and having been found without spot or blemish, then, that One having no sin of His own to atone for, having been perfectly righteous himself, He can come in and take the place of another if He chooses to do it, and as a vicarious victim, die for him. According to the Scriptures, Christ died for our sins; the iniquity of us all was put on Him. God made Him to be a sin-offering, who, himself, knew no sin, in order that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

Then how am I to be saved? Am I to be saved by saying ten prayers a day, by counting a thousand beads, by paying a thousand dollars, by endowing a school, by building a church, by inflicting chastisement upon my body? How am I to be saved? If I am to be justified in the sight of God, I must be justified in this righteousness imputed to me and in no other way. Therefore it is said that "by the works of the Law shall no man be justified." No man, no woman. Coming to us He says, "Take what I have done for you and what I have done shall be to you the end of the claims of the Law against you, all of them."

There are some people who think they can take Christ, but that He doesn’t meet all the requirements. They must add a little; they must pay somewhat toward the price; they want to help God in some way, in order to preserve something of the pride and conceit of having wrought out a salvation for themselves. But He will have none of it, none of it. He says your sin can be covered in Christ and in no other way. "Blessed is the man unto whom God imputeth not iniquity. Blessed is the man whose sin is covered."

Man started unholy. He was shapen in iniquity. He inherited depravity. Christ did not. He was born holy and His holy birth covers your unholy birth. As a little child you did wrong; as a little child He did right and that covers you. As a man you sinned; as a man He did not sin, and that righteousness covers your unrighteousness. And thus you take it and spread it all over the whole length of your guilty life, and it covers all of your life; it does not leave any of it exposed to wrath. It is broad enough to cover it all. The sin is covered completely and forever-covered by the righteousness of Jesus Christ.

"Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

If that is true, then to be saved requires no great element of time. If that is true salvation, its attainment does not come from afar. There is no descent to the bottom of the ocean for it. Now, some people do that very thing. They say, "I want to be baptized to be saved." Shall you descend into the deep to bring up Christ? Are you going to find Him by that method? You believe unto righteousness; you trust unto Him, and that is why the Scripture says, "The Word is nigh thee,

even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Now, whenever you do trust Him, whenever your soul takes hold of what Christ has done, whenever you come to Him and believe in Him and rely upon Him, there should come to your conscience a sense of freedom from responsibility to that law which you have violated. And when your realization takes hold of the facts; when the subjective equals the objective, you will say, it is met; it is paid; it is all paid; it is paid forever. It needs no repayment; I take it; I accept it; I envelop myself in it; I clothe myself in it from head to foot, and I can do that in a minute just as well as I can in ten years ¾ better.

Zaccheus climbed up a tree a lost man; he came down saved. The jailer at midnight was lost; at daylight he was saved. Three thousand men stood up lost men when Peter began to preach, and at the close of that sermon three thousand men were saved. "They gladly received the word that he preached unto them."

Now I want to invite you to that righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ as your only hope of justification before God. Do you take it? Will you do it? Think carefully. What better can you do? How can you expect to stand in your own miserable attempt at justification? Well, you say, "If I do that then am I to go on sinning?" I tell you that if you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as your Savior you will hate sin and you will begin to do right, not to be saved, but because you are saved; not from a principle of fear, but from a principle of love. And you will be willing to lay down your life for Jesus; and you will be willing to keep His commandments; and you will be willing to honor Him in your thought; you will be willing to glorify Him in your eating and drinking and whatever you do. But it will be from the constraining principle of love to One who has saved you, and not that by doing it you may save yourself. Will you come to it? Will you take it?

I now invite every one here dissatisfied with his own method of justification, realizing that you do not attain to anything; that you never find any ease in your own mind, no peace; you have tried that and you see that you do not find it; now I ask you to come, and without any sort of effort at self-justification, absolutely relying upon what the Lord Jesus Christ has done for you. But you say, "My heart is hard." I tell you that your heart is melted by looking at Jesus. When you look at Him and His wounds and His death throes, then you begin to groan and weep and cry out, and feel your sinfulness as you never did before. Take Him. My voice is so broken I cannot plead with you, but that is God’s method of justification. I beg you to come tonight. Just come and fix your mind on this one scripture. Jesus says, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." I will give it to you. You are charged nothing for it. You pay nothing for it. Come to me and I will give you rest. The gift of God is eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a gift. O, take it as a gift, and not as something purchased by your tears, or your resolution, or anything upon the. earth that you can do. Take it as a free gift and be saved. And when saved and because saved, and from a principle of love, then do good works as much as you please-and you will do them. The awful sin of this day is that men make a savior out of an ordinance; they make a savior out of the church; they put the church between a sin-sick soul and the Lord Jesus Christ. Never join the church, never be baptized, never partake of the Lord’s Supper, never in any way come to

anything of this kind as a means of salvation. Come to the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus first, then the water. Jesus first, then the church. Jesus and salvation first; then as saved, come and join the church, and in the church glorify the Savior by your life.

It is a stupendous sin for any man, preacher or what not, to put before a lost soul a church as a savior, saying to him, "Here, you come and join the church and be saved in the church. You come and be baptized and be saved in baptism. Cone and partake of the Lord's Supper and be converted right in the act of partaking of it." Never! Never! Never! I would not bow down to a wafer and call that God. I would not bow down to any church on the earth and say, "My savior!" Men cannot save you; ordinances cannot save you; Christ first, the Lord Jesus Christ first, and when saved, and because saved, and never until you are saved, join His church.

I invite you to Jesus Christ. He is the Savior. The Lord God drive away from between the sinner and that Savior any office, any ordinance, any institution on the face of the earth, that offers itself as a savior. The church itself is accursed when it assumes to be a savior. An ordinance is a sin when it assumes to be a savior. It is an awful sin; blasphemous sin. Come to the blood of the atonement and let that blood be sprinkled on your soul. Trust in what the Lord Jesus Christ has done, and then when your heart is glad because of this salvation, it will say, "Lord, what wilt thou have me do? If thou sayest, 'Be baptized,' I will. If thou sayest, 'Join the church,' I will. If thou sayest, 'Partake of the Lord's Supper,' I will. If thou sayest to preach my gospel to sinners, talk to them, pray for them, I will." But never, never attempt to put on the form of Godliness without the power.

I give it as my deliberate conviction before God, that souls are being lost in this town, and in every other town in this state, by having presented to them something else as savior rather than the Son of God Himself. The church is not the end of the Law to you. Christ is. Baptism is not the end of the Law to you. Christ is. The Lord's Supper is not the end of the Law to you. Christ is.

"On Christ, the solid rock, I stand;

All other ground is sinking sand."

Even if it is church ground, it doesn't make any difference to me. If you do tonight, thoughtfully, lovingly, trustfully, receive the Lord Jesus Christ as your Savior, neither height, nor depth, nor present nor future things, nor principalities, nor powers, nor any other creature can separate you from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus. O, the completeness of that salvation; the thoroughness of it! It meets the demands of God's law when nothing else ever does.

I ask you to come to Him. My heart's desire and my prayer to God is that you may be saved, but you cannot be saved, except as you come to the Lord Jesus Christ and trust in Him. And if you will take a step towards it; if you will honestly try this night to lay everything else down; everything in the world; just drop it and accept the Lord Jesus Christ as your Savior; if that is what you will try to do, come and give me your hand tonight, and let us kneel down here together and offer up a prayer, such as Paul felt burning in his heart, for salvation through Christ and no other. "For there is no other name known among men under heaven, but that name, by which you can be saved."

# S. The Foundation of the Church of Christ

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

TEXT: Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. - Matthew 16:18. We come now to consider perhaps the most remarkable passage in the New Testament: “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” Here almost every word calls for explanation and occasions controversy. Who or what is the “rock” upon which the church is founded? In what sense is the term “church” used? What is the import of Hades and what signifies “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?” What signify the “keys of the kingdom,” and the binding and loosing power? The first thought that I would impress upon the mind is that Christ alone founded His church. I mean that the church was established in the days of His sojourn in the flesh; that the work of its construction commenced with the reception of the material prepared by John the Baptist; that organization commenced with the appointment of the twelve Apostles, and that by the close of His earthly ministry there existed at least one church as a model, the church at Jerusalem. We find in the history immediately succeeding the Gospel account that this church at Jerusalem began to transact business by the election of a successor to Judas; that they were all assembled together in one place for the reception of the Holy Spirit, and that to them were added daily the saved. Hence, we are prepared to ask: On what did Christ found His church? What is the rock? After mature deliberation and careful examination of all the opposing views, and after a thorough study of the Word of God, it is clear to my mind that the rock primarily and mainly is Christ Himself. If it seems to violate the figure that He, the builder, should build upon Himself, the violation is no more marked here than in the famous passage in John where He gives the bread to the disciples and that bread of life is Himself. I would have the reader note the scriptural foundation upon which I rest my conclusion that the rock is Christ. The first argument is from the prophecy: “Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste,” Isaiah 28:16). This prophetic Scripture clearly declared God’s purpose to lay in Zion a foundation, a stone foundation, one that was to be tried, that was assured, a foundation on which faith should rest, without haste or shame. We next cite the 118th Psalm, 22nd verse: “The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing. It is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made. We will rejoice and be glad in it.” In fulfillment of these prophecies we cite first the testimony of Peter, unto whom the language of our passage was spoken: “To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious. Ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded,” (1 Peter 2:4-6). The spiritual house of which Peter here speaks is unquestionably the church. The foundation upon

which that church as a building must rest is unquestionably our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. He claims this as a fulfillment of the prophecies which have been cited. Our Lord's own words in another connection (Matthew 21:42) claim the same fulfillment: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner." With any other construction it would be impossible to understand Paul's statement (1 Corinthians 2:11; 1 Corinthians 2:16-17) "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." Here again the church is compared to a building. The foundation of that building is distinctly said to be Christ. It is also worthy of note that any other foundation for the church than Christ Himself would be wholly out of harmony with the Old Testament concept, as given by Moses, Samuel, David and Isaiah, and Paul's New Testament comment in the following passages, which the reader will please examine: Deuteronomy 32:4; Deuteronomy 32:15; Deuteronomy 32:31; 1 Samuel 2:2; 2 Samuel 22:2; 2 Samuel 22:32; Psalms 18:2; Psalms 18:31; Psalms 61:2; Psalms 89:26; Psalms 92:15; Psalms 95:1; and Isaiah 17:10; 1 Corinthians 10:4. Do not understand me to affirm that all these passages refer to God as a foundation. The thought is that the Bible concept regards God as the rock of His people under every variety of image, and so uniformly that to make a mortal and fallible man that rock on the doubtful strength of one doubtful disputed passage, does violence to the rule of the faith, as well as to the usage of the term. In a secondary sense, indeed, other things may be called the foundation and are so called, but all these senses support the view that Christ is the rock, primarily and mainly. By examining and comparing Isaiah 8:14, Luke 2:34, Romans 9:33, 1 Peter 2:8 and Luke 20:18, we may easily see how the faith which takes hold of Christ may be compared to a foundation. This accounts for the fact that many of the early fathers of the church understood the rock in this passage to be Peter's faith in Christ, and also explains how others of the fathers understood the foundation of the church to be Peter's confession of faith. The great majority of Protestant scholars regard the confession of faith as the rock, and it is a notable fact that Baptists particularly make this confession or its equivalent a term of admission into the church. Indeed, in a certain sense, both the faith and the confession may be regarded as the foundation of the church. From Ephesians 2:20-22 and Revelation 21:14, we see that the apostles are called the foundation. But 'it is only because they teach Christ. They are but instruments in leading souls to Christ, and are not the true foundation. By so much as Peter was more prominent than the others, in this sense the church may be said to be founded on Peter. The scriptural proof of Peter's prominence is clear. Though not the first apostle chosen, his name heads all the recorded lists of the twelve, (Matthew 10:2; Mark 3:16; Luke 6:14; Acts 1:13). He also leads the movement in filling the place of Judas (Acts 1:15). He opens the door to the Jews on the day of Pentecost Acts 2:14). And he is selected to open the door to the Gentiles (Acts 10:1-48 and Acts 15:7). By noting Hebrews 6:1-2, we see that the primary doctrines concerning Christ may well be called a foundation, and at the close of the Sermon on the Mount, obedience to Christ is compared to building a house on a rock (Matthew 7:24), but all these secondary senses derive their significance from their connection with Christ, the primary and real foundation. To put it in plain English then, the confession upon which the everlasting church of the Lord Jesus Christ is built, is a God-revealed faith that He is the Messiah, the Son of God. As it is expressed in another passage: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The faith

upon which the church of the Lord Jesus Christ was to be built was an acceptance, a reception of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, the Son of God, and every church instituted in apostolic times of which we have any account in the Bible, was established on that proposition as spiritually accepted by the men and women that confessed it with their lips. Whatever you may say of it, it is true that when men believed that Jesus was both Lord and Christ they were received into the church; that so long as they rejected that, and did not, from their hearts, accept that, they were not admitted into the church. And as no other was received into the church-whether man, woman or child-so that, without discussing this matter, I merely wish to get the thought of it before you, as the fundamental principle of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, that there shall be a personal, hearty and spiritual acceptance of Him as the Messiah and the Son of God. To accept Him as the Son of God is to acknowledge His divinity. To accept Him as the Messiah is to accept Him as the anointed one, for that is what the word means-Messiah in Hebrew, Christ in Greek, Anointed in English. And it implies all of the objects for which He was anointed; all of the offices to which that anointing consecrated Him, and those offices are expressly set forth in the Word of God as the Supreme Teacher, as the only Savior, as the Supreme King, Sovereign Lord of Heaven and earth. So that when a man, in the scriptural sense, believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, he accepts Him as his only religious teacher. His words are to be law. He accepts Him as his only Savior. He accepts Him as his only Ruler and King. And he accepts Him as a Divine Teacher, a Divine Savior and a Divine Ruler. And less than that is not the faith of the Gospel. Now, let us look at that a moment while I state another proposition: This question of religion is the great question in every man's life. No other is comparable to it. It is not merely a speculative question. It is an intensely practical one. It enters into one's home and heart. It touches his life here, his departure from this world, and the world into which that exit introduces him. It touches his children: It touches their birth, their sickness, their death, their destiny. It touches our conduct between each other in the varied relations of life, as husband and wife, as parent and child, as brother and sister, as friends to each other, as fellow-citizens in time and fellow-citizens with the saints of the Kingdom of God in Heaven. There never has been compressed in so few words such a far-reaching and comprehensive proposition as that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah of the Old Testament and the Son of God. The first thought that I want to present is this: I go back to the questioning of my own mind and take up a part of the experience of my own life, as that experience began in trying to understand the problems of life. I recall with great distinctness the first time that my mind ever came into contact with what is called "heredity" — what you inherit. That is, when I saw in myself a disposition of temperament that was merely a reproduction of my father's. I saw that in some way I had derived, unconsciously and irresponsibly, from my father certain tendencies, a certain bias, and that it had moved upon me before I was able to recognize the law according to which it worked. I could even see in me a reproduction of some of the temperaments and characteristics of my grandparents, and I was told by the only grandparent that I ever knew that there were in me some of the traits and dispositions of her grandparents. In other words, I confronted this proposition: That here I was in the world without my knowledge or consent, coming into it under conditions with the shaping of which I could possibly have nothing to do. Coming into the world predisposed, in certain directions, and all of the plastic and pliable part of my life that could be moulded and shaped by other people, so moulded and shaped before I began to be conscious of personal moral accountability. And yet that these inherited instincts and traits and pre-dispositions, when aided by local surroundings, and by influences brought to bear upon me by others before I

could possibly know what to do myself, that these had established the trend of my life; that they shaped its direction. And I began to say: “When did I commence? When did myself commence? Just where is the line where I crossed the border of accountability?” I saw that I had inherited many things that to me seemed bad; that I wished that I did not have; that I could not but recognize as evil. A proneness, a susceptibility, an easily yielding pre-disposition in certain cases, and at last the question forced itself upon me: “What is to be the measure of accountability that comes to me as an individual?” And if, starting as I did, conditioned as I was, wrapped about by an environment with which I had nothing to do, would it be right at the judgment bar of God to send my soul to hell? I asked my heart that question. And there is not a thoughtful man that ever grappled with the problem of life that has not at some time propounded just that question to himself, especially after he had studied what is called the law of heredity and environment. Now, I have said these things for a very special purpose. I have said them on account of a difficulty that has lodged right in the way of an earnest inquirer after truth, and my business is not to preach sermons in this meeting, but it is to get the stumbling blocks out of the way of men that they may come to eternal life. I put to an inquirer this question: “From what you have read of the Bible, tell me the difference between an angel and a man.” After reflecting a moment, he very readily saw the difference, to-wit: That every angel that God ever made He made full grown, with full maturity of intellect and without one atom of inherited bias, from the fact that he never had a father and mother, and his whole influence centering in himself, from the fact that he would have no wife, no children. And therefore, coming into existence with full and mature powers of mind and measures of life, and with no inherited pre-disposition, and standing or falling for himself alone, if he sinned he could not have a Savior. There could be no Gospel preached to him. There could be no basis upon which it could be offered, and there is not a word in that book that holds out the hope that any angel that kept not his first estate will ever be saved. Then why was the Gospel preached to me? Think about it. Did I start full grown? Did I start with full maturity of mind? Did I start without any inherited predisposition? Did I not fall far back in the past in an ancestor? And do I not see that the sins of the father have been visited upon the child? Do I not see it every day? Does it not follow that if a father is thriftless and a spendthrift, that his children bear the penalty? That if he is a drunkard, he transmits to his child a pre-disposition to drunkenness? Now comes the thought: The Lord Jesus Christ took not upon Himself the nature of angels, and there was no basis for an offered Gospel to an angel; but He took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham, of a man who had fallen in the first Adam, the first federal head; that he might be made alive in the second Adam, the second federal head. While I utterly disclaim any obligation binding God antecedent to His love, to make this provision, yet I submit that there is a propriety and a suitableness in a substitute for man, in the intervention of a third party, in the introduction of salvation by grace through another, since I find myself starting in this world lost; lost by another. Therefore when a Savior was to come into the world, He was to come and take upon Himself human nature, not angelic. Now, I want to lay down a proposition, not argumentatively. My mind is not running in that direction, but as I see it, as I feel it, as my heart takes hold of it, that Jesus of Nazareth was God, was divine; that He was the God that made this world. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.” God incarnate, and why? On what principle? I repeat a Scripture I read to you: “Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood He likewise took part of the same, that through His death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their

lifetime subject to bondage." And that He Himself, having been tempted like as we are, having suffered as we do, having been cold and hungry and full of pain and sickness as we are, might know, experimentally, how to sympathize with us in the trials and difficulties of our lives, and might put Himself in a position where we could get to Him and understand Him. Hundreds of years before He came, four thousand years before He came, on the very day that man sinned and entailed upon his posterity the dreadful evil of inheritance that I have been speaking about on that very day God said: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," and from that day He held out the hope of a Savior, whose mother was to be a woman, and whose, Father was to be God. Hence we read in the annunciation to Mary: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee, and therefore that holy thing that is born of thee shall be called the Son of God." And the annunciation to the shepherds: "Fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the City of David a Savior who is Christ the Lord." The record in the Scriptures upon this point is unequivocal. A man cannot accept them at all and reject the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Before every audience He proclaims: "I and my Father are one. I had glory with Him before the world was; I am going back to that glory. I am He that came down from Heaven, and I lay down my life and no man can take it away from me. And if I lay it down I will rise again on the third day." The first thought with reference to Jesus Christ is His divinity; that He is God. And I frankly say to you tonight that I would have regarded it as an insult if any man had brought a mere human being to me as an object of my worship. Before no man that this earth has ever known would I get down on my knees; would I prostrate myself, nor have I ever known the time that I would. Nor would I worship the brightest angel that stands before the throne of God. And when I bow down to Jesus Christ, I bow down to one of whom the ancient prophet justly spoke: "For unto us a child is born, and unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Now, the second point is this: Why did He come? He came that in His humanity He might stand in the relation to all redeemed people that the first Adam stood to all lost people. That as they died in Adam, they were to be made alive in Jesus Christ; that as death passed upon them through the sin of a forefather, so without obtaining any help at all from us, the Lord Jesus Christ worked out the obedience in which we stand and in His death paid the penalty that we owe to the divine law. Now, we come right up to the question of religion. It has made me sick at heart and I have wept bitter tears during this meeting as I have talked with men and women who have not even a conception of the first principle of the Christian religion, who say: "I am religious; I have always been religious." Well, so has every other man. There never has a man lived upon this earth that was not religious. It grows out of the fact that he has a soul; it grows out of the fact that he is related to God; it grows out of the fact that by the very constitution of his being he is a worshiper, that he will have some kind of religion. And he will try to have some form to that religion. But is that the Christian religion? I find that people say, "I have been religious ever since I was a little child, and I determined to live right and I determined to do right, and I knew that if I would be good I would get to Heaven. So I joined the Sunday-school and I joined the church, and I was baptized, and I helped pay the preacher, and I helped build the church, and while I have never been satisfied with what I have done, I am going to keep on trying, and if I get to be good enough God will save me." Never! Never! You have not even touched the first principle of the Christian religion. "Upon this rock will I build my church." What is it? Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Thou art my Savior, thy righteousness is my righteousness; thy death is in payment of the penalty to God's infracted law. O, I wish I could get you to see tonight what is meant by being saved by faith instead of being saved by works; instead of relying upon your good resolutions. Anything you have done, anything you can do, now or hereafter, as a ground of justification before God, amounts not to a snap of the finger. I, too, try to do right, but I would rather deliberately walk into the jaws of a crocodile, I would rather leap into an eruption of Vesuvius, I would rather plunge into the heart of an earthquake, than to trust my righteousness as a covering at the judgment bar of God. On what are you going to build your church? I am going to build my church upon this: My faith in Jesus Christ. Perhaps you say: "What do you mean by your faith in Jesus Christ? If that is to be the rock upon which the church is to be built, let me see what you mean by it." Now, let us look at it. Being lost and fallen in the first Adam, having a disposition that is prone to evil, born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward, and then having personally committed sin which I knew so well, there is no use discussing it. As an honest man I am bound to admit it, and I see that my neighbors have sinned, and I believe that God's Word is true, that there is not a just man upon the earth that liveth and sinneth not, our sinless perfection brethren and sisters to the contrary notwithstanding. What then? Shall I come before God and say: "I am a sinner, therefore acquit me?" What think you of that? What think you of a man, a criminal, standing before an earthly court and expecting to be acquitted on a plea of guilty? That first word that falls from his lips, "I have sinned," makes it utterly impossible for him to be justified in the sight of God on his own righteousness. Impossible. Now, you may think about it. I want to press it home upon you because some people are being lost in this town on that thing. It appalls me. I tell you that cold chills have swept over me, with my conception of divine truth, when I have seen men and women walking, as I believed, blindfolded into hell. I have no objection to any man trying to be good, but O my soul, let me not stand before the bar of God expecting to be justified upon my goodness. How then can I be justified? We are coming to that. I give you some illustrations I think you can take hold of. I will suppose a case in the lowest form, a commercial form. A man finds upon looking into his books that he is $10,000 indebted beyond all his assets, counting every one of them, and he is $10,000 in debt more than he is able to pay, and a note is made for it drawing interest, and he says, "Give me time and I will pay it. I will work every day, and I will work hard, and I will pay something on it." And at the end of the first year he looks and he finds that he has not even paid the interest. And he says again, "Give me time." And next year he makes another payment, and then another little payment, and not withstanding these little driblets of payments that he makes from time to time, the debt compounds, growing larger and larger, huger and huger. What on earth is he to do? He faces the situation: "I am gone! Tomorrow is the day of final settlement. Tomorrow bankruptcy will be written over the door of my business house, and it pains me to think about it." You begin to see the furrows come into his face. Anguish pierces him and care crushes him. He goes off alone to commune with despair. But a friend comes to him and says: "What's the matter with you? Something is the matter with you." "Yes," he says, "there is a great deal." "Will you tell me?" "It will do no good to tell you." 'But I wish you would tell me." "Then look here at my books. I am lost! There is no escape in the world for me. Do you see that balance? And it gets bigger all the time. What am I to do? Tomorrow I will be pronounced a bankrupt." That friend says: "You wait here a minute." He goes over to where the debts have been pooled and are consolidated in the hands of one relentless creditor, and he draws a check for the whole amount and takes a receipt for the whole amount, and he comes back to that friend, who is groaning when he thinks of tomorrow, and

he says, “Look here, my friend, here is a clear receipt, every dollar paid, paid right now. Will you take it? Will you accept it? I don’t want you to pay a nickel on it. I want to know if you will take this clear receipt.” And the debtor looks at it in perfect astonishment. He cannot realize it, but he slips it in his book, yet thinking about the next morning. When the next morning comes he goes up where he knows the judgment is to be rendered, and he hears his case called, and the question is asked, “Did you contract this debt?” “I did.” “Have you paid it?” “I have not.” “Can you do it?” “I cannot.” “Then can you give any good reason why judgment should not be rendered against you?” “Nothing in the world but this receipt.” The judge looks at it. “Why,” he says, “this is payment in full. This case is discharged.” And the man is dazed. As he walks out, the sense of being free comes on him. “Free; the debt paid, all the debts I owe paid — paid and I am free!” So he comes up to the friend and he says to him, “What made you do that; I want to know what induced you to do that?” “Love. I loved you and I could not endure to see you in that situation.” “What do you charge me for it then?” “Not a cent in the world. I loved you, I came and paid it for you.” Jesus Christ so loved us that He took upon Himself our nature and came here as a man, as a man who obeyed the law, and as a man died under the penalty of the law when the law had nothing in the world against Him. He came and said, “I will take that. Put that to my account; put all of it to my account. Mass it up. That cursing; that drinking; that lying; that cheating; that anguish of sin; that anger. Bring it up. I am going to pay it. I come before God. O law of God, I am the sinner’s substitute. I come to take his place. Put the sins on me. Bring them up; no matter how black; no matter how putrid; no matter how many; no matter whether committed by white men or black men, bring them up and pile them on the Son of God.” How it towers; what a mountain; how it blackens; how the poison exudes from it! Sin, loathsome sin, piled on the sin bearer. And when the sins are on Him, stand back; He is there now as the sinner, and God is going to strike Him. Sword of justice, awake, unsheathe thyself, flash in the sunbeams of heaven and smite the sin-bearer! And, ah me! The hurtling and pitiless storm of God’s wrath that fell on Him! So thick and dark the clouds they hid the face of the sun; so dark that moon nor stars could be seen, and still the storm goes on and the devils come to gloat over Him like vampires. They flock about Him as birds of prey, and the devil comes to triumph over Him because He is dying as a sinner. And now, listen: “My God, my God, O my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” “Because you are in the sinner’s stead. You are dying for a sinner and you must die as a sinner; die alone; die in darkness; die while devils gloat on you; die with sins piled on you.” And that is what the Scriptures mean when they say that Christ died for our sins. God made Him to be sin who knew no sin. Why? That we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. And I take Christ’s pure life, Christ’s sacrificial death, and I go trembling up to the bar, and the law of God speaks to me and says, “Sinner,” and I answer, “Here I am.” “When you lived in yonder world, didn’t you violate God’s law?” “I did.” “Did you violate it many times?” “Many.” “Did you sin against light and knowledge?” “I did.” “How do you expect to be justified here?” And I wrap Christ’s righteousness around me, cover myself from head to foot, and gazing at the law, I say, “Who shall lay any charge to Christ’s elect? I believe in Him. I take Him. He is my substitute. And, O Lord, every farthing of the debt is paid. I did not pay it, but He did. Here is the bill receipted. I believe in Him. I received Him, and I stand not on my record, but on the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Now, one other point and I am done. That being so, the man is only judicially clear. He is justified. The law speaks and the sins are removed. But what about that nature you spoke about a while ago — the pre-disposition to sin? Are you going to take him to heaven with that? No, not with that. What then is the provision for that? There comes in what is called in the Bible

regeneration and sanctification. A principle of life is implanted within him which we call putting off the old man and putting on the new man, Christ. The Spirit, the Holy Spirit, has put within that man a love of holiness, of righteousness, practical righteousness, and now with this new disposition he begins to say: “The things that I once loved I hate. I don’t like them now. They are distasteful and I turn away from them. I love God, Jesus, God’s people, the songs of God’s house; new affections stir within me.” But you do not mean to say such a man is personally and absolutely pure? No, he will have many a fight. Flesh will fight against you as long as you are in the flesh. But when he dies his spirit will be perfected and made pure forever and his soul will be saved, fully saved. But what about his body? The same principle operates there. Though after his skin worms destroy his body, yet in his flesh will he see God. He will rise up in that day, redeemed from the power of the grave through the Lord Jesus Christ, and his body will be glorified. No spot, no wrinkle no blemish, no weakness, no infirmity, no pre-disposition to evil, clean within, clean without, glorified all over, full of glory. That is the salvation that comes by the Lord Jesus Christ. When I try to lead people to God and to salvation, how it does hurt me to hear them say, “I have been trying all my life to be a Christian. I have been trying to be a righteous person all my life, and I am going to keep on trying. I am going to join the church. I want to join the church. I want to be baptized. I want to be in the Sunday School, and I expect after a while that I will be good enough to go to heaven.” O my soul, how I do dread to hear them talk that way. By faith in Jesus Christ and in that way alone are you made fit to join the church. “On this rock I build my church.” “Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” The church is for believers only. And if you will read the New Testament, you will see that every man that joined the church in apostolic times joined that way. For instance, when the jailer cried out, after the earthquake shock in the darkness of that awful night, “What must I do to be saved?” Paul said, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” “On this rock I build my church,” on that rock and no other. He would not build it on the water. The Lord have mercy on a man that will go and look in a pool of water to find the remission of sins. Why, the idea of it! The Lord have mercy on a man that will put a piece of bread in his mouth or a little wine and say, “This is salvation.” “Upon this rock will I build my church.” “Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” That is what we mean when we say, “Have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; take Him as your divine Teacher; as your King; take Him as your Savior.” Now I have just this last word. I was a sinner. My old comrade who was up here last night knows when we were together in the army how great a sinner I was, and I would not let any man living call me to bow down before a piece of bread or wine or water or an angel, and if I could not have seen God in Christ, I never would have accepted Christ, but when I saw that He was an everlasting Father, the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and that out of His love He came and took upon Himself my nature here in the flesh to live, and in the flesh to die, that through death He might destroy him that hath the power over death, that is, the devil, I Could fall down and worship Him, and like Thomas say, “My Lord and my God!” I hold up the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end. Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever, the immutable, the everlasting God. I hold Him up to you as a Savior and the One in whom to trust. Will you take Him? O, will you seek salvation by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ? Now, while we sing, I invite you to come to that Savior and no other Savior. Never, never come to the church first. Come to the Savior first. Never come to the water first. Come to salvation first, and when saved by your faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, why then decide where to go and what you are to do as a Christian man or woman. But salvation is of God through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and no

other way. The sole question now is, Will you take Him? Will you take Him, without paying a cent for Him, free? By grace are you saved through faith and that not of yourself, it is the gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast. Salvation is free mercy, not justice, remission through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. O sinner, don't go about and busy yourself to establish a miserable, ragged righteousness of your own. That bed is too short for you to stretch yourself on. That covering is too narrow for you, to wrap yourself in it. Don't come before God in it. Don't do it. But take the fullness, the sufficiency of the payment made by the Lord Jesus Christ, and then if you want to do good works, you will find a new life put in you by which you can do them. That will give you the true morality. "Created in Jesus Christ unto good works."

# S. The Convicting Power of the Church

THE CONVICTING POWER OF THE CHURCH

TEXT: And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth. - 1 Corinthians 14:25. If you should go out and try to count the stars tonight; try to comprehend all the glory that the heavens declare; try to trace all the handiwork of God in the skies, your finite mind would break down under the vastness and complexity of the problem. If, you should turn to earth and attempt to number the leaves on the trees, the green blades of grass and nodding flowers on wide, rolling prairies, or the sands which gulf billows fondle, you would equally fail; if you should try to master the height and the depth and the scope of the law of God, you would make a greater failure, for the commandments of God are exceeding broad. But you might just as well try to master every secret of nature, whether revealed by stars in their shining, or by night in her deepest and darkest character, as to try to comprehend all the mysteries of our inner nature. Who can know? Who can sound the depths of one human heart? Who can lay bare all of its most secret thoughts? Who can measure the flight of its erratic fancy? Who has ever been able to ascend to the top of its aspiration “and vaulting ambition? Who has ever been able to measure its presumption? Who, its lusts? Who, its blasphemies? Who, its wishes which night curtains from the sight and that would eclipse the moon if it should fully shine in the dark faces of those hideous secrets? Why is it that the heart is so much more difficult to understand than astronomy? Because, vast as is the page which God unrolls in the skies to the upturning reverent eye, and as complicated as is the system of worlds, and boundless as are the orbits in which they roll, there is nothing deceitful in their motions, not even in a comet whose flight, to us, seems erratic. All heavenly bodies pursue the several paths marked out for them by their Creator, with unerring accuracy and without collision. There is no deceit in nature. Everything is evenly balanced and adjusted to all other things in the vast correlated system, and while you may become appalled by the vastness of it, yet you can make definite progress in your investigation and you may know that what you have learned is sure. But who can say, in trying to aggregate the results of the investigation of his own heart, “that this much is certain?” You revise tomorrow your seemingly best conclusions of today. The heart is deceitful above all things. Nothing that ever yet throbbed with life in the universe of God takes such protean shapes, that so turns and twists and doubles, that assumes so many colors. Who can know it-who can know it? Almighty God alone. There is nothing in the world fresh from God’s hands out of plumb, out of harmony, out of adjustment. All of it moves silently and yet certainly and surely in its allotted direction. But the heart of man is wicked-desperately wicked. Wicked to a degree that when you attempt to rectify it, despair comes to you, despair to understand it, despair to manage it, despair to cleanse it. No Augean stable is comparable to it. Who can know it? Who can cleanse it? Who can fathom its mysteries? Desperately wicked! And yet, there is a way by which the secrets of the heart may be ascertained. There is a light which can shine down into its depths. By the law comes the knowledge of sin. The law of the Lord is perfect. The light of God’s truth enlightens our eye and we can never know our hearts (I mean even approximately) until we have

brought them under the focus of God's law. Then you begin to find it out. When the law says, "Thou shall not covet," the heart covets. There is the standard with its straight line, and here the warped and biased affection of the heart and its crookedness and defects and iniquities made manifest by laying the straight edge of the law to it. "Judgment will I lay to the line and righteousness to the plummet," saith the Almighty. And when the law of God is aligned with the heart, we find how very, very much it is missing the mark, how far astray it is going. We can then determine something of the latitude and longitude of the ship of the soul that has been driven by adverse winds far out of its course and is now rotting on seas of calm or tossed by storms on dangerous shores. A farmer once said to me that he never had great trouble in dealing with the breaks and gaps in his fence that were known to him, but always suffered the greatest loss from secret breaks and gaps in his fence. Those he never watched. He didn't even know they were there. Hence, the Psalmist says, "Who can understand his errors?" Who can locate, who can enumerate, who can measure them? And being ignorant of them, what provision can be made against them? Who can guard a breach in the wall of which he knows nothing? Who will stop a leak in the ship of which he is unconscious? Who will guard against the approach of an insidious disease that throws out no visible symptom and does not indicate by any pain, any present pain, that it is stealing up to take by surprise the unprepared citadel of life? And hence he prays, "Cleanse Thou me from secret faults." And hence Job, when he offered sacrifices for his children, was accustomed to pray, "Oh God, forgive the boys and girls for the sins of ignorance-sins unwittingly done." He had some conception of the nature of the heart. It is a dark subject, and it is an unhappy thing to think about. It is an awful pit to explore. It is worse than a cage where unclean birds are housed. It is worse than a cave where wild beasts have dwelt and fed their young. And yet, it is essential that you should look at it somewhat. It is essential that the law of God should enlighten our eyes. It is essential that we should know something of sin and realize something of its terrible consequences. And why? I do not believe that anybody ever has sound doctrinal views who has light views of human depravity. How can he believe in the doctrines of grace, in the necessity for the work of the Holy Spirit, in the cleansing blood of Jesus Christ, in the perseverance of the saints, unless he looks at the pit from which he was digged, and the hole in the rock from which he was hewn? And not only is this true, but you will never see one truly humble in the sight of God who has not had some light shining on the secret depravity of his heart, unless you can make him feet and know somewhat of his moral deformity, of his unworthiness, of his utter unfitness to stand in the presence of God. He will he proud-proud as Lucifer-proud as the devil, and arrogant in his pride, and for that pride to fall as a tree falls beneath the stroke of the woodman's ax, it is necessary that the Spirit of God shall come with the keen edge of the law and not only cut it down but dig it up by the roots and let that man see that there is no good in him no good utterly unworthy to come into the presence of God; that all of his righteousness in which he prides himself is but as filthy rags in the sight of God. Otherwise, he never has sound views of doctrine. He is never humbled, and never appreciates a Savior unless he sees his need of a Savior. Oh, when he is sick and knows it, when he is dying and knows it, when he is condemned to eternal death and knows it, when hell is the suitable place for him and he knows it, and he is nearly there, and the gravitation of sin is dragging him down, he then knows that only Omnipotence can suspend that law of gravitation, and only grace, the grace of a Divine Savior, can ever save him. I confess that I stand appalled at the slowness and lightness of men's convictions of sin. It can only be accounted for by the fact that they have never known their hearts. You say of a certain one: "He

is a good-hearted man." Let me show you. See yonder beautiful mountain. See how it catches the sunlight. See the flowers; they are blooming on its grassy side; that beautiful mountain! But come nearer to it and behold the mouth of a cave that hollows it. Now watch when the sun goes down. Behold! There creep out with stealthy tread a pack of ravening wolves, or fiercer beasts of prey. These are not so fierce as a troop of evils lurking in a wicked heart, ready to issue forth on occasion. There comes out murder, dagger in hand. There comes out foul-mouthed blasphemy. There comes out a troop of evil thoughts fiercer than wild beasts. Out of what come they? Out of the heart; out of the heart proceed these children of the devil. You hear the sharp crack of the pistol on the streets. You rush to the spot. See a man weltering in a pool of his own blood, and a good man, one who had committed no offense. You hear the night air pierced by a scream, and there comes rushing with unlifted hand and with quivering lip, and shrieks that rend the air, the wife to look upon the body of her husband, dead, dead! See little children rushing out and walking barefoot in that father's blood. Murder, murder, murder! Where did it come from? Out of the heart, out of the heart of one who was called, perhaps, a good-hearted man. There it is; look at it. There was a man once standing before a prophet of God, and the prophet being able to read the heart, or to look far ahead and see of what development the man was capable, seeing the unfolding of his as yet unformed character, tears began to run down his face and shudders shook him. "And Hazael said, Why weepeth my Lord? And he answered, Because I know the evil that thou wilt do unto the children of Israel: Their strongholds wilt thou set on fire, and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash their children, and rip up their women with child. And Hazael said, But what is thy servant, a dog, that he should do this great thing? And Elisha answered, The Lord hath shewed me that thou shalt be king over Syria." And yet he did more than that and it was in him then, but the circumstances had not called it out. There are restraints built up by society. There are restrictions called "good manners" which fence in a man and say to him, "It is proper not to go over this line, and it is better for propriety's sake to stop here." But let poverty try him; let worry try him; let temptation try him; and afterward a chance for the possibility and potentiality of his wicked nature to develop, and who would recognize the development? Now, I want to bring out a special thought: The last Scripture which I read, the one from which the text is taken, describes a company of God's people assembled to worship as you are here assembled to worship, as you are here gathered tonight. Let us restate it: "If therefore the whole church be come together in one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." This scripture teaches most profitable lessons. It shows that every unbeliever who attends a church service goes away either better or worse than when he came. He is never the same. It shows that the church service impels him to form a conclusion in his mind as to the worshippers. If disorder, confusion or a bad spirit prevail, he says within himself "They are mad." If piety, love and edification prevail, he reports to other outsiders that truly God is with those Christian people. But the thoughts most pertinent to our theme are these: 1. A bad service shows the infidel observer our sins. 2. A good service shows him his own sins. 3. A good service for Christian edification is the most potent of all services in convicting sinners. See the whole ministry of Spurgeon as an illustration. It is a great mistake that you can reach sinners only by direct sermons to them. They are watchful, distrustful, on their guard against impressions from such services. But when they are

merely observers of the effects of worship on Christians, they are not guarding against impressions on their own heart. And so by the order, spirit and power of Christian worship, “he is convinced of all, he is judged of all.” Every Christian rightly serving God, unwittingly shoots an arrow of conviction into his heart. Christian character judges and condemns him. 4. “And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest.” This last is the point which connects with all previous statements. If no man can understand his errors or be able to number his secret faults, if the heart is so deceitful and desperately wicked that none can know it and yet, if a knowledge of its disorder and depravity must be obtained before “he will fall on his face and worship God,” and if the quiet, orderly, spiritual worship of Christians does reveal to him the secrets of his heart, how solemn is the thought of public worship and how great its responsibility. Perhaps today there is present some ignorant, unlearned or unbelieving man. He is seeing, hearing, comparing, thinking. Impressions are being made on his mind favorable or unfavorable to you. And on his own mind that will attract him Heavenward or push him toward something about you or about himself. If your sins are revealed to him he will say you are mad, you are fanatics. Or, by observing you, by listening to what you say, by hearing the testimony which you offer of the power of God, by seeing your sincerity, by realizing that there is a power in you that he does not understand, what follows? The secrets of his heart are made manifest. He had never seen them before. He walked with a face that indicated no knowledge of his own depraved and fallen nature. He came in a sinner. He came in an unbeliever. He came in ignorant. He came in loving sin and hating righteousness, and yet thinking himself better than most people. But he hears something in the song, or something in the prayer, or something in the testimony of God’s people that strips off his disguises and lays bare his soul, and his own heart, and its fearful secrets, which have been covered up from his own sight, are brought to light, and he falls down and says, “I am a sinner. I am a sinner. I am convicted, I am judged; Lord God, I am a sinner!” The secrets of the heart are made manifest by the presence of the Spirit of God resting on His people, and evidencing Him in the very tones of their voices, in the earnestness of their hearts, and in the sincerity and Christliness of their manner and bearing. A public assembly of God’s people is like a mirror. When God’s people are moved properly by His Spirit, when they come praying, when they come humbling themselves, when they come longing after richer blessings and hungering after righteousness, when they come with charity for each other and love for the lost, I tell you it is a mirror, and the man looks into it, and there in that mirror is reflected his own true likeness. He never saw it before. The secrets of his heart are made manifest. He sees how vile, how abhorrent, how loathsome, how debased, how besmirched and defiled he is, and he says of himself, “unclean, unclean, unclean! I am convicted, I am a moral leper! Oh, is there not some place of cleansing, is there not some fountain into which I can plunge and wash away these sins that stain me and defile me and chain me to the devil’s chariot wheel?” The law of God gives the knowledge of sin, and nowhere is that law such a perfect mirror to reflect as when it is embodied in the saints of God, in God’s people, in their devotions, in their worship. When sinners come up before the law, oh, how bright and true is that mirror! Who can stand before it? Now, I want to ask you if this is not true. Didn’t you see that thing last year time and again? Didn’t you see men come in here and just take one look and begin to get restless and directly get up and leave the house? They saw a sight of heaven. They were convicted, they were judged. The secrets of their hearts were made manifest and they could not face the record. And then they would come back again and stop just in the door and maybe come up nearer and look and look and look. “Who is that I see? Oh, is it me, myself? Am I like that? I am lost! Oh, people of

God, pray for me that God, for Christ's sake, may forgive my sins." And this would follow, as the text says. Listen at it: "He would fall down on his face and worship God, being convinced of all, being judged of all." And then what? It says that he will go away and report "that of a truth God is among you. How do you know God is with them? I know it. I will tell you; I saw something that revealed to me everything I ever did. There was a light there that shone down into the chamber of my heart, revealing things of whose very existence I was unconscious. There was a power there that lifted the veil off of my past and waved its wand over the graves and caused the dead to rise up like spectres and shake their ghastly fingers in my face and say: 'Thou art the man; thou didst this; thou didst commit this sin.' And I was convicted of sin by the light of the law of God shining through His people." Yes, the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. Who can know, who can understand his error? I stand before you tonight, having come here with just one great burning desire in my heart, for I see what is the matter. It is just as plain before my eyes as the shining of the light in that chandelier. Men do not feel that they are sinners. And I have prayed God, "Oh, turn on the light! Let it shine! It is a sickening revelation, but it is a necessary revelation. Give them a sight of iniquity. Uncover the pit and let them see what they are in thy sight, and that they are lost." And now, brethren, the last thought I have for you is this: You do not understand the desperate wickedness of the men we are trying to save. You do not realize it. It does seem to me that if you did, it would take sleep from your eyes. It would put fire in your bones. It would make your tongue when you speak a tongue of fire. Oh, if you saw the awful, lost condition of men, their nearness to hell and its death and its darkness and its hopelessness and its eternity and its horrors and its wailing and its despair oh, if you saw it; if you saw it, you could not be willing to let one moment pass without bringing to bear all the power of Christianity to save that wretched soul. Why, if a man were to rush up here tonight and ask me to announce that a house was burning down, with two children in it, this whole congregation would turn out to save the burning children. If a messenger should come and say that one of your little boys or girls that you left at home was lost, a thousand men would be on the search before midnight. Lost! A child lost! A little, helpless child lost! A woman shut up in a burning building! But what is that loss, and what is that burning to the everlasting burning of hell? If a town were on fire and kept burning and burning like Chicago when it was on fire and the firemen could not put it out, every man would shut his door, close his business, turn from the most important interests of his life, and say, "God helping me, I will have no other business as long as those people are suffering and dying." And if God were to send the realization of the condition of sinners here in Waco into the hearts of these church members, every merchant that is a member of this' church would lock his store door; every lawyer would lock his office; every business man would turn away from goods and groceries and realty and say: "Let me save life, life, life! Let me help in the salvation of the lost!" God Almighty alone can give us a new heart. Will you come? Will you ask Him for it? Will you seek to be renewed? Will you seek the birth from above? I ask you to come. Oh, bring your heart, bring it with all of its wickedness and scars! Bring your sins, crimson red, bring them all and put them upon the Lord Jesus Christ and have them blotted out forever! Will you try it?

# S. The Ever-Living Christ

THE EVER LIVING CHRIST

TEXT: Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and the spirit-world. Revelation 1:17-18. Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Behold, he cometh with the clouds. Revelation 1:5-7. (Revised Version.) This is a long text. The emphasis, however, will be laid upon one declaration, “I am the Living One.” There is much doubt about the exact dates of many of the events connected with our Lord Jesus Christ. We do not know the date of His birth, but we can determine with reasonable probability the date of His resurrection. We know that the Jewish Passover took place on a certain date in the month of April, and that Jesus rose from the dead on the Sunday after the Passover. There have been grave questions by many people as to the degree of evidence necessary to establish such a tremendous event as the resurrection of a dead man, but I submit that no two things are more susceptible of legal proof than, first, that a man dies, and, second, that a man is alive. If you can establish anything in the world by human testimony you can prove the death of a man, and in the same way you can prove that a man is living. It is constantly done in our courts. There was a murder trial in which a certain man was accused of having put to death by violence a friend who was last seen with him. The circumstantial evidence was very strong against the accused, but when the jury was about to make up its verdict, and it seemed certain that this man would be condemned, the supposed victim stepped into the court and stood there before them. There was no question of his identity. He was there, and he was alive. The evidence was so abundant as to both the identity of the man and the fact that he was alive, that it at once disposed of the case. The accused was instantly dismissed. A man cannot be tried for the murder of one proved to be living. In the same way it frequently, in our courts, is necessary to establish the death of a person. An insurance company requires such evidence before it will pay the policy taken out on a man’s life. The physician who attended the dead man usually gives his evidence: “I knew this man. I was his physician. I was with him in his last illness. I examined him and I know he is dead.” The undertaker gives his evidence: “I knew the man. I was called on to prepare him for burial. I did prepare him for burial. I did bury him.” Other evidence like this is introduced until the fact is clearly established that the death has taken place, and on that evidence the policy is paid. Now, it has been objected in the case of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ that nobody saw Jesus rise from the dead. But the evidence is very complete that He died. No evidence can be stronger than the evidence that Jesus Christ died on the Cross. The centurion who conducted the execution, and who in that capacity about answers to our present sheriff, gave his certificate that he carried out the sentence of the law, and he knew He was dead. He stood by until He was dead. The evidence of those who buried Him, the evidence of those who watched the grave after He was buried, the evidence of His disciples who witnessed His death and wept over His departure-if any fact in the world can be proven, it can be proven that Jesus died. So, on the other hand, by the most overwhelming evidence it can be proved that Jesus

was alive after He died. His mother, His brothers, His sisters, who ought to know Him, saw Him, talked with Him, were with Him many days. His nearest friends and most intimate associates were with Him for forty days. They saw Him; they talked to Him; and more than five hundred witnesses testified to the fact that Jesus, “Who was dead is now alive.” In this text He says, “I am the Living One. I became dead, but I am alive to die no more.” In vital concerns the human mind is not willing to rest alone upon the historic evidence of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. That evidence is indeed complete and sufficient for academic purposes. But we now have much stronger evidence of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If every man in Jerusalem, including all the officials, both Jewish and Roman, had testified that they were gathered about His grave, and saw Him emerge from the grave, and were to sign their depositions before notaries that they did witness it; and if the Emperor of Rome and all of his officers, even to the number of a million men, had gone before the courts of the land and certified that they saw Him after He rose from the dead, and all of that were to be upon record and we had that record before us now, it would not be half as satisfactory as the evidence that we of today have that Jesus Christ is alive. He says, “I am the Living One.” All historic evidence is remote. Nearly two thousand years have come between us and this old evidence. If, indeed, He rose from the dead there must be some fresh evidence, some continuous evidence. If He rose from the dead, He must be somewhere now, and there must be some signs of His life now. There must be some demonstrative proof of the fact that He is living today, and this proof must be not the evidence of dead men; not the evidence of people who have been sleeping in their graves for two thousand years, but the evidence of men and women of the present time. You might put this entire church on the witness stand to establish the fact that Jesus Christ is now, today, alive: And this is living and, therefore, more impressive evidence. Note carefully the words of our text. They are just as applicable to us as to the ones to whom the words were spoken. Let us see what these words are: The King James Version says, “Unto him that loved us,” past tense - but the revised version more correctly gives it, “Unto him that loveth us.” It is not a love that may be confined to the past tense. It is the outgoing of a heart now beating. Not merely He did love us a long time ago, but “Unto him that LOVETH us,” loveth us TODAY. We are the subjects of the affection of our Lord Jesus Christ as we sit before Him, or stand before Him this Sunday morning.’ “He loveth us.” Not only does He love us now, and the proofs of His love will be referred to in a moment, but “He loosed us from our sins.” That, indeed, is past tense. That may not be referred to as the time when He made His expiation for sin nearly two thousand years ago. There is necessarily a difference in time between expiation, which was once for all an ever recurring remission of sins, based on that expiation. So it was not two thousand years ago when the application of that atonement was made to your soul. You were nonexistent then. You must have gotten in touch with that forgiveness of sins since the time that Jesus Christ died on the Cross, and, unless somebody is alive, unless there is some living force in the world to apply the benefits of that divine transaction that took place on the Cross nearly two thousand years ago, then we cannot go before men and testify to the pardon of our sins. But many of us can look back to a certain time in our own lives and say, “On that day God, for Christ’s sake, forgave my sins. The One who once loved us yet loves us. I know that it is not merely historic love, that it is not merely a love for the human race in bulk. It is a particular and present love, because the application has been made to me as an individual, and made to me in my lifetime.” And just as that man who had been healed of blindness was able to stand up before the court and testify to two facts: “I was blind; I now see; I know both of these things to be true: I know I was blind; I know I

see," so some of us can stand up and say, "I know that date, a certain date, in my life, when I stood in my own consciousness, in my own heart, a condemned and lost sinner in the sight of God, but at that date I was loosed from my sins. The sense of guilt and condemnation that was oppressing my soul departed, and in the place of it came a sense of peace and rest. I was conscious of a reconciliation with the Father." But while that was not so very long ago, I need not go back to the time when I was twenty-three years old, and God, for Christ's sake, forgave my sins. I have been committing sins since that, and every time I commit a sin my conscience takes notice of it and reproaches me for it. Now, not only did He then loose me from sin, but He continues to loose me from sin. The transaction goes on. Every time the back-slidden Christian comes humbly before God and makes a confession of sin, God is just and faithful to forgive his sins. But that forgiveness cannot take place unless there be somebody alive, some advocate with God, who takes the case and pleads it before the Judge. He looseth us from our sins, now - not only then, but now; not merely an historic expiation of the sins of all His people, two thousand years ago; not merely my own case when I was first converted, but my case all along through my life, it may be seven times a day. The pardoning stream continues, and the dispensation of that pardon is based upon one fact, that "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." So I need not go back to that old historic evidence that John and Peter and James and the five hundred brethren and sisters saw Jesus Christ alive. There is other evidence, today's evidence, evidence of which I am both subject and witness, and can testify that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and that Jesus is alive, because I get the application of forgiveness of sins through His loving intercessions. "He loveth us and looseth us from our sins." Again the text says, "He hath made us to be a kingdom." Here, too, we need not content ourselves with an abstract historical argument based upon the Book of Daniel that there was a Babylonic kingdom, followed by a Medo-Persian kingdom, and that by a Grecian kingdom, and that followed by a Roman kingdom, and that followed by the establishment of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is easy enough to submit historical proof that in the days of the Roman kings the God of heaven set up a kingdom. But this event of which I am talking, was in the year 95 A.D., and there was only one apostle living. It was in the reign of the Emperor Domitian, and it was during the persecution by that emperor that John was banished from Ephesus to Patmos, and he was then a very old man, and to him the revelation was made just as fresh as it was made when they cast their garments before Him and waved their palm branches and shouted, "Behold, the King cometh!" We do not now allude to those subjects, men, women and children who formed the procession that welcomed Jesus Christ when He entered Jerusalem. Let us rather consider a nearer kingdom. "He loveth us; he looseth us from our sins. He has made us to be a kingdom not kings. Now, can it be proven? Is it in evidence that today, not two thousand years ago, there are actually living subjects of the Lord Jesus Christ? Nero had no subjects after he died. Alexander the Great did not have any subjects after his death. It has been two thousand years, nearly, since Jesus died, and yet there is the affirmation of a kingdom of loving subjects of the Lord Jesus Christ. There has been neither change of dynasty nor royal person of the same dynasty. Whosoever has felt on his heart the handwriting of the Spirit of God, on whose soul has been breathed the breath of life, who has been converted, who has been translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, is a living witness of an actual, existing kingdom a kingdom that does not go on without a king. Look over the map of the world today. Try to enumerate, if you can, the number of the subjects of Jesus Christ, those who do not hesitate to say, "He is my King; I am His subject. I am under His law." He as King,

sitting on His throne, is dispensing the affairs of the kingdom now. “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” “Whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things.” “Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion.” We want to keep out of the past tense. We want to refer to the present. Every individual Christian, being a subject of the King of kings and Lord of lords, is a witness that Jesus is alive. No king, no kingdom! If a kingdom, then a king! We cannot be under the dominion of a dead man. We cannot be under the sway of a scepter when the hand that held it has turned to dust. Empty thrones do not rule mankind. There must be an occupant of that throne. He must possess the powers. of a king. He must be able to demonstrate the supremacy of his sway or else he will have no subjects in the world. Now, He has made us to be a kingdom. And will you please notice the distinction in this text between the kingdom and the church! When you refer to the kingdom of Jesus Christ you mean by it those who have been really and truly converted. Whoever has been converted is a subject of the kingdom. He is a part of the kingdom. But now, when He comes to speak of the churches, He does not speak of them in the aggregate. He says, “To the Seven churches.” And He moves among the seven churches, and holds each church responsible to Him. Each church is an executive, business body in the kingdom, but now when it comes to the kingdom of Christ, whether we are members of the church or not, if we are God’s children we are subjects of the Lord Jesus Christ, and He is alive. We belong to the kingdom. He has made us to be a kingdom, and He has made us priests unto God. I mean every Christian, whether he is a member of the church or not, is a priest, and offers sacrifices, but sacrifices are not offered where the oracle is dumb. When the Shekinah left the temple, when the Veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom, from that time, void was every sacrifice offered upon a Jewish altar. There is now no Jewish high priest. The temple has disappeared. And because there is no temple and no altar, there can be no priest in the Old Testament sense. But here we are made priests and the character of our sacrifices is defined. We do not offer bullocks and goats, but we offer the sacrifices of praise and of humility and of prayer and of contributions. These sacrifices are being offered now unto God by those who are God’s priests, and there is no distinction between them. It is not the preachers alone who are the priests. It is the people of God, whether they are even members of a church or not. If they are converted they are priests, and every time they praise God they are offering sacrifices, and every time they pray to God they are offering sacrifices, and every time they make a contribution for Christ’s sake they are offering a sacrifice. Now, to get the picture before you in its bearing on the fact that Jesus Christ is alive, let us consider the one sacrifice of praying. I kneel down to pray. and if the one to whom I pray is alive and able, He can answer me, and if He be alive and able and willing, and the request is a proper one, He will answer. If, therefore, the throne of grace be a living institution; if there be an ear that hearkens when pallid human lips plead; if there be an eye which sees when trembling human hands are uplifted; if there is a heart that feels when, with sighs and sobs and gaspings, the stricken and troubled ones here upon the earth pour out their woes; oh! if there be a heart that can enter into sympathy with their wants, then somebody is alive. When Christ died, the heathen oracles became dumb. Men quit making visits to the oracle of Delphi. Why? There was nobody to answer. No replies came. And in the two thousand years that have elapsed since the death of Christ, if there had been no response to prayer, no matter what the historical evidence of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is, or might be, what would it count to us that He be alive if He does not hear us, if He does not answer us, if He does not sympathize with us, if He does not intervene in our extremity? So when we say that Jesus is alive we refer to the fact of a

present love, of a present loosing from sin, of a present kingdom, of present priests who offer sacrifices of prayer, and who now get the answers to their prayers. Take another thought in connection with it. The historical testimony is that Jesus Christ entered into the realm of death. He was disembodied, and after awhile He emerged from death. What comfort is that to me? What present and powerful compensation is that to me, if, when I stand, as I did last Friday, a member of the First Church having died and a number of us went to Itasca to bury him, and. there was his wife, and there were the children and the grandchildren, and between 700 and 1,000 people out there in that cemetery. Now if there were a mere historical resurrection from the dead, with nothing heard from it since, oh! how could I comfort those stricken hearts that day? But when I read this passage of Scripture upon which I am speaking today, that He has the keys of death and the spiritworld; He now has the keys; He now can open; He now can shut; and no power can shut when He opens, and no power can open when He shuts. He will come again and raise the dead-that was comfort to the stricken ones. I refer to the present comfort that the Christian heart derives from the fact that Jesus is alive, and being alive, holds the keys of death. When we deposit the bodies of our loved ones in. the grave, that is death death to the body. Now, if Jesus has the keys not if He had them once, but if He now has them and when we know that this spirit has gone into its disembodied state, if there be no kind of evidence that this spirit meets the Lord Jesus Christ, finds Him alive, has such communion with Him that the soul can say, “For me to die is gain - When I am absent from the body, I am present with the Lord,” our comfort fails. But when we die, we, too, may hear the voice: “Today thou shalt be with me in paradise.” If Jesus is alive, then our dead ones are with Him, and He has the keys, and whenever He says the word, that whole realm of the spirit world will be destroyed. There will no longer be a disembodied soul. A voice will speak the word that will raise us from the dead, and bring our bodies out through that open door to die no more, so that we can say, “I am a Living One; I became dead, but I am alive to die no more.” There is the comfort that belongs to God’s people in the thought that Jesus is alive today. Where one is dead you cannot hope to get any benefit from him. Hope stops at death, if that death be complete. Jesus Christ is not only alive in the sense that He loveth us and we are now the subjects of that love, and that He looseth us from our sins, and that He makes us a present kingdom and present priests, and in our behalf holds the keys of death and the spirit-world, but more than that, the Lord Jesus Christ assures the heart at the present moment of a glorious hope. What is it? The text says, “Behold, he cometh; he cometh.” If He is dead He will not come back. If He is alive He will come back. If He is alive I may hope for His coming. I may not only desire it, but I may expect it. I may not only rest in a present love, in a present forgiving power, in a present comfort, in a present answer to prayer, in a present service as belonging to a kingdom, but I may rejoice in the fact that this Living One is coming; coming in the clouds of heaven; coming to wind up the affairs of the world. And He stands before my hope and causes that hope to become so keen of vision that it can penetrate the intervening mists, and behold the Coming One until He may loom up in visible form before the expectant eye, for the declaration is, “Every eye shall see him; and they also that pierced him.” Thus, brethren, I have presented to you Jesus Christ alive, as the lover of your soul, as the pardoner of the sins of your soul, as requiring of you a present service as a subject unto His kingdom, and as hearing your petition when you lift up your sad hearts to Him in prayer, and as holding the keys of death and hell, and as one who is coming, coming. Who looks for Apollo to come back to the earth? Who expects Jupiter to descend and occupy his ancient temple? Who expects the Neptune of the classics to reassert his power over the ocean waves? But the millions

of Christians expect Jesus to come back. “Behold, he cometh, he cometh!” Now, is Jesus alive in this sense? If He is alive He knows about the future. He is a revelator. John saw a book the book of future events and it was sealed - sealed seven times and nobody on earth could open it. But if Jesus is alive He can break those seals. He can drive away the mists that hide the future from our sight, as one draws curtains that shroud a hidden room. And He may say, “Rise, make a record. I will reveal now the things which must come to pass. I will stretch out before you in panorama the coming events that touch ‘the church and the people of Jesus Christ, clear on to the general judgment, and the end of the world.” And as a revealer He speaks in this book. We, looking back after two thousand years have passed away, are amazed at the accuracy of this forecast. Paul had said, “Jesus will not come unless there first be a falling away.” Who expected such an apostacy as that? Who that looked upon the first triumphant march of the kingdom of God, when, under apostolic power, they took the capitals of the world and overturned idols where they were fortified in the hearts of the people; who expected that the brightness of that faith would be eclipsed, and that shameful impostures would take the place of religion? We look back at it now and we know that it did take place, but when this book was written no man could see it except the man unto whom God gave the vision to look into the years ahead. And here is the book that tells all about it. It tells of the decay of the piety of the churches. It tells of a formal religion taking the place of a religion of heart and of life and of power. It tells of the coming of a cumbrous system of rites and ceremonies, though they had been nailed to the Cross of Jesus Christ and banished. It tells us that they will come back and sway the world, and that only out in the wilderness where faithful witnesses have fled will there be true ones who will adhere to the simplicity of the gospel as it is in Christ Jesus. We know now that all this happened, but here it was put on record that it would happen, and some of it more than a thousand years before it did happen. So that we stand before Jesus Christ as a living revelator, and we hear His words: “The revelation is ended.” There will be nothing more revealed until Jesus comes, and whosover adds to the words of this prophecy, God will add unto him the plagues that are written in the Book, and whosover takes away from the words of this prophecy, God will take away from him any place in the kingdom of heaven, or any space in the Book of Life, which contains the roll of the immortal ones that shall reign with Him forever and ever. Finally, there are the churches. This is one. Is Jesus alive? Does He move among the churches now as then? Does His flaming eye take cognizance of every act of fidelity on the part of the pastor? Does He hold the pastor in His right hand? Does He know of the faithfulness of the members of the church, so that He can say to you, as He said to Ephesus and Smyrna and Laodicea and Thyatira, “I know thy works. I know thy fidelity or thy infidelity?” And, oh, sad to say, can He in His present state, in His omniscient sight, say to us, “I have somewhat against thee; thou hast left thy first love?” Or, “Thou hast substituted for gospel that which I never gave as gospel?” Or, “Thou hast become indifferent, neither cold nor hot, imagining thyself to be all right in the sight of God, when thou art all wrong?” Is Jesus alive in the church? If He is alive in the church, there must be some evidence of that life, and to the church that does not manifest the evidence of Christ’s being alive now He says, “I take away thy candlestick. If a tree has become so dead that, after winter passes, it will not put forth buds; if when April comes it will neither cover itself with foliage nor flowers; if when summer comes it will not bear fruit, then let that dead tree be cut down. Why cumbers it the ground?” The fact that these trees are cut down proves that Jesus is alive. The fact that dead churches become the subject of His chastisement is evidence that the Administrator of Justice is not a dead Man. And the fact that He gives His blessing to faithful

churches is a proof that He is alive. Your own record is evidence. In four years' time one hundred and fifty have been baptized upon a profession of faith. Now that proves that Jesus is alive. The pastor could not convert one hundred and fifty people, not even one. The church could not convert one. But the Holy Spirit, the living vicar of the living but absent Christ, can convert souls, and if the church is yielding itself to the monition and to the impulses of the living Son of God in heaven, then somebody is going to be converted; some backslidden Christian will be restored; some hypocrite will be unmasked and discipline will be administered. There will be power in the church if Jesus is alive. And I cite these arguments as greater proof that Jesus Christ is risen from the dead than the monumental evidence of the Lord's Day. That is monumental evidence. He rose on the first day of the week, and from that time the date changes, and the monument stands - Anno Domini, the year of our Lord, and Sunday, the sacred day, instead of the seventh day. But stronger than monumental evidence is the presence of Jesus Christ in the churches, in their revivals. And now, brethren, you wish to present this house to Him. You act simply as stewards for Him in retaining control of the house. None of you occupies this house as a home. You have your own home. You say, "This is the Lord's house, and we will meet here to worship and serve our living God." That is what you mean. Then if that be in your heart I think I could say to you what the prophet said in the time of Joshua the high priest, and Zerubbabel: "The latter glory of this house shall eclipse its former glory, and this house shall be the abode of much peace, and unto this house the Desire of all nations shall come." Jesus will come in spiritual presence and power to bless your services. There is a field for you here. There is room for you to do great things. Upon your enterprise I invoke the benediction of a Living Redeemer. I gave the first money that went into the little building where you first assembled as a congregation, and with the missionary at that time joined in the prayer that God would bless that humble beginning, and make it a signal power, and I continue my prayer for you today. The Lord bless you! Whatever may be the fate of the candlestick that once stood and held the light at Laodicea and is now gone; and, though marshes have taken the place of the harbor of Ephesus, where that other candlestick shone, God grant that this candlestick, supplied with heavenly light, may be a demonstration of the fact that Jesus is alive, by conversions, and restorations, and reconciliations, and prayers, and praises, and every other act of priesthood. May God's blessing rest on you!

# S. The Glory of the Church

THE GLORY OF THE CHURCH

TEXT: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by the church, the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Jesus Christ, our Lord. Unto Him be the glory in the church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen. - Ephesians 3:10; Ephesians 3:21. The church is a Divine institution. It is the only visible religious organization that is of specific Divine appointment. It is to the church that God has committed the preaching of the Gospel to a lost world, and to it committed the memorials which He instituted concerning His death and resurrection. This appointment was made by the Omniscient One, looking to the end of the world, taking into account perfectly all of the coming developments of nations, of society, and all the changes to be wrought in the world by science, philosophy or any other force of civilization. And having in view the end from the beginning, He deliberately appointed the church as a perpetual institution for the purposes specified, and distinctly declared that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. It is important to understand, then, the meaning of the church. After the last man is saved, after the resurrection and the judgment, the anti-typical church then will consist of all the redeemed, from the beginning of the world to the end of the world. That will he the true temple of God. That temple is in process of construction, but will not be completed until the last man is saved, and will not be inhabited by the Holy Ghost as a temple until it is completed. Hence it is evident that is was not to the church in that ideal future sense, that is, to the completed family of God, that were committed the official activities by which God intends to accomplish His purpose on earth, and in time. Our text refers to a visible organization. The next thing to be determined is whether in any New Testament sense this visible organization is, a federation of all the local organizations as its constituency and subordinated to some common earthly head. If there be a federation like the United States government, there must be an earthly head there must be a President. If a hierarchy be contemplated, there must be an earthly head, such as patriarch or pope. In the case of either federation, hierarchy or autocracy, responsibility keeps shrinking away from the individual and from the local community, and keeps drawing together wherever the head is. The natural tendency is, that the sense of responsibility is taken from the individual, leaving more and more the fate of the whole, the work of the whole, the development of the whole, to be determined either by some general congress, if it be a federation, or by the dictum of a pope or of a council. But the New Testament distinctly teaches the contrary idea. It teaches that the responsibility in every instance rests upon the local, visible organization. The scriptures expressly declare that each local congregation is the temple of the Lord, so that there is no way by which the local duties which rest upon one congregation can be shoved off upon some other congregation. We cannot wait in matters local until we call together all the people of God upon the earth to determine what is duty. We cannot wait until there be assembled a council even of all the Texas brethren to determine duties which peculiarly concern us here in Waco. When, then, our text says that, “Unto Him be the glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages,” it means that the glory is to be rendered

by each local congregation in its assembly and in its specific work. Not the vague kingdom at large typifies the future heavenly temple, but as the scriptures in this very context declare, “In whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.” (R.V.). That brings home to us the sense of our responsibility to God, and it makes it easy for each individual member of the church to understand his part of the matter. As set forth again in the context, “From Christ, the Head, all the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body into the building up of itself in love.” I state then as the first proposition that it is essential to a due sense of responsibility in a local congregation, and it is essential to a due sense of responsibility in the individual, that the whole idea of a future temple of God should be represented in each local church. The conception of all local congregations in federation,, or of all denominations in congress, constituting the church on earth or even representing the church in heaven, is unscriptural. Beyond the ideas of comity and voluntary cooperation there is no such thing as the Lord Jesus Christ dealing with churches in groups. It is true that He addressed a communication to the seven churches of Asia, but it is also true that He dealt with each of the seven according to its particular condition. He did not hold Smyrna responsible for the state of affairs in Philadelphia, and what He said to Thyatira was widely different from what He said to Laodicea. He came directly to each congregation and looked upon the condition of that congregation, and held pastor and church responsible for their local condition; and He deals with us also just that way today. The next point which I wish to present is, that being built up, edified, depends upon compactness of organization, compacted by that which every joint supplies. Now, if any part of the church be loosely attached, that destroys compactness. There must be cohesion in order to unity. You may lift up a woven garment by one thread, because the different threads are interwoven. You may lift up a coat of mail by one steel scale because all are linked together. If the local congregation is the church in the sense in which duties are to be performed, memorial services are to be held, and the gospel to be preached, we can readily understand how the head is Christ. As the scripture expresses it, “Speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things who is the head, even Christ.” “Christ is the head over all things to the church.” We are the body and He is the head. The pastor is not the head of the church. The deacons do not make the head of the church. The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church. It follows, therefore, that for compactness and for each part to work according to its measure, there must not only be a connecting bond between the parts holding them together compactly, but there must be some connection between each part and the head. In order to be a church in the highest idea of life, there must be a vital connection between each member and the head, which is Christ. It follows, at once, that if there be in a congregation one member who has no living connection with Jesus Christ, that member is so much incumbrance and dead weight on the church. It is impossible that strength can be imparted to the church by that man’s being a member of it. It needs must follow that his connection with the church is absolutely hurtful to the church. There is no way to evade the conclusion. Now, when we would address ourselves to the work committed to the church, that is to manifest the glory of God to all ages, we must first carefully consider the things which are conducive to the highest success. It is quite possible that there may be a vital connection between an individual member and the head, who is Jesus Christ, and yet through sin and backsliding there may be a partial paralysis of this connecting tie, so that a healthful and continuous circulation of life does not pass from the head to this member. It would follow then from this that when a church

is to attain to its best proportions and its greatest activity, those things should be done which will restore the circulation to any member in whom the circulation is feeble or interrupted. Therefore, every time you bring back to the joy of salvation a backslidden Christian, you have re-established full connection between that member and the head. It is also true that there is no way by which compactness with other parts can be maintained when this circulation is interrupted; when there is a loosing from Christ, the head, there is a loosing from every part. If a man's communication with Jesus Christ be real, if it be daily, then is he a profitable part of the organization, and the more nearly he touches Christ the more nearly he can be made to touch his brethren. The next thought that I would impress is that our Lord has not left us free to seek relief from paralyzed or enfeebled church life in organizations devised by our own wisdom. Whenever the church as an organization, as a body, is loose-jointed, not compact, when it rattles as it moves, whenever it is carrying a large number of members that have no vital connection with the head, the remedy is not to be sought in our own expedients. We must have recourse to the means of resuscitation prescribed in the scriptures: "Unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places are to be made known, throughout all ages, by the church the manifold wisdom of God." We are to renew the unity of the church by compacting its members, causing their minds to flow together and their wills to merge and their movements to harmonize in time and step. We must do the things that will bring this about. Such is the great problem always. And so whenever a church loses all compactness, there remaining no bond of cohesion between its members, and there is no living connection between most of the members and Christ, that church as an organization must die. Nothing else remains. The converted souls in it are saved, but that particular church, as an organization, passes away. It no longer has a name or a place in history. That is the provision of God. It simply loses its life. When there is no light, there is no need for a candlestick, and the candlestick is removed. Consider ourselves shut up to this. We have nothing else to think about. There is no other direction to which we can profitably turn our attention. If God is to be glorified in this world, He is to be glorified by the institution which He appointed, and if that institution is to accomplish the ends for which it was designed and established, it must be by attending to the means which He sets forth in His word. Our hope then to reach men, our hope to save men is through the church. That being true and being unwilling to concede that this organization is lifeless, being unwilling to concede that all touch between the members is destroyed, and that all connection between the head and the members is destroyed, we should, in proposing to hold a meeting, honor and magnify the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the institution which He appointed, in which, through which and by which we will do what He has commanded us to do. My hope then in going into this meeting rests upon the fact that if it be attempted at all it will be attempted by the church. We are called upon to vote upon that officially. Some of us have been meeting together and praying about it ever since Wednesday night, and those of us at these meetings have felt impressed that we ought, as a congregation, to hold a meeting. That is the impression made on our minds, at least all who spoke out, and there seemed to be concurrence upon the part of those who did not speak. But we were only individuals. Now, when you come together in conference this afternoon you are to intelligently vote upon this matter. One of the objections considered particularly last night was this: The untimeliness of such an effort, and humanly speaking the conditions every way seemed to be unfavorable, but when we began to look at each one of these seemingly unfavorable conditions by itself and reduce the difficulty to its real and last analysis, it became to us evident that each difficulty was more apparent than real; that it was more in

apprehension than in substance, and that so far from the approaching period in which Christians are accustomed to celebrate the birth of Jesus Christ being an inappropriate time, it is a more appropriate time, if there be any distinctions in time, than any other in the world. It will not be considered today, whether December 25th is the birthday of our Lord. But we may well remember that when He was born, whatever the time, Heaven sent all its choir of angels to sing in the hearing of the astounded shepherds, and to make known to a startled world that there was born unto them a Prince and a Savior, who is Christ, the Lord, and that His advent meant glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will among men. Let us be willing enough, heartily willing, to co-operate in all innocent measures which look to making children happy and households happy, and let us exchange suitable gifts, though they only relate to time and timely things. These things are not only innocent in themselves, but commendable. Yet, our greatest desire, if we would harmonize with the higher and deeper spirit of our Lord's advent, should be to turn men's thoughts to greater gifts, gifts from God's free grace, eternal life and the indwelling Spirit. It cannot be inappropriate and untimely to signalize this December by the reconciliation of difficulties, by bringing brethren wide apart closer together, by comforting hearts that are stricken. And we may make the occasion glorious in the sight of God by carrying the good tidings of that Prince of Peace to some soul in bondage and darkness, thus accomplishing the highest aim and holiest mission of the church of Jesus Christ. The thing to do, then, is to catch the spirit of such an effort, realize that this is an appropriate thing to do, and that this is a good time to do it; be persuaded that it is in accordance with the commandment of the Lord Jesus Christ that it be done. As glory to God in the highest came on that birthday of our Lord, surely it cannot be incompatible with the Divine Will that the same glory should come now, nearly two thousand years later. Looking back to the advent as the greatest event in the history of the world to that date, and to be paralleled only by the second advent, when our Lord comes to take His people to Himself, my own heart and spirit need no stimulus to work heartily now in a revival meeting. No abstract reasoning of any kind is necessary to induce me to readily take hold, and work as joyfully as the ancient German went forth to battle, as gladly as the long-waiting husbandman goes out to thrust his sickle into the ripening grain fields upon which he has bestowed his labor, expecting to hear the shouts of the harvesters as they garner in the precious grain. So does my own heart leap and throb at the thought that this church, by the glory and power of God, is waking up to a meeting just at this time. Being now prepared for it, let us consider for what purpose I read the other Scripture: "Simeon hath declared unto you," saith James, "that God purposed to take out of the Gentiles a people for Himself." Indeed, He has a purpose to take out of each community a people for Himself. For example, when the difficulties at Corinth, humanly considered, seemed to Paul to be insuperable, when his own brave heart was daunted, when his own firm grasp was ready to relax, God came to him in a vision by night and told him not to be afraid, but to speak out, because He had much people in that city. Equally are they here. God knoweth. You do not, but God knoweth. The things we may do, let us consider them. And one of the things is that God hath ordained that through the church He obtains His glory in the salvation of these people. Let us face that, and we also know that God's word has declared that if a sinner will seek Him while He may be found and call upon Him while He is near, God will abundantly pardon him. Let us know that thoroughly. And know that though you be not a good man, or though you are in a backslidden condition, though you have allowed your heart to become as hard as the nether millstone, though it has been years since you shed a religious tear, though your heart may be a long desert waste far back to an oasis, showing that then your heart was fresh

and your soul was full of love for your brethren, and then the outgoing of your spirit was for the salvation of men all this may be so and yet it does remain true that God's Divine appointment is that the church shall make known His wisdom, and the church shall declare His glory, and the church shall proclaim His gospel, and the church shall be the blessed instrument which, set on fire by the Spirit of God, shall give life, and light and salvation to men. That is true and I stand on that truth. And I stand on the eternal purpose of God to save men, and I stand upon His declarations that if the sinner will call upon Him he will be saved. We can make no greater mistake than to imagine that everything depends on any one man. It may be that on account of your coldness of heart your attention has been withdrawn from religious things. Your business may have absorbed you. Political affairs may have diverted you. Unhappy tragedies may have caused you to forget that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and you may be this day living in sin. God knoweth. But I do know that if you are a Christian, you can be reached. If there was ever kindled on the altar of your heart one spark of the divine light, the devil cannot put that light out. There may be a big fire revived there by piling on the proper fuel, when we rake among the smouldering ashes of your heart, and find one coal not extinct, if so be the breath of God's Spirit blow upon it and the fuel of duty piled on it. It is with a reasonable expectation that you, my brother, notwithstanding your present wretched condition, may be by the grace of God brought back to compactness with your brethren and into uninterrupted communication with Christ, the head. It is worth working for. One of the things then clearly before my mind as visible as a mountainous coast to a mariner at sea, one huge substance that rears itself up into the sky, so that the eye cannot help but see it, is that backsliders may be healed. God has made abundant provision for their healing. And' it seems to me that you ought to be unwilling for this year to close, if your spiritual affairs are not in good, condition, leaving them in a wretched condition. Why should there not be on your part an adjustment before this year closes? Why not seek to commence the new year with fresh views of divine grace, with new sensations of religious joy, and with quickened purpose of religious life? I invite you to that as personally as if I were to call your name and step down from this pulpit and walk down the aisle, and take you by the hand, singling you out from everybody else in the world, to ask these questions: Is it well with your soul, my brother, my sister? Will you help your pastor? Will you respond to the trumpet commandment of your Redeemer? Will you yield yourself to the impressions of the Eternal Spirit by seeking a deeper and a richer spirituality before this year closes? Then remember that whet God says that it is His purpose to take out a people, that He does not mean to take all the people. You torture yourself to no good end, you afflict your soul without accomplishing any good result, if you seek to satisfy all outside people. All men have not faith. Some of them will never have it. Some of them have already sinned against the Holy Ghost. Some may call you hypocrites. Some may hate the doctrine you preach. Some may work against it. These possibly would be glad if every one of you were dead. Let it be so. Allow not their criticisms to influence your action in this matter. But there are also some people in this town that may be saved. And here I suggest two or three things to think about as you go out and try to save them. These are thoughts worth ten thousand volumes of philosophical speculations which deride the Word of God. The first thought is that man by nature is religious. Man, by nature, as God made him, is endowed for religion, and infidelity is simply a veneer. Under the veneer the eternal truth remains that man is religious by nature. There is a craving for something better than anything this earth can give. There is the restlessness of an immortal spirit. There is a longing for something more gratifying than anything he has ever yet found. He feels that earth's foundations and songs

and glories and honors and powers and emoluments cannot satisfy the inner man. Now you have that to work on. Then remember this, that whatever may be the ten thousand objections sinners may allege at any particular time, whatever their charges against you or any other Christian people, these things are evanescent. They do not abide. There comes one breeze from God, and as autumn leaves are stripped from the boughs of the trees which gave them birth and are carried away, so these objections that sinners regarded as insuperable and multitudinous, and that you regarded as beyond your power to break down, one single breath of God may sweep them all away, every one of them, in an hour. Go out then on these thoughts: (1) God has appointed the church as the institution for the accomplishment of His purposes; (2) that God has a purpose to take out of the Gentiles a people, so that while confessedly you cannot reach everybody, since all people have not faith, there are some people reachable and it is your duty to reach them; (3) that difficulties which at one time may appear to both you and sinners as insuperable as granite mountains, melt away and vanish before one breath of the rising day. So let us have faith and go to work. Are you out of touch with your brethren? Get in touch. Are you out of touch with Jesus Christ, the Head? Get in touch. And as a church which God has wonderfully blessed in the past, and for which, as I trust, He has reserved greater blessings in the future, I invite you to move together, honor the institution of the divine appointment, keep the bond of unity, and for Christ's sake, who loved you and cleansed you from your sins and made you kings and priests of God, let us render glory to Him in this December.

# S. The Good, Acceptable & Perfect Will of God

THE GOOD, ACCEPTABLE AND PERFECT WILL OF GOD TEXT: That good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God. - Romans 12:2. The bible represents God to us as a being whose existence ante-dates all other existence; as one not only eternal in His being, omniscient in His wisdom, omnipotent in His power, omnipresent in His pervading being, and as infinite in holiness, but as being love in His essence, and in His nature. Such a being must have in Himself all of the causes of actions. His actions cannot be determined by anything outside of Himself. The will of such a being must be Himself. The will of God is God willing, and such a will, being according to the eternity and immutability of His nature, and according to His infinite goodness and love, and according to His power, must be such a will as besides which there can be no other. From the nature of God it must be good. From the nature of God it must be perfect. From the nature of God it ought to be acceptable to all the creatures whom He has made, no matter what it is. So that when we reflect upon the nature of God and the manifestation which He has made of Himself, there ought to be but one supreme object before any finite being, and that is this: To do and submit to the will of God. Not, “How can I understand it?” Not, “Does it accord with my pleasure?” Not, “Does it glorify me, or diminish my name,” but, what is that will? And, wherever it is, it is good, it is perfect, it must be acceptable to me. If in the accomplishment of His purposes in the universe, and with relation to all the complicated affairs of the system of worlds which He has made, it is best that I should suffer; that is good, that is perfect, that shall be acceptable to me. In other words, there is nothing better. Whenever we begin to question the actions of God as judged from the standpoint of our individual necessities, or our individual wishes, or our individual pleasures, we stand upon the border of atheism-we stand on irreverent ground. No matter what light may be thrown on the subject, considering the limitations of our being, our short-sightedness, the imperfection of our comprehension, and the small scope of the affairs of the universe that comes within the range of our observation, it is utterly impossible for us to sit in judgment upon the will of God. When the Lord Jesus Christ taught men to pray, He taught them after this fashion: “Thy will be done. Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.” In all the heavenly courts there is not an intelligence that questions for one moment the wisdom, the goodness, or the perfection of any purpose of God. That He said it, is enough. It stands as approved in the intelligence of every heavenly being that God purposes it, no matter what it is. And they know that that is the best thing for all parties concerned. It is the best for God’s glory; it is the best for the universe; it is the best for all people, if God wills it. Now, our prayer is that His will should be done here upon earth as it is done in heaven. Our context asks the question, “Who hath known the mind of the Lord?” How are you and I going to understand His mind? With which one of us did He consult? And if He had consulted with us, how could we have aided ominiscience in devising any of His plans, and how could our feebleness have imparted strength to His omnipotence, and how could our ignorance have assisted His wisdom? The shortest way to the solution of every earthly trouble, the one that has no windings in it, the one that admits of no appeals to future tribunals, is just this: That in everything we should seek to know and be conformed to the will of God. There must be something fixed. There must be some standard which does not waver. There must be some tribunal whose

decisions are beyond controversy, and that standard and that tribunal is God's will; and from the nature of the case we are to account it good and perfect and acceptable. And every creature should seek in the lights that are given concerning that will, in Providence, in prophecy, in the gospel, to know just what it is. It is useless to talk about anything being beyond the range of that will. Startling as it may sound, it is true nevertheless, that every evil thing that happens comes in some way within His will. I do not say that God is the author of sin. Sin is the transgression of His law, but He does come within it in one sense. I will take a case to illustrate. Take Herod, take Pilate, take the Sanhedrin, that pronounced judgment upon the Lord Jesus Christ, and carried out their wishes and their malice and their scorn, and yet above all that they boasted or did was the determinate counsel of God. And in the broad sweep of God's will, as an outer circle, revolve all of the inner circles, all human law and Satanic law, the law of devils, and God's law is over it all. And, therefore, if there should come to be a wrong done by any man, God permits that wrong to be done. If there should come to be a calamity of any kind, God permits that calamity, and He permits it for purposes that He will ultimately bring out when He vindicates Himself before the eyes of the assembled universe at the Judgment of the last day. I abide that final decision. I leave my vindication to Him. I leave His vindication to Himself, and it is for me to accept what comes from the Lord. You remember when David, on one occasion, was followed by a very wicked man, who took advantage of the misfortunes that had come upon him; when his heart was broken with domestic sorrow; when his heart was careworn with the disastrous affairs of his kingdom; when there was none to do him reverence; when for the time being he was a fugitive then this wicked and vindictive man followed him and cursed him and threw stones at him, and David said: "Let him curse on. Who knows but God has permitted him to vent his spite on me in this sad condition for my good? Let him curse on." He submitted himself to circumstances over which he had no control, knowing that above all human malice and all spite, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and that His will is supreme, and that ultimately He will bring out everything into glorious daylight, and vindicate all truth, and will punish all falsehood. David knew it and felt it. This is certainly true with reference to all troubles which come upon us in this life. I mean sickness in the family; the death of some member of the family; any reverse is business. It does not make any difference what it is; before the eye of the creature should ever be this supreme object: The will of the Lord be done. If I am well, His will be done. If I am sick, let His will be done. If my day must be eclipsed in the meridian, His will be done. What am I, and who is the Lord, that I should bring my wishes and my pleasures and demand that they should triumph rather than that the purposes of God should be executed? Now, it is this view of the subject that I wanted to present to the congregation today, because the Apostle here bases all of his exhortations to practical Godliness upon that subject: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God." Now, what he refers to are the mercies that have been stated in the context. What are they? There was a time when His mercies seemed to be given to the Jews, and other nations looked at Him and said: "Is God partial? Has He exalted one people and conferred upon that people privileges that He confers upon no other people?" There came a time when this people, that had enjoyed those mercies, were outcast. The Kingdom of God was taken from them and given to another people; and now here was mercy to the Gentile, and that mercy continues to this day. Standing over against the first mercy to the Jews was the second mercy to the Gentiles to be followed by final mercy to both, and all according to the counsel of God, who makes no apologies for Himself, not even feeling called upon to explain Himself to men, but from the height of eternity and from the immutability of His counsel, and omniscience and

wisdom of His intelligence, directing all things to one glorious consummation. On this, Paul exhorts, “Therefore, by the mercies of God, I beseech you, brethren, to present your bodies a living sacrifice to the Lord.” It is an easy thing to present a dead sacrifice. It is an easy thing for anyone, when the burdens on him get to a certain point, to say, “Now, I am willing to quit. I accept it. I am willing to quit.” That is, I am willing to die. That is not a living sacrifice; that is a dying one. The will of the Lord be done, even if He calls upon you to live, to endure, to hold out faithfully, to leave to Him the day of your death as well as the day of your birth, and not to say that the scissors of fate are in your hands that shall clip the cord of life and hasten your exit from this world. It is to be a sacrifice that absolutely submits to God the full length of its continuance, whether it be years or whether it be hours. It is with the Lord. Lord, you know how frail I am. You are acquainted with my being. Your knowledge is infinite, and your nature is perfect in goodness, and your love is infinite. I just leave the matter with you. Portion it out to me, give it to me according to your judgment, and not according to my judgment. I want to ask you a question in this connection. If, in your past lives you have not found your chief trouble to be this: The difficulty in you of adjustment to what God has purposed? Whence come our murmurs? Whence come our complaints? Whence come our rebellious feelings? What is the source of them? They all grow out of the fact that we stand there and stubbornly say: “Let my will be done and not God’s will be done.” That restiveness under Godly restraint, that impatience to hurry on the way we wish to go, that shaking of the hour-glass to make its sands run out faster, or that endeavor to lock the wheels of time and clog them, that they may not go so fast it all grows out of the desire in the human heart to subordinate God to man. Take the illustrations that are given in this chapter. One of them is a case of vengeance. A man has wrought an indignity upon us. He has greatly excited our anger, and with the rapidity which characterizes the human mind when selfishness touches the wavering balance, we call for instant judgment. We march up and take our seat in the judge’s chair, and while we sit in the judge’s chair we stand up also in the prosecutor’s place. And occupying this double position we summon ourselves also as a witness, and upon our own ex parte testimony, as prosecuted by ourselves before the court of our own heart, we pronounce a judgment and then assess a penalty. And all vengeance that is ever exercised by human hands is just of that kind. The one who exercises it claims to be judge and prosecutor, and witness, and then assumes the only remaining right to execute the penalty. Every prerogative of government is thus usurped, whether it be legislative, judicial or executive. The man claims it all for himself. And when you talk to him in his excitement over a wrong that he thinks has been done to him, and you see his eye is on fire, and he cannot even look at a thing that does not coincide with his view of the case, his feelings, the outrages that he seems to be conscious of, are all that he thinks of. There is no thought of God, no thought of the other man, but it is, “I, myself.” I have been wronged. My sacred person has been violated. The things which are peculiar to me have been interfered with, and who is God that He should trespass on the boundaries which belong to me? And hence this chapter, in making an application of the text, says: “Brethren, avenge not yourselves.” God’s law is good. There is no evil in it. God’s law is perfect. There is no fault in it any way. “Give place to wrath,” which is an obscure translation of the original. It means, You give way and let God’s wrath sit upon the throne of judgment. Here is a picture of it: A wrong has been done you and a judgment has been set for investigation of the case. The wronged man is in the attitude of one hastening up to take his place on the judgment throne in order to dispense judgment in his own behalf, but this text arrests him and says, “Stop! You get out of the way. Give place. Here comes the wrath of God. Give way! Give

place to His wrath! Don't claim your own. Let Him come up and take His position on that throne and investigate that case. Let God's will be done in this matter." There never has been a murder committed but it has been a stroke given in anger that has not proceeded from the same usurpation of the divine prerogative. That man is unwilling for God to be the judge, either of himself or other people, but he claims to be his own judge, not only of his own affairs, but of the affairs of his neighbors. In every one of these several instances in this twelfth chapter, some of which relate to business, some of which relate to family affairs, and some of which relate to the very thought and intent of the heart the whole, comprehended in, one single word, is brought and placed right under this precept, that we should conform our selves to the good and perfect and acceptable will of God. Suppose you are going to pray, and every time you are in any serious trouble you will be disposed pray; now, what are you going to ask for? That comes instantly; what are you going to ask for? What is to be the nature of the petition you send up to God's throne? Shall I ask that my hand be placed in the neck of my enemy? Shall I ask that I may be rich because it is pleasant to be rich, and I like luxury? Shall I ask for power because I enjoy being above other people? Shall I ask for the gratification of the carnal desires of my nature because they clamor for gratification? Listen! If we ask anything which is in accordance with His will, He heareth us. That is the end of it. Well, now, would you have it otherwise? When you think soberly would you have it that God should allow your will to be the standard of answered prayers? Let us see what would be the result of it. Here is a ship on its way to Europe. At a certain season of the year, in accordance with the providence of God, which providence is related to the good of the whole world, the trade-winds blow that way all through that season of the year. Well, now, you are in a hurry and you are on a sailing vessel, and you say: "I will go and ask God to change this wind. I will kneel down here and I will say, 'Lord, reverse this trade wind. I want to go to Europe, and what are the affairs of all the rest of the world put together in comparison with mine? Am I not more prominent than all other people? Are not my wishes more sacred?'" Just think of the presumption of it. See the overweening conceit and vanity that are involved in it. Take another case. There are two of you. One of you fastened his heart upon the acquisition of a certain object. Another man has fastened his heart upon the acquisition of the same object. And you both say: "We will pray about it." And A kneels down and prays that the Lord will let him have it, and B prays that the Lord will let him have it. Now, if man's will is to he the standard concerning prayer, how is that matter to be adjusted? Here is a direct conflict between the two human wills. Each man wants, as his own peculiar possession, a certain thing. It is absolutely impossible that its ownership be peculiar to both. And as there are so many minds, and chaos, such as Ovid describes, when all the elements commingled, when fire and air and earth were one heterogeneous mass of matter that did not coalesce and yet would not separate-such chaos would result in the affairs of this world. There must be one high, holy, good, perfect, infinite and loving will that is supreme, and to which every other will must be subordinate. And men ought to pray this way: "Lord, if it be thy will, if it is best for me, if it is best for the good of all and for thy glory that I should have a certain object, I would like to have it. But, if its attainment will injure me, if its attainment will injure my neighbor, if its attainment will be contrary to your own purposes for the general good, then, Lord, thwart me in this. Do not let me have it, and I will bear the disappointment. I will be conformed to thy will. I will adjust myself to the divine requirements, and I will do it without an argument and without a murmur, and without a rebellious thought, and I will do it with the absolute knowledge that God's withholding that desired thing from me is good and perfect and acceptable and bound to be so in the nature of the case."

See how James brings up the thought in questions of trade. He says a merchant deliberates and he says then to himself “Tomorrow I will start to a certain city and there I will purchase goods and trade for a year. And then I will go to another city and trade for another year, and then I will come back with my increased gains.” And James adds: “Why not say, ‘If the Lord wills’,” for if the Lord does not will it cannot be done. His counsel stands and He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and in the affairs of this earth. And that man who lays his plans without any regard to the sovereign and absolute and divine will of God is a man who is all the time going to meet with disappointment. Things are going to come about that he never counted on, and he is going to be a chronic grumbler. He is going to become soured on the world. He is going to carry a face that will bear, its own story of unsoothed and unprofitable sorrow and disappointment and sadness, and care will come and furrow the brow with wrinkles and whiten his hair, and take the sweetness out of his disposition, and curdle the milk of human kindness in him, and at last he will be an embodiment of complaint, a bundle of murmurings and grudges, feeling that his hand is against every man, and every man’s hand is against him, and what is the good of it, after all? What purpose does it serve? Does it amount to anything that a man should pitch the puny straws of his opposition against the thick bosses of Jehovah’s buckler? Will it accrue to his advantage in anything for him to impudently confront Omniscience and say, “My strength is stronger than God. My ignorance is wiser than His wisdom?” See the folly of it! “Saul, Saul, it is hard for thee to kick against the goad.” The supreme folly of it ought to strike any mind at a glance. It cannot possibly accomplish any good. I want to illustrate, finally, what I mean by an observation passed upon some of the attendants at the Young People’s Convention, which has just adjourned in this city. The question curiously came up in my mind as I looked at my own part of the guests: What guests for a Young People’s Convention! One of them, seventy years old, and who knew me when I was a little boy, and who used to call me “her boy,” and the other two were venerable, aged parents, whose son was president of the Convention, and yet I said: Are not these people young? Is not the dew of their youth on them? Is not the light of youth yet on them? And why? Because they have not wasted their energies in fighting God. They have not allowed unhallowed desires to consume them internally. They have not allowed their resistance to the dispensations of God, which are irrevocable, to so bow them down and crush out their spirits that they are prematurely aged. Hence they are young yet. They are in the springtime, though the hair is white on the brow, and I imagine that when they die they will die in the springtime-die not in cold winter (I speak figuratively), not while trees are bare, not while the whole earth is locked in the iron of ice; but they will die while birds are singing and flowers are blooming, and will cross over with a smile into the eternal spring of the other shore. Why? Because of their habit of adjusting themselves to the good and perfect and acceptable will of God. Because of the trend of their minds in acknowledging God as wiser than they are and better than they are, causing their minds to melt into the greater mind of God, like the little stream melts into the broad river into which it flows, and loses its own current in the broader current of the mightier stream. Now, go butt your head against a wall if you will. Go wring your hands in hopeless repining, if you choose. Go wrinkle your face with corroding anxieties if you prefer it. It will do you no good. ‘Rather conform yourself to that good and perfect and acceptable will of God. That is the option you have. Now, which will you elect? It is an exceedingly practical question. It touches every affair of this life. You know certain people, you could call their names today if you felt disposed, and there was any propriety in your mentioning names-you know people right here in this city that are trying to live as if there were no God; trying to live as if there

were not an infinitely higher mind; trying to live as if there were not a sovereign and absolute will which is above theirs; trying to live as if there were not a standard to which they must conform. You may be like them, or the aged young people mentioned. I leave you with the option. Here comes the triumphant chariot of Jehovah. His steeds Are swifter than the lightnings. His chariot passes our way. It represents the will, of God. Will you get in the chariot and sit down by the divinity and let Him drive these fiery steeds, and carry you safely and gladly and happily with Him, or will you remain outside, chained to that chariot and dragged along and become finally a mangled corpse and a mangled spirit? I don’t know of any other alternative.

# S. The House of God

THE HOUSE OF GOD ( Dedication Sermon of East Waco Church House where George W. Truett was Pastor.) TEXT: For we (preachers) are God's fellow-workers: ye (church members) are God's field, God's building. Know ye not that ye are a temple o f God, and that the Spirit o f God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are. The house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground, of the truth. - 1 Corinthians 3:9; 1 Corinthians 3:16-17; 1 Timothy 3:15. Brethren of the East Waco Baptist Church, with the pastor and deacons, visiting brethren from other churches, and friends of whatsoever religious name or state: We are all here before God upon no ordinary occasion. The occasion is the setting apart of this goodly structure to exclusive religious use. It is not intended as a hall of justice, like the court rooms beyond the river, nor for political uses, nor for any secular use, however good and profitable any of these may be in their place. The building and furniture as it now stands cost about $10,000, as will appear directly from the report of the Building Committee. This large sum of money comes not from any public fund, nor from any system of taxation, but from the voluntary contributions of the members of this congregation and such of their friends as chose to aid them. It is doubtless a matter of curiosity with some to note the character of the services by which this meeting house will be set apart to sacred use and to discover what special sanctity will attach thereto by reason of its consecration. From the outset we will be candid with all who may cherish this natural curiosity. There will be no imposing ceremony no ritualism whatever. The service will be exceedingly simple, a sermon deemed appropriate to the occasion, a brief history of the enterprise from its inception to completion, read by the clerk, a final report of the building committee, a prayer offering the completed house to the Lord and invoking His acceptance and blessing, and a song of praise to Him whose grace prompted His people to undertake the work and enable them to complete it. This is all. And when done it is only a meeting house of wood and brick, and not a temple. One object of the sermon today is to justify the simplicity of the dedication of a Baptist house of worship, if indeed services so very simple may be called a dedication at all. And now, brethren, before entering upon the exposition of the text, bear with some brief personal references, which will explain somewhat the pleasure with which I respond to your invitation to preach this opening sermon. The first public talk I ever made as a Christian was in a log house not far from this site. The occasion was a prayermeeting conducted by Dr. R. C. Burleson, in the fall of 1865. In the summer of that year I had been converted, but had not as yet united with any church. Indeed, the church question was occasioning me no little trouble. My conscience was much exercised on that grave question, which, when decided, so largely affects the Christian's after-life: "What church shall I join? Which, if any extant is, in form of government, polity and doctrine, conformed to the mother church at Jerusalem-the model established by our Lord?" With the New Testament before me as the only standard of authority, I had little trouble in deciding in favor of the Baptists except upon two points commonly called "close communion" and sanctification. On these two doctrines I had not reached a satisfactory conclusion. On the communion question I had but recently read the views of two authors whom I greatly admired, Robert Hall and John Bunyan. My difficulty on sanctification was not at all in the

direction of the modern holiness idea, but to determine whether the Bible taught an imputed holiness or a personal holiness. If imputed, it was instantaneous and contemporaneous with justification. If personal, then the Baptist view was right. So, as Dr. Burleson was my old teacher, I concluded to ride the intervening 100 miles and consult him on these two points. While we were considering these matters, he invited me to drive with him to a prayer-meeting in East Waco, where, as he said, it would be necessary to establish a church some day. So, fording the river, we came to that old log house and there, without a word to me about it, he announced to the few country people present that there was with him a young Christian who would probably become a preacher, and who ought then and there to get up and tell those people what he knew of the grace of God. And thus, after such a method, I was literally thrust forth to testify for Christ in the log house prayer-meeting, which three years later led to the organization of the East Waco Baptist Church. Again, on a later visit, in July 1868, this church having been organized the May previous, I united with its first pastor, Bro. Walker, in aiding Bro. J. M. Wright in a meeting seven miles below this point, which resulted in the organization of the New Hope Church, to which I was called as pastor in October, 1869. Since that time I have been intimately associated with all the successive pastors of this church four of whom sit behind me today in this pulpit. Particularly is this true with regard to your present pastor, Rev. G. W. Truett. Your committee which sought my advice concerning his suitableness for the position, will recall my heartiness in recommending him; and the earnestness with which the growing importance of East Waco was urged as a suitable field for the development of a strong church. Well, you got him; and right glad of it you ought to be this day, gathered in this house, whose happy conception and speedy consummation are due to his counsel and labors. And so much did my own heart rejoice in your prosperity that when I was invited to preach this opening sermon in the new building, I fully purposed to prepare one worthy of the occasion. But an attack of erysipelas in the foot has confined me to my bed until this very morning, and so you must be content with such a sermon fresh from my heart as may be preached under the circumstances, on the grandest theme to which the Christian mind can be directed after the first sight of his Savior the church of our Lord Jesus Christ. In expounding the text, let us consider:

1. The term, “Fellow-workers.”

Usually the establishment and development of a church is the result of the labors of many preachers. It was true in the case of the church at Corinth, and is equally true with the East Waco Church. But mark you, the text does not say that these several men are “fellow-workers” with each other. Their labors were successive, not contemporaneous. They are God’s fellow-workers, that each one in his time was a fellow-worker with God. For example, the present pastor does not say to his predecessor: “We are fellow-workers,” but “I am God’s fellow-worker, as you were God’s fellow-worker in your day.” Fellow-worker, therefore, has no reference to a conjunction of one preacher’s labors with another preacher’s labors, for they were successive, not conjoined, but to the conjunction of their work with God’s work. God works. God does die divine part-man the human part. Under the agricultural figure of a field, God created the seed, sends sunshine and fruitful seasons, making it to germinate, grow and mature. Man plants and cultivates. Hence Paul’s question, not “Who is Apollos,” but “What is Apollos and what is Paul?” “Servants.” Whose servants? God’s. What is their service? To lead men to faith in Christ and build them up together in that faith. But the servant is only an instrument in the hands of God a minister through whom men

believe as God gives to every man. One servant may plant:, and another may cultivate, but God makes it grow. Thus are they fellow-workers with God. Bearing in mind, therefore, the subordinate position of the greatest preacher on earth, we understand the justice of Paul's conclusion: Glory not in men, but in God. The honor of the laborer is the association of his work with God's work-God's fellow-worker. But where there have been successive laborers in the same field, it becomes a question:

2. How can we apportion to each his credit and reward?

We can't do it. We may not even try it. It is not denied, but affirmed, that each laborer will receive an equitable reward. But we cannot make the award. Who then and how? Look at the case before us suggesting the text. Paul started that work at Corinth. He planted that crop. He laid the foundation of that building. Others came after him to cultivate the field planted by him or to carry up the wall on the foundation he had laid. And he insists that he started the work right; holding up before those people one theme: Christ and Him crucified; relying on no natural endowment of body or mind no physical or mental acquirement, no trick of elocution no well-rounded period of rhetoric. He came among them in fear and trembling, relying, not partially but absolutely and wholly, upon the demonstration of the Spirit, that their faith might not stand in men, but in God.

No man could lay any other foundation, though he might build thereon. But he urges that in the great variety of building material, let him be careful what he puts on that foundation. It must correspond to the foundation. True, you may, if you will, reject the costlier marble with its garniture of silver and gold, and build a cheaper wall of wood, and thatch it with straw. But one thing is certain, when Jesus comes, there will be no need for the several pastors themselves, or their partial friends in their behalf, to dispute about respective credit and reward. For, says the Apostle, "That day itself will declare it" declare it by fire. Then however hard or long or acceptably to men the pastor toiled, if he "daubed with untempered mortar," or if he built of wood or stubblequicker than lightning, in that fire, will his wall tumble into ruins or his thatch roof go up in flame and smoke-counting for nothing that day. One flash of that flame supersedes all argument as to respective merit, and reveals the enduring or evanishing character of each man's work. He himself, if a converted man, will be saved, but if his works be bad-he suffers loss. Judgment will be God's line, and righteousness His plummet when He comes to inspect our work on the wall. Let us next inquire, Where so many work:

3. Whose is the field whose the building?

Here emphasis is brevity. It saves the use of labored explanation. Mark then the emphatic word: "Ye are God' s Field, God' s Building." In contradistinction to and in rebuttal of any claim of ownership set up by any preacher himself or by his friends, for him that emphasis is final: "God' s Field-God's Building." Should Paul say: "The church at Corinth is my building," or should Apollos say, "No, it is mine," and Peter say: "But it is mine," or these being silent, their respective friends should say: "I am of Paul," "I am of Apollos," "I am of Peter," the whole of them go down in a moment before the words, "Ye are God' s building." But the thought most pertinent to this occasion is suggested by the next question:

4. What is the field-what is the building?

Again emphasis is brevity. “Ye are God’s field Ye are God’s building.” Let the emphasis on that pronoun contradistinguish from this meeting-house of brick and wood. Do allow me to impress most solemnly on your minds today that ye people making this congregation of Christ’s baptized disciples are the husbandry the house of God. Nowhere in the New Testament is the meeting-house called a church. Modern usage has so applied the, name “church,” to the place of assembly that much hurtful confusion arises in the minds of the thoughtless. The usage doubtless grew out of the gross misconception that Christian houses of worship are the successors of Solomon’s temple and so must have altars and priests, and so must be dedicated with imposing rites and ceremonies, and so when dedicated became holy places, a violation of whose sanctity became sacrilege. Hence the gorgeous cathedrals of the dark ages whose ornamentation cost millions of money and whose services became idolatry. The painter’s art and the sculptor’s chisel were employed to minister to a man’s aesthetic taste and throw a halo around a structure which covers holy ground. The place became the attraction of pilgrimages and the alleged locale of miracles and so fostered colossal superstitions subverting our Lord’s glorious doctrine: “Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father.” “But the hour cometh and now is when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be His worshipers. God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.” (John 4:21; John 4:23-24). Moreover, it diverted attention from God’s true house, which house are ye. I would not disparage your meeting-house, brethren, nor underestimate its uses. But if its walls were Parian marble, its roof a poem of architectural beauty, its spire gilded, cloud-piercing and diamond tipped, yet would it remain true that ye worshipers are God’s building and not the structure made by human hands. Not only so, but every part of any meeting house, and all ornamentation whatever, that diverts the mind from the simplicity of New Testament worship, and detracts from the utility of any auditorium where God’s word is preached, is more than a blunder; it is a crime. Let us bless God that we are emerging from the dark ages, the idolatrous cathedral ages. No wonder that Mark Twain, when contrasting the beggary rags and wretchedness of Italy with the uncountable millions squandered on the cathedrals, sarcastically remarked: “The amazing thing is that it never occurred to them to rob the churches.” The congregation, whether meeting in groves, or tents or private houses, or structures specially erected for permanent use as a place of worship the organized congregation, that is God’s building. If our modern meeting-houses are the successors of anything, it is the ancient synagogues, which, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, were erected by pious Jews in every place, not as temples, but as houses of religious instruction. Solomon’s temple has but one antitype in this world today, a congregation of Christ’s baptized disciples. What says our text: “Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.” (1 Corinthians 3:16-17.) Now, if it were accounted sacrilege to defile the temple of Solomon, to make it a place of barter and exchange, to crowd its courts with doves and oxen, to erect in its holy place “the abomination of desolation”-if it were sacrilege to mar the sanctity of that mere type of cold rock which never had in it more than a symbol of the Divine Presence, how much more sacrilegious to mar the spiritual antitype a congregation of Christ’s baptized disciples, the true habitat of God’s eternal Spirit. With what painful tardiness does the conception enter our minds that to destroy the unity and fellowship of one of God’s churches is as much more heinous a sacrilege as the antitype surpasses the type!

“Whoever destroys the temple of God, him will God destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.” However slight some may regard the offense of schism, causing divisions in a congregation of God’s people, it is yet as much graver a crime than stealing or murder as the first table of the law excels the second table. Our first and holiest and most far-reaching relation is our relation to God. A church of Jesus Christ is the only organization on earth inhabited as a home by the Holy Spirit. Here let us consider the latter part of our text: “These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” - 1 Timothy 3:14-16. The preceding chapters show that Timothy was left at Ephesus to set in Gospel order the affairs of the church established at that place by Paul, its doctrine, its order of public worship, its officers and their official duties. To this he refers in the phrase: “That thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God.” Proprieties are quite important, but the reference is to the conduct and order of worship by the congregation, and not to the amenities and civilities of social etiquette in the place of assembly. For example, he distinguishes in the prayer service between the respective parts of men and women, the men to pray everywhere, the women to learn in silence and subjection, just as he had required particularly in the congregation at Corinth, and “in all the churches of Jesus Christ.” - 1 Corinthians 14:26-34. Then comes the importance and functions of the pastoral office and the office of deacon. It is doubtless deemed a matter of some importance by you East Waco people who shall be the next president of the United States, and maybe (I don’t know) some of you are interested somewhat in the pending election for mayor, but these are much more important questions to you: “What shall be the order of our worship what the doctrines preached to us and hence, who shall be our pastor?” Solemn question! To be left at God’s feet. “O Providence, guide our choice! O Thou Holy Spirit, whose province it is to make overseers of God’s flock, show to us him whom Thou wouldst have to minister to us.” You have him, I think. With heart and judgment, I think you have him. This much sure, he would have chosen death rather than acceptance of your call, if he had not felt it was also God’s call. Much and earnestly we prayed and counseled about it together. And so with the deacons. Behavior in the house of God! The house-what house? In Old Testament times this might have meant the temple, a material structure, but here, what? “The House of God, which is the Church of the Living God.” Church building? No. All the saved people in the world, dead or living? No. The congregation of Christ’s baptized people at Ephesus, a local, working, worshiping, organized business body, just as this local church here. As Paul himself writes to this same church at Ephesus: “In whom (Christ) each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also (the congregation at Ephesus), are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.” - Ephesians 2:21-22, R. V. Meyer, the greatest exegete of the New Testament text, thus elucidates: “In whom each congregation, in whom also yours, organically develops itself unto its holy destination, ” and further shows that Paul’s conception is not of the whole Christian community, but “every congregation for itself” is a temple-building. He then cites 1 Corinthians 3:16, a part of our text, as an instance where the conception of the general “collective body of Christians” is, to use his own words and emphasis, “linguistically impossible.” So you also, the East Waco Baptist Church, (not this beautiful meeting house) are the house, the temple of the Living God, mark you - LIVING GOD. The temple of

Diana, at this same Ephesus, held an image, not the sculptured form embodying in marble the beautiful Greek conception of the chaste Diana-but a monstrous prodigy, a hideous wooden image representing nature. But there was no life in that image. It was dumb and dead. No voice, no hearing, no feeling, no love. How it recalled the sarcasm of old Elijah, taunting the 400 vociferous priests of Baal: “And it came to pass at noon that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud: for he is a god; either he is musing or he is gone aside or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked. And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lances, till the blood gushed out upon them. And it was so, when midday was past, that they prophesied until the time of the offering of the evening oblation; but there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded.” - 1 Kings 18:27-29. But, brethren, our God is alive! He inhabits His church and vitalizes it. He “inhabitest the praises of Israel” and His life gives power to preaching, unction to prayer and sweetness to song. Ours is not a God of mere history, a reminiscence of yesterday, last year, ancient times, but a living, present reality, now, here. God is alive. Jesus is risen indeed. Oh! My brethren, the joy of being the ambassador, not of a defunct dynasty, a desiccated mummy, but of the living God, here accessible, now to hear our prayers now to shake the ground where the pious kneel, now to quicken the dead. It flushes the heart to think of it. God is alive! Yes, ye Sunday School children, Jesus is alive - hear His voice in your spirits today: “Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me.” Power, present power, saving power, omnipotent power, power to cast out Satan, power to send down heaven’s glory to cover the earthly mercy seat. But to what end does God inhabit His church? “The pillar and ground of the truth.” Truth itself conceived of as a temple, like the Athenian Parthenon. Its ground, what? The everlasting rock of the Acropolis. Its supports, what? Those glorious pillars, matchless masterpieces of marble sculpture. What then is the office of the church? The pillar and ground of the truth. On the church, as a rock foundation against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, rests the truth. As a marble column upholds the superincumbent structure, so the church is the pillar of the truth. To blot out the church organizations, if one could do it, would be a blighting thing, for truth would fall. Conceive of the blotting out of all solar and stellar lights. How cold and dark and dead the world! Oceans are adamant, rivers but stiffened, winding blocks of lice. But blot out the churches and who or what would hold up revealed truth, the truth of salvation? Who would publish it by a living ministry to earth’s remotest bounds, generation by generation? Who would illustrate it in holy words after the teaching power forever had ceased? Who would believe it, with none to bring it to hearing? Who would vindicate it by discipline when organization ceased? Who would pictorially represent it when ordinances and other monumental evidences had been pulled down with the organizations which administered them? How long would survive even one vestige of the holy day of worship and instruction, when the organic bond of the worshiping congregation was dissolved? How long would Sunday Schools, and Christian colleges, and orphanages and asylums continue when the organizations which established and nourished them are dead? How long would family religion maintain her altars in the homes after public instruction ceased? And when the Sabbathless, churchless wave of cold, hard secularism had swept over the world, leaving no light of revelation to shine on a Godless world, a world on whose sufferings only pitiless stars looked down in unsympathizing silence a world claiming indeed a God of nature, but a dumb and deaf God who heard no prayers and spoke no words-no voice of love. Ah me! What then would be in the world? Without the church, a Deist world would come, you say. Wouldn’t? From what page of history do you learn it? Divorce man’s worshiping heart from the God of revelation

and heathen idolatry comes. The creature then is worshiped rather than the Creator. And even then that is better than a mythical, impossible thing, unknown to history, a Deist world, for “To own a god who does not speak to men, Is first to own and then disown again; Of all idolatry sure the total sum Is counting it a god that is both deaf and dumb.” I say, destroy the church and what or who becomes the pillar of revealed truth? Could you rely on the secular press? As a rule they decry that truth now and count that church or preacher the best who leaves it out and substitutes the chaff of so-called philosophy and humanitarianism instead. Let a preacher betray his solemn trust and use the pulpit for publishing infidelity and he becomes their hero. Take an example: Not long since there appeared in the Washington Post, afterwards copied into a Waco paper, a so-called New York preacher’s account of how he went to Washington City and, climbing into a belfry there, virtually worshiped the bell that tolled when John Brown was executed for insurrection and murder, and what feelings of reverence he had for him whose hand was red with blood unlawfully shed from Osawotamie to Harper’s Ferry, who, in time of peace, led an armed invasion, looking to bloody, servile insurrection against an unoffending sister state, and who, by violence, seized upon United States property and crimsoned with murder the streets of a peaceful village. I say, all this was preached as a sermon,, not only without a word of the Gospel peace in it, but actually substituting for “Christ Jesus and Him crucified” the theme of “John Brown and him hanged,” on which the secular paper comments: “That was a sermon indeed.” We come now to the last thought of the text: What is that truth of revelation of which the church is the pillar and ground? Our context gives it thus: “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” - 1 Timothy 3:16. This summary embodies six constituent parts: First, God was manifest in the flesh. This is the doctrine of the incarnation of Deity in the person of Jesus of Nazareth and embraces all the facts of His miraculous birth, life, work, doctrines, vicarious death, burial and resurrection as set forth by the Gospel historians, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul. It is a crucial doctrine, for says the Apostle John, “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of anti-Christ, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.” No man can rightly be called a disciple of our Lord who denies it. It is fundamental and vital. Second, He was justified in the Spirit, which means that the Holy Spirit bore witness to His divinity and mission when incarnate. For example, just after His baptism and while He prayed, the Spirit in the visible and bodily form of a dove descended upon Him, accrediting His mission and qualifying Him for it, as it is written: “Him hath God the Father sealed,” and again: “Anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power,” and yet again: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.” Third, “Seen of the Angels,” which means that when incarnate, the veil of the flesh was transparent to an angelic sight. Man might be slow to recognize the “Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,” in the babe of Mary, but the angels knew Him. They saw Him, a babe in a manger, a cow trough, born that night, in a scene of poverty, and men saw nothing in that baby, but angels from above looking down upon the earth saw the baby and grouped together and leaned over and said, “We see the Master. We recognize His divinity.” And instantly spreading

their wings, they came down in flight like lightning, and with rustling sweeter than song, hovered over the heads of the upgazing shepherds, and said to them, “Unto you is born this day in the City of David a Savior who is Christ the Lord.” We know it. We see Him. Yes, they saw Him when, in the temptation, the devil crawled around Him his tortuous, slimy length, and when the wild beasts came around Him, the angels saw. Him, and as soon as the devil left, they came and ministered unto Him. When Gethsamane left Him lonely and no man watched, the angels watched while Jesus prayed, and when He said, “O my Father, my Father, let this cup pass from me if it be possible,” and it could not pass and men be saved, an angel came and held His head while He drank the bitter cup to its dregs. And when He slept in death and Pilate said, “He is a dead man,” and the Sadducees said, “He is dead and there is no resurrection,” and when the Pharisees said, “He is dead,” and set a watch at His tomb, the angels saw Him, and though marred with gaping, bloody wounds they recognized Him the Son of God, and they came down and rolled that stone away and the Divine Being stepped forth. Fourth, Preached to the Nations. This incarnated Jesus Christ, dying upon the cross as the Savior and substitute of sinners, justified in the Spirit and seen of angels, was preached among the nations. If it had been said, “preached to the Jews,” that would have been a different thing, but for one coming as He came, to be preached to Gentiles; to the world, the whole wide world, the vast, lost world, the fallen and sinful world, the world of liars and thieves and murderers and backbiters, and for Him to say, “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature,” why that was a thought such as this world had never had before. Fifth, Believed on in the world. Men priding themselves upon their shallow philosophical analysis may say, “Why, you cannot believe in the incarnation of God. You cannot believe in the resurrection, you cannot believe in the power of the Holy Ghost,” and they will prove it to their satisfaction; but over against their sophistries stands the indubitable fact that men did believe on Him. “Believed on in the world.” Yes, He was believed on then, is believed on now. You believed on Him, brother, and you, sister, and you know it. Your soul is a witness that you did believe on Him. Now let them argue as they please, and say what they please, there stand the facts in your consciousness that you did from your heart believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and that God did for His sake forgive your sins. Sixth, Received up into Glory. Resurrection and Ascension! Risen from the pit of death, from the conflict with the devil, binding him, chaining him to His chariot wheels, rising above all Jerusalem to the top of Olivet, rising above Olivet higher than Hebron or Lebanon, above Alps or Pyrenees, higher than the clouds or the stars, taken up, up, up, He goes up shouting, “Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and let the King of Glory come in. Who is the King of Glory? I, the Lord, mighty to save.” And so He mounted to the throne of the universe, and there, brethren, He ever liveth to make intercession for us. He is alive. Jesus is risen. Now you can prove it today by evidence more vivid than that supplied by the carnal sense of those who witnessed it nearly 2000 years ago. There is a more impressive demonstration of the Spirit. And now, if the congregation is the building, the true building, then what purpose does this house serve? It does this: It gives you a convenient, a commodious, a comfortable place for the assembling of God’s people, where your children can be taught in His Word, and where His Word can be preached regularly without regard to weather. It is of vast practical utility, is this house, and let it be used for that purpose. By way of directing it to this end, I do not expect to see anything today like sprinkling of holy water, but I do expect you will offer it to the dear Lord. Offer it to Him in prayer and ask Him to take it and make it the gate of heaven. I trust it will stand until thousands of souls have been converted in it. May its walls enwrap an atmosphere so vibrating with the

presence of the Eternal Spirit of God, that just as soon as a man comes in at yonder door he will say, “God is in this house, of a truth God is in this house.” Oh, there is something in here, when those people come together, when they pray, when they sing, when the Word of God is preached, there is something in here that we have not out in the world, and that something is saving and it is as sweet as life. It is light that dispels the darkness of despair and the gloom of the grave and the black horror of hell. It is light that kindles in the heart an inextinguishable flame that cannot be fanned out by adverse winds, nor quenched by down pouring torrents of rain, but that shall burn, rising higher and higher, until it touches the person and presence of God in heaven. O, East Waco Church, how proud I am today that you stand where you do. May the benediction of God, dear people, come down upon your pastor’s head, as the oil that was poured on the head of Aaron until it ran down to the skirts of his garment. O Father God, let Thy Spirit clothe George W. Truett with salvation as with a garment, and make his heart hot within him as he speaks Thy truth. And may the deacons,, monuments of grace, under that spirit that is in them, be as pillars about him. And Lord God, grant that the boys and girls that now are and the children that are unborn shall look toward this building as the wanderer, after a long absence, looks toward home when the familiar fields and houses, and the curling smoke of the chimneys, and the watch-dog baying, and the light in the window, are near to him. Lord God, turn the hearts of the children that are yet unborn to this house, that here they may come to find the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

# S. The Living Christ

THE LIVING CHRIST

TEXT: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold I am alive for evermore. Revelation 1:18. In the service this morning I called your attention to a certain subject with the accompanying statement that that subject would be preached upon tonight - a living Christ. I repeat again tonight that there has never been a time in my life that I have not been impressed with the force and power of the historical argument proving the resurrection of Jesus Christ. But no matter how strong that demonstration may be, it might be as high as heaven, and no man might be able to see a flaw in any part of the argument, it yet would be a powerless argument unless proofs of Christ's living could be shown. It would serve no purpose as affects us to prove that He was alive eighteen hundred years ago. In order for it to be a special benefit to us there must be a kind of argument that conclusively proves to us that He is alive yet. The Scripture read in your hearing tonight is a case in point. Years had passed away since Christ arose from the dead, and yet the Apostle Paul preaching in Lystra, saw a man in the audience with impotent feet, who never had walked; he had been lame from his mother's womb. And the poor, helpless cripple was intently listening to the sermon Paul was preaching, and Paul caught his eye and perceived that that man had faith to be healed, and in the name of Jesus Christ he commanded him to stand upright, and he leaped and walked. That is to say, Jesus Christ was alive then, and His power was just as great in healing that cripple at Lystra as it was through the instrumentality of Peter and John in healing the beggar at the Beautiful Gate of the temple, and just as potent as it was when Jesus in the flesh raised from the dead the sleeping maiden, or the lame young man, or Lazarus four days resting in the tomb. Now it is the affirmation of this text tonight that He is alive forevermore. He was dead, but He is alive forever more; that He is as much alive tonight and as accessible tonight and can hear our prayers as well tonight and can read our hearts as readily tonight, and tonight has power on earth to forgive sins as in the days of His flesh. And that Christianity, by whomsoever preached or advocated, that does not furnish proof of a living Redeemer, is not worthy to be offered to the acceptance of the people. And that preacher who does not see in his Saviour a living Christ with present power to save, had better surrender his credentials. And that church that has not faith in a living Redeemer who can now furnish proofs of His life and His power and His majesty and of His glory, had better disband and not mock the world with a form of godliness after having denied its power. So far as I am concerned, if the whole world were to stand up before me, they could not make me believe that I did not in my heart and by faith see the Lord Jesus Christ in the hour of my conversion, and by His divine power was freed from my sins. There is a personal experience, a matter of inward consciousness that is more satisfactory to the one who is the subject of it, than the thousand false theories, than ten thousand speculations of philosophy; it is something a man has; it is something that teaches him; and he is a witness concerning a gift which has come to him from God. He is more competent to testify of it than everybody else in the world. I would like to see this matter fairly tested tonight. I have never been afraid to accept any fair challenge of the power of Jesus. Across the sky of my soul there does not roll one speck of the cloud of doubt that He is

tonight mighty to save. Let us look at some of the points which go to establish this. I shall not take your time to ask you to hear the arguments upon the evidences of Christianity, but I call your attention to things that now are, and these are the proofs convincing to my mind, overwhelmingly convincing, that Jesus Christ tonight has power on earth to forgive sin. I call attention first to this: He can hear us we know, and He can answer our petitions we know. I know that just as well as I know that you hear me and that you can grant a request of mine. There is no more question with reference to the throne of mercy which He has established, that those who approach that throne of mercy, as prompted by His Spirit and offering prayers that are in accordance with His will, that the answer comes, and readily comes, and sensibly comes-there can be no more question of that than of our own existence. I know He has heard and answered prayers offered today. He is near enough to us to send a response inside of twelve hours; he is near enough to us to send a response even while we speak the petition; so near that He can anticipate, and before our lips have completely voiced it, the answer is like an echo to the first part of the prayer, and God has granted what we desired and so soon that He did not give us time to ask that it be done. He said that if He arose He would give gifts to men, and these gifts are here in this house tonight-fresh gifts, gifts that are not old and musty and ancient, like documentary proofs on parchment, but gifts that the heart cherishes; gifts of power, gifts of utterance, gifts of prayer, gifts of discerning spirits, gifts of faith, gifts of hope, gifts of love; they are here, right here in this house. And the dead cannot give gifts. He said that if He arose He would be with His people. That was His promise: “Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world.” He is risen. If that promise is fulfilled in your heart, or in my heart, or in the heart of any member of this church; if Jesus in His Spiritual power is with you and you feel His presence, then is He risen indeed; then is He alive. Then being risen, being alive, being present, He has all the power with which He was ever invested. By those gifts and by that presence Jesus is risen and is alive. He said, “It is expedient for you that I go away. If I go not away the Comforter will not come. If I be raised from the dead I will send Him and when He is come He will convict the world of sin.” If there is in this house tonight one sinner that trembles at the thought of God; if there be one mind here uneasy at the fact that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth and the judgment cometh; if there be here tonight one soul that is lamenting sin and grieving over it and mourning because of it, then Jesus is risen. There can fly no arrow of conviction from the bow of a dead archer; but if He be living, then with an unerring aim He can select this man and that man and send that shaft dipped with fire and tinged with the blood of redemption into that heart and make that man who a short time ago was careless and indifferent, now full of deep concern and ready to cry out: “God be merciful to me, a sinner.” If, since this service commenced, one trembling sinner whose mind was darkened by his memories of iniquities and his apprehensions of judgment, who has passed out of that state of trembling and fear and found rest and peace in believing in Jesus Christ, then Jesus Christ is risen, and that conversion stands for the present day and for the present generation as a more convincing argument in favor of the resurrection of Jesus Christ than all the books that ever have been written upon the evidences of Christianity. That is practical. That is personal. That is satisfactory. It convinces the subject and convinces him in such a way that his mind cannot turn away from it, for it is a present possession of light and peace and joy. Then, is Christ risen! Men may doubt that He has risen when church members assemble and feel no presence of God. Many may doubt that He is alive when sinners are convicted and are not converted, but if there be a felt presence of God; if there be the exercise of fresh gifts bestowed by His divine hand from the throne of His power; if sinners

tremble and then rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, how can men doubt that Jesus is risen? If you can find one, just one, on whom some crushing calamity has come, one heart into which the finger of God's chastisement has been placed and has snapped every tuneful chord and filled it with unspeakable sorrow because a dear loved one has been taken away from earth forever, and while that heart is swelling and while the soul is in gloom because of a vacant place, or a vacant chair, or because of the strange fixed look of some picture on the wall that has no earthly representative, that into that heart there comes consolation so rich and sweet that death and separation cannot overcloud its light, then is Jesus risen. And these are the proofs we want, and these are the proofs which we want in this meeting and that we want here tonight. And I would be ashamed to invite any sinner to come to an empty tomb, to bow before a dead Saviour; to ask of one who cannot give him relief from any burden of whatever kind. But it is the present and all-powerful Son of God that we hold up before you tonight. I care not how black the heart, how seamed and scarred the soul may be with sin, how distant the wandering, how confirmed the habits of vice, if you have faith to be healed and will bring that heart under the blood that falls from the riven heart of Jesus Christ you tonight shall be washed whiter than snow. I do not know anything about tomorrow. I know tonight there are people in this house who are lost, lost! Some that are old, but lost. I know that there is a place of awful hazard if you remain there for one moment, and in my mind I can see the soul near that precipice, beyond which rises the flame coming up to meet him, the smoke of torment already rising, and thus on the brink of eternal death I can yet speak to that soul and say, "Even you tonight by grace divine can be made alive unto God and saved forevermore, if you have faith to be healed." I ask you to try it. I put the whole matter before you into an act, into a deed, a deed of faith, a deed that will set the seal of your sincerity. Will you from the heart ask God for Christ's sake to forgive your sins? I could not feel this any more deeply I could not believe it any more sincerely if the Lord Jesus Christ and the twelve Apostles were standing here, and if I had this afternoon seen Him raise the dead and heal the sick and comfort the sinner I could not more confidently ask you to come and trust Him here tonight and receive the benefit of His power; and I know that if you come sincerely and hold out your hand to Him that you will be saved. He says, "Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." I do not believe He ever did cast any one out. I do not believe that hell could furnish a single witness who could truthfully say, "In yonder world I penitently kneeled at the feet of Jesus and said, 'Lord save me.'" I am going to ask you to try to venture on the promises of God. There are here all around us men and women who tell you that they were once lost and felt the burden and anguish of their sins; they penitently asked God for Christ's sake to forgive them and He did forgive. And these tonight will reach out to you the hand of sympathy, the hand of prayer; they will try to bring you to Jesus, knowing that if they can get you to Him, your petition is answered and your soul is saved. Oh, may the Spirit of God shine into your heart, drive away your doubts, fix your attention, awaken your faith, move your lips to speak and your heart to feel, that you may this night find precious peace in the salvation of your soul! I invite you to try it, any of you, all of you, that are without God and without hope in the world. I can scarcely control my feelings. I do not know how to put what I feel into words, but I do know that I have the most intense longing to go right out and take you by the hand, lead you to Jesus and say, "Lord, save this sinner; save him now!" Sinner, come to Him! Come to Him now! While we stand and sing, I want to ask every one in this house who sincerely desires to be saved to come and give me your hand.

# S. The Sinning Christian and His Sins

THE SINNING CHRISTIAN AND HIS SINS

Dear Brethren: Before the text is announced, let us prepare our minds for it by prayerful attention to these Scriptures: Romans 8:34 : “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.” Spurgeon has a great sermon on this text which he says contains “the four pillars of salvation,” namely: (1) The sacrificial death of Christ; (2) His resurrection from the dead; (3) His exaltation to the throne of sovereign power;

(4) His ever-living intercession.

It is this fourth pillar: “Who also maketh intercession for us,” that I would have you bear in mind just now. Romans 5:10 : “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life.” Here notice salvation by the life of Christ. Three pillars of salvation of the four just cited belong to Christ’s life after His death. As He said to John on Patmos: “I am He that liveth, and was dead: and, behold, I am alive for evermore.” And again as He said to His sorrowing disciples when preparing them for His departure: “Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me; because I live, ye shall live also.” Now, let this next Scripture sink deep into your hearts, Hebrews 7:24-25 : “But this man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.” Hear one more passage: 1 John 2:1-2 : “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And He is the propitiation for our sins.” With this introduction I now announce as the text, 1 Timothy 2:5 : “There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” You have learned a great deal of theology, you have made tremendous progress in divine things, when you have accepted without any sort of modification the simple declaration of this text, that there is one, and that means but one, Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. There are many millions, there are hundreds of millions of those who profess to be Christians, that do not believe it, but who believe in other mediators between God and men than the man Christ Jesus. In taking this text today I want to compare it with two other passages of Scripture. One of them is in the letter to the Corinthians, where the Apostle Paul says that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and where he goes on to say that this reconciliation was affected by the death of Christ. The other passage of Scripture I read to you a while ago from the letter to the Romans, where he says that if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more shall we be saved by His life. There are two departments in the work of mediation. One is to make an offering, a satisfactory propitiation, and the other is in the intercession based on that offering. Jesus Christ, when He died, made an offering of Himself, without spot, unto God, as a lamb without blemish, and in that offering became the propitiation for our sins and furnished the ground upon which we are reconciled to God. That is the first

department. But now, after you are reconciled to God, when your past sins are blotted out, when you are a Christian, you come in conflict with this thought: No man's conscience can reproach for a sin before it is committed. Hence it is the sight of "past offenses which pain his eyes" and constitute his burden. But he reads that Christ died once for all. That there will be no more offering for sin. And his conscience, he knows, was not purified from the reproach of future sins. Hence, while he questions not the sufficiency of the one offering to propitiate for all sins, past, present and future, he does not feel that when he first came to Christ there was an application of its cleansing power to any but the sins which preceded his faith in Jesus. After you become a Christian you sin. You know that you do. I have had children ask me the question, and with as much intelligence as when grown people have asked it, "What must we do, and what does God do with the sins which we commit after we are Christians?" They understand that when they first come to Christ by faith they put all their sins on Him, and they understand that these past sins are blotted out forever. But in a very short time after that, much sooner than they are aware of, but consciously to them, soon after they say: "We have sinned.' The conscience says it." They know that they have violated some law of God. And when the question arises with them, What am I to do with this? Where am I to put it? What disposition does God make in His Word for the sins which Christians commit of per they are converted? Now it is upon this point that we come to the second part of the mediation of Jesus Christ. It is here that we understand, not how we are saved when we trust in Jesus Christ, but how we are saved to the uttermost; not how we are saved when we are converted, but how the salvation is to continue, and continue to the end. That is the thought. I shall not seek at all today to be original. Indeed, if I were to tell you in what books of theology you may find similar thoughts, I would have to refer you to all that have been written upon the subject. But I want to speak very plainly today about one of the grandest doctrines of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and that is the intercession of Christ-Christ's intercession. And I am not talking about the intercession that Christ, when here upon earth, made for sinners. He did make intercession for the transgressors. He did pray, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do," just as He commands us to do today. But I am not discussing that part of Christ's work. I wish to discuss His intercession for His own people, by which the life that comes into them at their conversion is to be continued; by which remission of sins which they receive at conversion is to be applied to sins after conversion; by which the life that is in their souls is to continue and prove itself to be eternal life. That is the subject, and I will put some questions so that you can understand. The first question is: "Where does Christ make His intercession?" The place of it. In the ninth chapter of the letter to the Hebrews, and in the third chapter of the first letter of Peter, we are expressly told that the place where he makes this intercession is in heaven; that He ascended to heaven for that purpose. The thought was presented in type in the Old Testament ceremonies, where the priest would first slay the sacrificial victim in the outer court. The lamb would be put to death, and then taking the blood of the lamb as the basis, he would enter into the holy of holies, and there would offer the blood, and when the blood was offered he would stand there, and upon the plea of that blood the intercession took place, in the Most Holy Place. So is Christ's intercession for His people in heaven. It is going on now. Right here today when we are gathered to worship God, His intercession is going on at the court of Heaven, and the sins which you Christians have committed during the past week He is interceding for. He is pleading His blood, once offered, as ample to cover your sins, for the present as well as the past. The next question has already been answered. What is the basis-of the intercession which He offers up there? Again I repeat that the basis of it is the ample atonement

that He made for sin when He offered Himself up as a lamb without spot or blemish. He never offered any other plea, never! And no plea could possibly be accepted that was based upon anything else than the fact that the blood of Jesus Christ was shed for the remission of sins. No prayer for forgiveness could possibly be heard, either here or yonder, that was not based upon the ample and all-sufficient atonement made in the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. The blood is shed once for all. But we come to the blood as often as we sin. So the Lord's Supper teaches by its frequency. That blood not only cleansed us once, but still cleanses. And now we come to a particular part of the subject. What are the qualifications of one who is to be a mediator between God and men? What constitutes Him a suitable Mediator to go before God and touch Him with one hand and reach back and touch man with the other hand? 1. He must be both God and man. With His divinity He must be able to touch God, and with His manhood He must be able to touch man, to be able to put the two in contact. And impress this on your mind, that whenever anybody offers to you a mediator between God and men, who does not possess both humanity and divinity, reject him at once. Suppose they offer the angels? You must say, "These angels do not possess either one of these qualifications. They are neither divine nor human. They can neither touch man nor touch God. They cannot mediate between men and God on that account." Bear that in mind. You will need it directly. 2. Now the next qualification. The Lord God says, as you will find in Hebrews 1:1-14, that no one taketh this honor upon himself. Even Aaron, who was to represent the thought in type, did not take it upon himself. He did not say, "I will be the mediator. I claim this office." There had to be divine authority conferred. God had to speak from heaven and say, "I invest this one with authority. I appoint him. I furnish him credentials to mediate between me and men." As Aaron could not do that in the type, so it is expressly stated that in the anti-type the Son took not this honor upon Himself, but the Father put it on Him. The Father gave Him His credentials. And now you apply this test if any one presents for your consideration a mediator between God and men. Call on him for the chapter and verse where Almighty God conferred that authority; and if he has no credentials; if he cannot be in this mission authenticated as from God, you reject him. Now I want to read you where authority was conferred on somebody else than Christ, and that, too, since you were born. I read from a decree of Pope Pius the Ninth, on the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary: "Since we have never ceased in humility and fasting to offer up our prayers and those of the church of God the Father through His Son, that He might deign to direct and confirm our mind by the power of the Holy Ghost, after imploring the protection of the whole celestial court, and after invoking on our knees the Holy Ghost the Paraclete, under His inspiration we pronounce, declare and define unto the glory of the holy and indivisible Trinity, the honor and the ornament of the holy virgin, the mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and insure our own authority, that the doctrine which holds the blessed virgin Mary to have been, from the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of mankind, preserved free from all stain of original sin, was revealed by God, and is, therefore, to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful. Therefore, if some should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than we have defined (which God forbid), they shall know and thoroughly understand that they are by their own judgment condemned, have made shipwreck concerning the faith, and fallen away from the unity of the church; and, moreover, that they, by this very act, subject themselves to the penalties ordained by the law, if, by word or writing, or any other external means, they dare to signify what

they think in their hearts." 1854. Now you ask yourself why that decree was published. The point is that whoever goes as a mediator between God and men must be righteous. John says, "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." The proof must be made out that the mediator is holy, undefiled and separated from sinners; there must not be a spot, or a blemish, or a wrinkle upon the character of the one who mediates between God and man. Otherwise, he would need to have a mediation offered for himself instead of being mediatory for others. Now to meet that qualification-the qualification of holiness and righteousness-it became necessary in order to have a mediator other than the Lord Jesus Christ; in order to have a woman, one who could plead with God, and who would act as days-woman between men and God it was necessary that the decree should be issued making her immaculate. But the decree is marvelously out of date. It is nearly two thousand years after the canon of Scripture is closed. It is a decree signed by the name of a man, himself frail, sinful, who expressly declares that it is issued by inspiration and under his authority, as well as the authority of God, and upon that it is issued and being accepted it is held by two hundred million so-called Christians upon the earth, that Mary intercedes, that Mary mediates. 3. The next qualification: In Hebrews 4:1-16, where this mediator is being discussed, it is said that he is touched with a sense of our infirmities. Now that is a phrase, expressed by one Greek word, which being Anglicized becomes our word "sympathy." There must be in this mediator a bond of sympathy between him and the one for whom he intercedes sympathy. And the basis of the sympathy toward us in that Scripture is declared to be this, that in all points (now you may not be willing to believe it, but that is what the Bible says) that in all points He was tempted as we are, yet without sin. It is the declaration of God that when the Lord Jesus Christ was here upon this earth that every kind of temptation that comes to you came to Him. The Devil suggested to Him in His hunger what He suggests to men in their hunger now. The Devil suggested to Him, in view of His being able to establish kingly power over earthly territory, just what he suggests to the ambitious men of the present time. The Devil suggested to Him when He met the contradiction of sinners, just the same kind of resentment that you would be tempted to exercise if there should fall upon you such an indignity. In every point, every point, it covers the amazing length and breadth of human experience on the subject of temptation. That could not be affirmed of Mary or any other woman, or any man, or any angel, but it was true of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and men. Now, take the next question: For whom does He make intercession in heaven? I stated to you a while ago that I was not discussing the intercession that He offered for transgressors, and which we are commanded to imitate, but I am speaking of His priestly office as exercised in heaven, in which He says, "I pray for them I pray not for the world." I will now merely state this point so as to hasten to the concluding part of my subject. In making intercession in heaven, for what does He intercede? What does He ask? First, He asks that Christians here in the world should not be taken out of it, but that while in the world they should be preserved from evil. I do not know how to express the thoughts that are in my mind on this subject. I imagine that if the Lord would just lift the veil off the inscrutable past, and we could take a back look at all the paths we have trod, and see in the light of that revelation how many times we have unconsciously walked as it were upon the edge of a knife, how many times our feet have stood on the brink of a pit, how many times, as it were, by a chance step we have over-stepped a net that was set for our feet, how many times enemies have come and have lain in ambuscade and were ready to shoot their arrows against us, and yet utterly unseen by us a shield was interposed that protected us from the fiery darts of the adversaries, and as we look at it and wonder where it came from, we

look up to heaven and see Christ praying: “Preserve him. Preserve him from the evil. I see the evil ahead of him. I see the plans, I see the counsel and devices, I see the hazard. Father, preserve him. Let him not fall into them.” Oh, if we could realize it, how rich, how deep and how sweet to our hearts would be the thought of the preciousness of the intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ continually going on for us, that we should be preserved from evil! I can look back over my life where in after years things have been brought to light that I knew nothing on earth about at the time, just as ignorant as a child, and yet how there seemed to be just a hair’s breadth between me and death just a hair’s breadth. And surely it was not my forecast, it was not my wisdom, it was not my strength that rescued me, but that prayer of Jesus: “Father, preserve him from evil.” Brethren, if the Lord Jesus Christ was to withdraw that shield from between you and your enemies; if the restraints of the great ‘High Priest were withdrawn, every Christian in this town would be wrecked before night. You may think you know men, but you do not know the Devil. You do not know the depths of sin. You do not know Satan’s wiles. You do not know his stratagems. Oh, it is principalities and powers with which you have to wrestle, and were it not for the restraining power of God, every one of us would be swept away like driftwood on the rising breast of a stream swollen by the downpour of waterspouts of rain! For what else does He pray? I will give you a sample. You will understand it better. Jesus one time saw the Devil looking with hungry eyes at one of his apostles, and He saw the Devil laying his traps for him, and He called the apostle to Him and said, “Simon, Satan hath desired thee. Satan hath made a request that he might have you. Don’t you know that he made a request to God about Job? Satan hath made a request that he might have you, that he might sift you as wheat; and, Simon, I have prayed for you that your faith fail not.” Now, there is a part of it. There the intercession comes in. What is it that keeps your faith alive! What is it that keeps the faith of any Christian alive! Why, I tell you that the Devil would gather about you a fog and mist of doubts and perplexities that you would absolutely not know whether you are in the flesh or not. He could make ‘you doubt your very existence. He has made men doubt it. I say there have been men who have carried their doubt to the extent that they have doubted their own existence. Now Jesus said, “I have prayed for you that your faith fail not.” I cannot tell you how many times, right here in this town (I do not call any names), some of the best Christians in this town, from my estimate of a Christian, have come to me staggered on that question of faith-staggered. Is my faith failing? Is the light going out? Now, that intercession goes on in heaven. You are to be saved in that respect by the life of Christ; having been reconciled to God by His death, much more shall you be saved by His life. He ever liveth to intercede for you, and therefore He is able to save unto the uttermost them that come unto God through Him. Well, what else? As I told you just now, sins that you commit after you are Christians, if we confess them, He is faithful and just to forgive them. If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. Here is our attorney, here is our pleader. Here is the one that takes our case upon the sins that we commit after we are Christians, and takes it before the Father’s throne and pleads the all-sufficient blood offered once for all, and never to be offered again, and says, “Father, forgive him.” That blood is enough, that atonement is enough. I tell you what I do: Whenever I become conscious that I have done wrong I do not parley. I take the wrong, whatever it may be, and say, “Lord Jesus, take this and plead for me. Take my case; I do not dare to plead my own case. O thou righteous Advocate with God, plead for me, and by Thy intercession let this sin be blotted out.” Now, a great many Christians are continually in trouble because they have not learned that when they do a wrong they must come and put that case in the hands of the

Advocate. Let Him plead. He is the Mediator. We cannot go to God directly. There must be a daysman between us and God. Our prayers do not reach God directly. The High Priest offers the prayers. He takes them as the high priest of old took the censer, and having kindled the incense with a coal from the altar, and waved it before the throne of God, He said, “Father, let these prayers be heard.” He is our Advocate. He prays for the unity of His people: “I pray that they may be one.” Now if there be any danger (and there is always danger) of schisms, a rent of any kind, flying “off at a tangent”, the supreme hope of the world on that subject is the intercession up yonder: “I am praying all the time that my people may be one; even as the Father and myself are one. I am praying that my people may be one.” Hurrying on, the intercession takes in the whole subject of our sanctification: “I pray for them that thou mayest sanctify them by thy truth. Thy word is truth.” The whole process of sanctification that goes on in Christians after they are converted is brought about by the intercession of the High Priest. He is pleading that this work may go on. Very briefly I mention two other points. After He went up there to exercise His priestly office in heaven (I do not understand it, but I know the fact) He went up there to make some preparations. Here is what He said: “I am going to leave you, but I am going to prepare a place. I am going to prepare a place for you.” And, based upon His death, upon the plea that is predicated upon His blood, in His high priestly power, somehow, I cannot explain how, He does prepare a place in heaven for every one of His children. Sometimes here on this earth a letter comes to a family about a long-absent loved one: “I will be home on the twentieth of a certain month.” And they read the letter over in the family, and Oh, how glad they are! “He will be here at that time. Now we must make ready. Let us prepare a place for him. What room shall we give him and how shall we fit it up, and shall we put flowers here and shall we prepare the things that he likes best? Shall we gather his friends to meet him and grace his coming and help us to extend a welcome?” And that preparation goes on, and after a while that long-absent traveler comes, and when he comes he does not have to go to a hotel. He does not have to go among strangers. But here in a bright and happy home is a place made ready, and those that love him the best are there to greet him and go out and kiss him, go out and take him by the hand; go out and say, “Oh, we are glad that you have come to be with us!” So up there in His high priestly office He prepares a place for us. I tell you, my brother, we may die suddenly, as in a lightning’s flash, but death cannot come to you in so sudden or startling a form, cannot thrust you out of this life and thrust you into a world to come so as to take the reception committee unaware of the fact. It will be ready, no matter whether your train gets to the depot of death in the daytime or in the night; or in the summer or in the winter; God’s carriage, His chariot of fire and His convoy of angels, will meet you there and take you to the place that is prepared for you in that bright and better world up yonder. You do not have to send any dispatches ahead, oh, no; it will be ready, your place; yours, brother; yours, sister; it will be ready when you get there. There is room enough in Paradise for all to have a home in glory. Now my crowning thought is that the effect of this intercession not only gets the place ready, but, blessed be God, it provides an abundant entrance into the place. Why, you do not go as if you were squeezing through a hole in the wall. You do not go as if you were a galley slave, whipped and scourged to a task. The door is open. The door is a wide-open door. Your ship comes home, comes to the harbor of heaven, comes to the port of eternity, not a battered and shattered hulk, with compass and helm lost, and cordage snapped and shrouds and sails torn to tatters. No! It comes with every sail full; without danger of rock in the harbor. It comes with an abundant entrance into the glory of God, our Father. And ever since that time when you received the Lord Jesus Christ as your only Saviour, ever since

that time, up yonder in heaven Jesus has been praying: “Father, I want that one to be with me, where I am. I want that one to be here in heaven forever with his Lord. Father, I want that one to have an abundant entrance into heaven.” That prayer goes on day and night, forever and forever. And it is in this way that we are saved by His life. It is in this way that we are saved to the uttermost. It is in this way that the one Mediator between God and men ever liveth to make intercession for us.

Chapter 104

# S. The Three Witnesses

THE THREE WITNESSES: THE SPIRIT, THE WATER AND THE BLOOD

This past week I received a communication from a prominent lawyer in Texas who had just been reading his Bible in his office. He asked me for an interpretation of the passage of Scripture upon which it is my purpose to preach today. He said he was puzzled by it. He did not understand what it meant. As preaching ought to be along practical lines, whenever you can find that one thoughtful person is engaged in the study of a passage of Scripture and wants information upon its import, it is quite probable that in the land there are others whose minds are perplexed upon the same point, and who would be gratified to have their difficulties removed. This is the passage of Scripture, 1 John 5:6-10 : “This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth…. And there are three that bear witness …. the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: fir this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself.” After stating the passage of Scripture he asked me to expound two points (1) What is meant by His coming by water and blood?

(2) Who are the two witnesses whose testimony harmonizes with the testimony of the Spirit? “There are three that bear witness …. the Spirit, and the water, and the blood.”

It is quite a natural thing for a lawyer to be concerned upon a question of evidence, and upon the character of witnesses who give evidence, and upon the subject matter of that testimony, and its value when given. He saw at once that if this conjoint and harmonious testimony of three witnesses is to be of particular value to us, we ought to know who the witnesses are, and their character. We ought to know to what point their testimony conspires, upon which it unites, and then the value of the testimony to us. I replied to him that our knowledge of Jesus Christ is derived from testimony; that there are many ways of obtaining knowledge, but upon certain subjects we have no way of obtaining information except upon evidence; in other words, that man, by searching, cannot find out God; and it is a fact that so far as our methods of investigation are concerned, God or any revelation of Him is unknown to us, and that if we obtain any information about Him it must be by testimony. On this account, the Apostle Paul in writing to the Corinthians says, “I determined to know nothing among you but the testimony of God,” that is, “I lay aside all excellency of human speech or of human reason. I deal not with the philosophies of the world, nor with the inquiries which have been created by these philosophers. I confine my preaching to the testimony of God.” If we are to know anything about God, it is because He has borne witness. He has given us information. This text, then, refers to One who came by water and blood, and not by water only, but by water and blood, and the first question to be answered is, What is meant by the expression, “He came by water”? That is one of the questions that puzzled this lawyer. “He came by water.” I will not take up your time rehearsing the many interpretations that have been given by wild theorists upon this subject, but will at once call your attention to the scriptural answer to this

question: How did Jesus “come by water”? The word “came” is equivalent in meaning to “was manifested.” Jesus Christ was manifested to be the Son of God by water, and He was manifested to be the Son of God by blood. How then was He manifested to be the Son of God by water? In John 1:1-51, John the Baptist explains the whole matter. He says that he was sent to baptize for this specific purpose, that in his baptizing the Son of God might be manifested, might be made known. He says that when Jesus came to him to be baptized that he did not know that He was the Son of God, but that it had been revealed to him that the Son of God was to be manifested in his baptizing, and that he would know which one of the persons baptized was the Son of God by a certain event, namely: That the Holy Spirit of God, in the form of a dove, would descend upon one whom he baptized, and that that descent of the Spirit upon the person baptized was to be a manifestation to Israel, to John, and a manifestation to both of them that this was the Son of God. And in referring to it he says, “I saw the Spirit descend upon him, and I bare record, that this is the Son of God.” So when our text says that He came by water, there is no reasonable question of the accuracy of this answer that the water by which He came was the water of His own baptism. While there have been some wide differences of opinion as to the manner in which Jesus Christ came by water, the scholarship of the world, among the nations of the earth, with reasonable unanimity have settled upon this meaning, that when He came by water He came by His own baptism. His baptism was His manifestation. His baptism was the initiatory step into His public work. On that occasion a voice from heaven said, “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.” On that occasion the Holy Spirit of God descended upon Him and abode on Him. On that occasion as He was emerging from the waters of baptism, He prayed; and we may be reasonably certain of the thing He prayed for by the answer which came to His prayer, and that it is not irreverent to assume that His prayer was on this fashion: “Father, in the sight of men, I take my place as the substitute for men, to obey that word, to be obedient unto death, and to make expiation for the sins of man, and who will believe my report? Oh, send me divine accrediting! Give me unmistakable credentials. Let my mission be authenticated in such a way that it cannot be questioned. Empower me to do what I have engaged to do.” And there on the banks of the Jordan, as He came up out of the water, praying, the answer came the Spirit descended upon Him; the voice of God from heaven announced Him to be His Son; and John, who saw it, bore witness, “This is my beloved Son.” “This is the Son of God.” The next question is, “How did Jesus come by blood?” That answer was prefigured in His baptism. His baptism represented a burial, which implied a previous death. It was a forecast of what was at the terminus of His public life on earth. And so we are told that when it was written in the Book, “Lo, I am come to do thy will, O God,” that He came and through the Eternal Spirit He offered Himself unto God, without spot, without blemish as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The Spirit bore witness at His baptism. It was through the Spirit that He made an offering of Himself unto God. The connection here of the blood is evident. John the Baptist saw its meaning, for as soon as he saw the Spirit of God resting upon Him he was not only satisfied in his own mind, “This is the Son of God,” but he was satisfied as to the purpose of the manifestation of that Son of God, for he pointed to Jesus just after baptism and said, “Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!” And this leads us at once to understand the controversy between John and Christ as to the propriety of the baptism of Christ. John, not understanding the matter, but knowing the purity of Christ’s life that much he knew-and knowing from what had been testified concerning Him that He was a marvelous person, said to Jesus, “I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest thou to me?” “I am sent to baptize sinners, men

who need repentance. You need no repentance. You need no baptism. Why do you ask me to baptize you?" And Jesus said, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." What is the meaning of it? The meaning of it is this, that while Christ in His own character and in His own life and in His own person needed no repentance and no baptism, yet if He came as a Lamb to take away the sin of the world; if He came as a substitute for sinners; if He came to be made sin, though He knew no sin, then there was a propriety in His baptism. That is the explanation of it. It shows that His coming by water referred to His baptism, and that baptism prefigured His manifestation by blood. So, to paraphrase the Scripture, suppose we read it this way: "This is He that was manifested to be the Son of God through His baptism and His sacrificial death." He was manifested to be the Son of God, not through His baptism only, but through His sacrificial death. So that the one who holds that the divine Logos left Jesus Christ when He was betrayed by Judas, holds and teaches an error. He came especially by blood. That is to say, He not only came through His baptism, which prefigured His sacrifice, but He came through the sacrifice which fulfilled what His baptism prefigured. The next question propounded by the lawyer was about the three witnesses. Granting that He came or was manifested through His baptism and through His sacrificial offering, yet there are three that bear witness to the fact that He is the Son of God. Then who are the three? The first He had no question about-the Holy Spirit. He is the great witness to Jesus Christ. Our Lord Himself announced that fact, that when the Holy Spirit was come He would bear witness to Jesus, that He was the divine witness, and that the point of His testimony would be this: Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God; He is the fountain and author of eternal life. That is the value of the testimony. He cannot be the fountain of eternal life if He be not the Son of God. If He be the Son of God, he is the fountain of eternal life. "And if He be the fountain of eternal life, my faith in Him is the victory by which I overcame the world. So we get at the value now of the testimony. The three witnesses are to prove one proposition, that Jesus is the Son of God. He is the author of eternal life. If He be the author of eternal life, my faith in Him puts me in touch with that life and I possess that life. Now let us look at the three witnesses whose several testimonies converge to one point, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God. The first witness is the Holy Spirit, and we may examine the occasion upon which He bore convincing testimony to the divinity and the sonship of Jesus Christ, first of all, at His baptism. What was the import of that testimony of the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus? In the sixth chapter of John, it is said, "Him hath God the Father sealed." When did He seal Him? He sealed Him when the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon Him. What is the object of sealing? Sealing is a mark by which ownership is expressed, and by which consecration to a certain object is avowed. What was the object avowed by that sealing? He was sealed as a victim. When the lambs were presented, the priest must go among them and examine them, and if any one has a spot on him he is rejected, if any one has a blemish he is rejected; but all that are acceptable, being of the right age, being of the right color, being without blemish or spot, those the priest seals, and they are set apart for sacrifice. The seal on him indicates that this particular lamb is God's peculiar property, and that he is a devoted lamb, and that he is to die upon the altar of sacrifice, and the object of that death is expiatory. Now the Holy Spirit of God at the baptism of Jesus sealed Him by that descent upon Him, as the accepted and approved and inspected and consecrated sacrificial and expiatory offering for the sin of the world, and John the Baptist saw it and understood it. He also, besides sealing Him, revealed Him to be the Son of God by that descent. John could not know that Jesus was the Messiah, that Jesus was to be the prophet, priest and king of Israel, as well as the

sacrificial victim. John could not know it except the Holy Spirit would reveal it by that descent upon Him. So He bore witness by revealing that particular person to be the Messiah, and by sealing that particular person to be the expiatory victim. Not only this, but He bore witness at that baptism by anointing Him to be the prophet and teacher of Israel, and therefore Jesus said Himself, referring to this matter, when He stood up in Nazareth, where He had been brought up, “The Holy Spirit is upon me because he hath anointed me.” He hath set me apart. He hath indued me with the qualification to teach authoritatively and finally the will of God concerning man. The Spirit bore witness by that anointing. And not only that, but in Acts 10:1-48, in referring to that same descent of the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus Christ, it is said that Spirit not only on that occasion anointed Him, but indued Him with power to do what the Messiah was here to do upon the earth. Power descended upon Him, and from that time, what He wrought He wrought by the authority of God. So we see on what particular points the Spirit bore witness at that baptism. He bore sealing witness to the victim. He bore revealing witness to the person. He bore anointing witness, giving authority and credentials as the prophet of Israel. He bore induing or power-giving witness in qualification of the one selected to do the work to be performed by the selected one. But that was at the beginning of His life. Now, how did the Spirit bear witness at the end of His life? Not only in that figure of death (for He came by water), but He came by water and blood. How did the Spirit bear witness when He manifested Himself to be the Son of God by blood? The answer is given to us in the letter to the Hebrews, that when an offering was to be made, that offering was to be made once for all; that it would take the place of the multitudinous and oft-repeated offerings made upon Jewish altars. This one offering was to be for the remission of sins, and the record is expressed that through the Eternal Spirit He made that offering. So when Jesus died on the Cross, when His blood was poured out, that blood, through the Spirit bearing witness to its appropriateness and its efficacy, bearing witness to its intrinsic worth, bearing witness to its cleansing and saving power-through the Spirit that offering was made. But again, how does the Spirit bear witness? To die as His baptism prefigures, to be buried, and to stop there, meant a frustration of all His claims and purposes; but the Spirit bore witness again in His resurrection. The Apostle Paul says, “He who was put to death in the flesh was made alive by the Spirit,” and in Romans 1:1-32, he says, “He was declared to be the Son of God, with power by his resurrection, through the Holy Spirit.” He was declared to be the Son of God through the Spirit. He was declared to be the Son of God through the Spirit at His resurrection. What is the point upon which the testimony must converge? The proposition is that Jesus is the Son of God. What is the value of that proposition? If He be the Son of God He is the fountain of eternal life. How, then, speaks the witness of the Spirit? That when Jesus was cold in death, He demonstrated that this dead person was the Son of God by quickening Him, by making Him alive, by causing Him to emerge from the grave as triumphant over death in its own territory. But I come to the last, and as I think the main point upon which the Spirit’s evidence is given concerning His Sonship; an evidence more marked than the descent of the dove; an evidence more marked than the offering up of the sacrifice through the Spirit; an evidence more marked than the display of the Spirit-power in making the dead victim live again. And what was that? He had said, “I will rise again on the third day, and I go to my Father, and if I go to my Father, if I be exalted, if I take my seat on the throne, if I be crowned King of kings and Lord of lords, I will send you overwhelming proof that I am there, that I am empowered there, that all authority in heaven and on earth is given unto me there.” And what was the witness? Why, it was the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, when the church which Jesus Christ had

established and to which He had given His Commission this temple of God that had been completed, this temple, that was yet without an occupant, as the tabernacle was without an occupant until the cloud descended, as the temple of Solomon was without an occupant until the cloud descended-this finished church of Jesus Christ that stood empty on the day of Pentecost, the answer came in the outpouring of the Spirit, in filling that church and giving that church power to testify for Jesus Christ. And so now the Spirit bears witness that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God. But there are three that bear witness. Let a thing be established by the mouth of two or three witnesses. Our text says that three bear witness, and there is no lack of harmony in their testimony. We are not concerned with the testimony of the Spirit except upon one point: Does it prove that Jesus is the Son of God? We are not concerned with the testimony of the waterwitness except on one point: Does it agree with the Spirit's testimony? What is the bearing of the testimony of the water on the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God? That is all the use we have for that witness. And we put that witness on the stand and we want to know who the witness is. It is true that Jesus came by water; that is, the water of His baptism; but there are three that bear witness, and one of the witnesses is the water. Now, what water is referred to? Again I answer that the concensus of intelligent construction and interpretation of the Word of God is that primarily the water there means the water of Christ's own baptism. I will refer you to a secondary and scripturally permissive meaning directly, but primarily it refers to His own baptism. His own baptism was not only a means by which He was manifested to be the Son of God, but His own baptism was constituting a witness to establish the proposition that He was the Son of God. And do look at that baptism of Jesus and see how it bears upon the point: That He is the Son of God; He is the Author of Eternal Life; He is the object of faith by which we receive eternal life. How does the baptism of Jesus bear witness upon that point? It does not bear witness upon any other point. There is no other way to account for His baptism. There could be no other reason assigned why a perfectly sinless one, in His own person without spot or blemish, should be baptized at all. We would have to support John's objection and protest. We would have to say, "You have no need of prayers. You have no sins to be forgiven. You have no need of repentance. Why comest Thou here?" And yet, that baptism says, "Jesus of Nazareth, you must go beneath the yielding waters. Jesus of Nazareth, as marked unto death, you must go through this symbol of peril, and here on the threshold of your public work there must be a commission that can never be forgotten, that from the start you know what is ahead of you. You know the terminus of your public life. You know why you are here upon the earth. You know what must be the outcome of your life here upon the earth. Your baptism bears witness to your Sonship in this That as the Divine Substitute for sinful men you are to die for sinners." And His sacrifice on the Cross bears witness to that. Let us see how that bears witness to that. We stand and look at the death of Jesus Christ and ask for an explanation of it. A good man dies not in horror. A good man dies not in shame. A good man dies not in impenetrable darkness. A good man dies not in his spirit, for spiritual death is separation from the Father. And this man cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" No martyr died that way. The drops of blood as sweat rolled not from Paul's brow when he was beheaded. Peter gave no such symptoms of unutterable woe when he came to die. Stephen's face was heaven-lit and glory-crowned and full of rejoicing in his martyrdom. But this Man did not die that way. He died as a sinner dies. He died in darkness. He died under condemnation. He died separated from the Father. There is no testimony that can be wrung from the death of Jesus Christ that does not center upon this point: He is the Son of God, as the Substitute of sinners dying. That

is the testimony of His death. And so the Spirit and the water and the blood united without any dissension of testimony, with perfect congruity of evidence, to establish the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God. Now comes a reflection of the Apostle John. He says, “If we receive the witness of men the witness of God is greater.” That is to say, You know you do receive the witness of men. You know that you count that human testimony is capable of establishing facts, and the text here furnishes us an example. Now listen to it. In King James Version it reads thus: “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood.” Now we receive the testimony of men that all that part 1 John 5:7-8, commencing, “There are three that bear record in heaven,” and concluding, “There are three that bear record in earth” upon the testimony of man we reject every particle of that, as not a part of the text. It appears in the King James Version. It does not appear in the revision, and no scholar of the present time would call that a part of the Bible. If there is one single passage in the whole Bible, according to the accepted or King James Version, upon which there is a unanimity of judgment among scholarship that it is spurious, this is the one, and upon this testimony of men we threw that out. Why do we throw it out? Well, it does not appear in the old and reliable Greek versions of the text. We bring the manuscripts into court. Scholarship introduces these witnesses, and this testimony, submitted by the power of human reason and according to the acuteness of human research and scholarship is accepted, and we reject that. The text says: “If you receive the witness of men, now the testimony of God is greater.” So far we have spoken of objective evidence only, to the one proposition that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and we have introduced three witnesses. First, the ordinance of baptism, or rather, so far, the baptism of Jesus Christ Himself, the reason why He was baptized, and then the otherwise unaccountable death of Jesus Christ. There stands the Cross. There flows the water. The Spirit, and the water, and the blood! By the mouth of two or three witnesses shall everything be established. They say that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, is the Son of God, and one of these witnesses is a divine one God Himself. Now, if you receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater. How can you reject the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God? The Holy Spirit at baptism induing Him with power to work miracles, foreshadowing His expiatory death, that Divine Witness through whom the sacrifice was offered when on the altar of His divinity His humanity was slain; that Witness that made Him live after death; that Witness that came down in power on the day of Pentecost and filled and accredited His church. Where on this earth has there been a witness of such veracity, of such competency? And that witness says Jesus Christ is the Son of God. You accept the testimony of men on matters of property, on matters of title to your land. You accept it on everything. Your whole life is based upon your acceptance of evidence, that this witness shall be veracious, that this witness shall be competent, and on their testimony you act in everything in this life. If you accept the testimony of men, how can you reject the testimony of God? I said that while this is the primary unquestionable meaning of this passage of Scripture, there is a secondary meaning, and scripturally true. There are two witnesses, the water and the blood, that are with us now. They bear witness now. One is our own baptism. When we were baptized we were baptized into Christ’s death. We were “buried with Christ by baptism into death,” and your baptism is a secondary witness on the same line as the witness of the baptism of Christ. Here stands, then, a venerable institution. It was instituted nearly two thousand years ago. It partakes of the nature of a monumental evidence. It is not a monument built of wasting wood or crumbling stone. It is not a monument that is confined to a single locality and must be approached

from distant parts of the earth, at great sacrifice of time and toil and expense; but it is a witness that is always speaking, always visible. Wherever water flows, wherever water gathers into pools, or lakes, or seas; wherever the stars mirror themselves in any placid pool of water, that water disturbed with the baptism of the believer in Jesus Christ carries back to the stars this testimony: Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Jesus is the author of life. By faith in Jesus Christ I live. The life which I now live, I live by faith in Him. “Planted together in the likeness of His death we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection.” Men have tried to silence this witness, and men have tried to obscure the clearness of the testimony of this witness by changing a burial to an effusion, by substituting a sprinkling for an immersion, and by putting the water upon one who knows not Jesus Christ, who does not believe in Jesus Christ, and this witness has in a measure been slain. In places, for hundreds of years, murderous and felonious hands have been upon this witness, but its deathless testimony still survives. And your baptism testifies on that point. Well, what is the testimony of the blood? There it is. Why are you here today? What means these emblems? What signifies the shroud? What lies beneath it? The emblems of a body, slain, broken; the emblem of blood outpoured. There are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water and the blood. And men have tried to mar the testimony of this witness. They have taken away the cup, and that is the main thing, for it represents the blood. They have contented themselves with putting a wafer on the tongue of the communicant, and saying, “This witness hath testified, but no blood.” And they have destroyed the value of this evidence by allowing men on whom the blood of Christ hath never been sprinkled, who have never been born of God, who do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, to come up and take of these elements. And thus they have sought to destroy the value of the testimony. I had an intelligent man only week before last come to me and say, “There is one thing in connection with religion that I cannot understand. I cannot understand the persistency of the controversies about baptism and the Lord’s Supper. At the best they are only external symbols: Why on earth have they been battle grounds?” I said to him, “Ask the Devil. Ask him why he would put out of court two witnesses, and what he secures by obscuring their testimony, or by silencing their evidence, and that will explain it to you.” Now if they meant nothing; if they came with babbling words into court; if there was no cogency in their evidence; if there was no veracity in their testimony, who would have a controversy about it? But if while water flows and grapes express their juice the fruit of the vine to fill the cup of the communion with the Lord’s blood-then you would expect all manner of controversies concerning baptism and the Lord’s Supper. There will be those controversies until Christ comes. But I have this to say to you: The blood of Jesus Christ on the Cross demonstrated that He was the Son of God, and the author of Eternal Life, and this ordinance which holds forth that fact is the secondary witness that witness that is to abide until Jesus comes and if all demonstrations on the face of the earth were to gather in some unscriptural conclave, and ecumenical and synodical enactment declare, “There shall be no more baptism, there shall be no more observances of the Lord’s Supper,” it would still be true that they would have no power to exclude the witness from court. When Jesus said, “This do until I come; as often as ye drink this cup ye do shew forth the Lord’s death until He come” until He comes that voice will speak and cannot be silenced. And I doubt not there will be congregations of faithful Christians gathered around the Lord’s Supper, partaking of the emblems of His death, and while these symbols are being handed around a shout will interrupt the services, a proclamation will startle the worshipers, “Behold, the bridegroom cometh!” This witness now goes out of court forever. His mission is ended. There is no need of his testimony any further. Their Master Himself is here.

Briefly and finally, you see the object of this letter is to show that the proposition is established by external testimony, objective testimony: three witnesses, the Spirit, the water and the blood. But I want something more than that, and the witness tells us that we have it “He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him.” In him! Now, here is the subjective ratification of the external evidence. The baptism of Jesus Christ was nearly two thousand years ago, a traditional witness. The crucifixion of Jesus Christ was nearly two thousand years ago, a traditional witness. The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was nearly two thousand years ago, a traditional witness. What can I have new? If I accept that evidence by faith, can I not have a confirmation in me that will be perfectly and forever assuring that this evidence is true? That is exactly what you can have. Now mark the object of the testimony is to prove that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The value of that proposition is that if He is the Son of God He is the author of eternal life and that we get in touch with that eternal life by faith in Him. Now comes the concluding thought, that if I exercise that faith in Him on this external evidence, that proves His Sonship, and hence, His being the Author of Eternal Life, then I have that witness in me. And when they talk about cold testimony testimony two thousand years old I say, “Yes, it does not make any difference to me how old it is, if I can in my own heart have that testimony confirmed, if I can have it in me.” Well, the man who rejects Jesus Christ never gets to that internal evidence. No man has that who rejects the external evidence. “But whosoever believeth in Jesus Christ hath the witness in him.” And if he be a poor man, if he be an ignorant man, if he be a slave, if he be a white-headed and trembling old Negro, he can stand up before the universities and kings and courts and emperors, and say, “I am not able to compete with you in your logic, but Jesus Christ is the Son of God. I have the witness in me. I feel it. I know it. He is my Saviour. One thing I do know, that I was blind, and now I see; that I was a sinner and burdened with sin and God, for Christ’s sake, when I believed -in Him, has forgiven my sins. And while this evidence in me is not to convince you, it satisfied me. It was given for my satisfaction and I have it, and you cannot take it away from me.” You might confront me with logicians. You might bring up your higher critics and experts. You might bombard me with these learned theses and scholastic dissertations, yet, I, poor, ignorant, unlearned, have the witness in me that Jesus Christ is my Saviour, and you cannot take that evidence from me. God gave it to me. He hath compassion on my infirmity. He knows how to have compassion on the ignorant, and He descended to my low estate, and He kindled a fire in my soul that all the powers of the earth cannot put out. It shines there and it does me good. I feel the shining when it is night. I feel the power of it when I am sick. I feel it when I go to die, and like the dying Methodist bishop, I look in the face of the grim and spectral monster and say, “is this death this light, this joy, this buoyancy, this soaring, this chariot, this welcoming of angels? Is this death? Welcome death; O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” I have the witness in me, and if you are a Christian you can have that eternal ratification. You can go out before the world without any fear. That is the hope of the church. And the Holy Spirit beareth witness by convicting, by converting, by sanctifying. The Holy Spirit beareth witness throughout. the whole earth. And hence, said Paul, “When I come to discuss God, when I speak of what God is to man, and how man is to be reconciled to God, I lay aside philosophy, I waste no time in trying to find out God by that method, but I confine myself to the testimony of God. My way of knowing Jesus is by evidence.” I look at the witnesses and they speak to me. The Spirit says, “He is the Son of God.” The water says, “He is the Son of God.” And the blood says, “He is the Son of God.” And one of these witnesses is here in these emblems the testimony of His blood. If you are a Christian and you stay away from the

observances of the Lord's Supper, you lend your aid to the Devil just that much to darken the clearness of His testimony. You are not called on to partake because you are good, not because you are consistent, nor because your life has been holy in the sight of God, but you are called on because miserable sinner and unworthy sinner as you have been, you yet have faith in Jesus Christ. By faith in the blood you come up and allow this witness to show forth Christ's death. Show it, Brother, oh! show it! For the world needs to see it! Unmuzzle the witness! Unmuffle the voice! Let him speak. Let him tell to the dark and lost world, Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. I have the witness in me. My soul tells me that it is true-He is my Saviour. Oh! how precious that internal evidence! Have you been sick? Have the shadows been upon you? Have you felt that you were parted from your scattered loved ones? Have you felt that earthly help was gone? Oh! in that hour has it not been an unspeakably precious thought that you had a witness in you that Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and your Saviour? Now we want to show forth the Lord's death. Let us pray.

# S. The Way to Eternal Life

THE WAY TO ETERNAL LIFE SCRIPTURES: Matthew 19:16-22; Mark 10:17-22. It is not my purpose this morning to preach a sermon, but to talk to you somewhat upon your Sunday school lesson. That lesson is concerning the rich young ruler, and shows the perils of riches and the necessity of leaving all things to follow Christ. It is followed by a parable which discloses the principle upon which Christ rewards His disciples. All of the lesson flows from a simple incident: A young man came running very earnestly and propounded to Jesus this question: “Good Master, what good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?” By comparing Matthew’s statement with Mark’s you find that the adjective “good” is applied by this young man to the person of Christ and to the thing which is to be done as a means of securing eternal life “Good Master, what good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?” And by comparing the two accounts you will see that Jesus replies to the use of this adjective in both cases. Replying to the application of the adjective “good” to Himself, He says: “Why do you call me good? There is none good but God.” Replying to the application of the adjective to the thing to be done, He says: “Why do you ask me concerning that which is good? God is the only good.” So you see that the answer is “God” to both of the thoughts. As a person, God only is good. As a possession, a thing to be enjoyed, God only is good. I never read this but my mind goes back to the historical incident when Louis XIV was about to be buried Louis the Grand Monarch, the greatest sovereign of the French nation, Bonaparte excepted, that ever occupied the throne of France - Louis the magnificent, who had the power to attract to him the greatest literary minds, the greatest social celebrities and the greatest martial heroes, and who, by the impress of his own character, not merely pushed out the boundaries of the French empire to a vast extent, but exercised an equal sway over society and over literature. He was truly great, as men count greatness, but in his old age (for he reigned a long time) he lived to see all of his glory vanish. It began to pass away when the Duke of Marlborough at the battle of Blenheim defeated Marshal Tallard, and continued to pass away as Marlborough gained victory after victory, until France became impoverished, until Louis shriveled up, void of human respect, a painted old man. He who had been the center of all sight, the chief attraction of all the great of the earth, was dead even while he lived. His greatness was an illusion, his life artificial. Macaulay says that it excited great surprise to find by post-mortem examination that instead of his being such a very tall man he was only a little over five feet high. But, anyhow, on the occasion of his funeral the preacher commenced with this statement, “God alone is great.” So here our Saviour wished to rebuke the adjective employed by this young man and applied to Himself. The young man did not regard Jesus as divine. He did not look on Him as God. He looked on Him merely as a great teacher. To paraphrase the thought: “Looking on me as only a man, why do you prostrate yourself before me and apply to me the term ‘good’? God alone is good. If you mean to ascribe it to God, well. If you mean to apply it to me as a mere human being, not well. There is none good but God.” The thought is this that there is no perfection in human goodness. While the law requires a man to be as perfect as God is perfect, and as good as God is good, and while grace will ultimately bring that about in the case of every man who enters heaven, for without holiness no man shall see the Lord, yet it is an arrogant claim when one applies it to himself here and now, under the present earthly

conditions. Supreme goodness can only be predicated on God Himself. Now the other thought, “What good thing?” The Saviour rebukes his application of the adjective “good” to a thing, to a possession: “You may have ideas of goodness as applied to things that need to be corrected. You say to me, What good thing shall I do? That is, to be so good, that I can offer it to God as an equivalent or eternal life. Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? God alone is good.” The meaning of it is this: It is the old question, which is the chief good? What is that one possession which if a man have he lacks nothing, and if he have everything else in the world except that one thing, you can say to him, “One thing thou lackest?” What is the chief good? The answer to it, as to the other, is, “God is the good.” That is to say, He has so constituted our immortal spirits, He has so endowed them with capacities, He has so conferred upon them desires, that these capacities cannot be suitably employed and these desires cannot be adequately satisfied outside of the end of them, which is God. God is the good that alone can satisfy the human heart. Allow a man to possess just as many other things as he is willing to enumerate, and let their excellency be as high in the human scale as one is disposed to wish, there will be no dispute about quality; take as many as you please and after you take all you may wish to claim, your soul will be a pauper, for God is not its portion. One thing thou lackest - THE thing. There will come a time when you will get to the end of any limited thing. There will come a time when you will exhaust the fulness of all measures, of all finite quantity. There will come a time when all glory of earthly things will vanish, and when that time comes, defer it just as long as you please, pass from days to months, and months to years, and from years to cycles and from cycles to ten thousand times ten thousand centuries, let it be so, when you do get there, and ultimately you must, and your eye sweeps the horizon of eternity you are in absolute poverty. You have used up what you had. You have used it up without, in the least, taking away your capacity for enjoyment. You remain as hungry, as craving, as longing, as when you first commenced. Then none of these things can be called the good, the equivalent of eternal life-none of them. “You asked me” concerning that which is good. I say to you that God is the good, and if your springs of joy are not in God, then your springs of joy are summer springs. They will dry up. There will come a time when dust takes the place of sparkling and bubbling waters. Now that is the thought with which the lesson commences. Notice next that while this young man had a very low idea of personal goodness and of the good that could fill the heart of man, and consequently a very low estimate of the dignity of manhood itself, the Saviour now wants to show him that he has an equally faulty view of the law. “You ask me what you shall do to inherit eternal life. If you wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments.” The law is the measure of human conduct. “The law, you mean, as I know it?” “No, I mean as God knows it. It is not limited by your ignorance.” “Oh, then you mean as my conscience feels it?” “No, conscience is not a standard. Conscience is only a judge. The judge that sits on the bench is not the standard. The law is the standard. Conscience pronounces according to the law that is before it, whatever law that may be. If it is an inferior law, then the decisions of conscience will be inferior. The supreme standard is the divine law, and you are in no way free from the obligation of the law simply because you say, ‘My conscience does not tell me to do that.’ Ask Paul. He verily thought within himself that he was doing God’s service in persecuting the Christian religion. He had a certain standard. According to that standard his conscience, as a judge, construed and applied the law put before it, hence his conscience told that persecution was the right thing to do. But is God’s law to be lowered until it fits an unclean conscience? Is God’s law to be lowered until it fits human ignorance?” The Saviour knew that this

young man was at fault in supposing that he had kept the law all his life. That was his claim. He says, “All these have I observed from my youth.” Why then did the Saviour refer him to the law? In order to disclose the real state of his heart. The law, expressed in great principles and not in special statutes, is this: “Thou shalt love God supremely and thy neighbor as thyself. Thou shalt love God with all thy affections, all of them. Thou shalt love God with all thy understanding, thy intelligence. Thou shalt love God with all thy activities, thy strength. Thou shalt love God supremely and thy neighbor equally with thyself.” Now he said that he had kept that all the way. Mark how the Saviour discovers his case to him: “You affirm that you love God with all your heart, for you say you have kept the law from your youth up. I will subject you to a test. God says that heavenly treasures are better than earthly treasures. God says that heavenly rewards are superior in excellency to earthly rewards. You say you love God with all your heart. I will test your affections. Here you have vast earthly possessions. Yonder are vast heavenly possessions. I propose an even swap to you. Let these replace those. Give up one and take the other. Sell all that you have, every bit of it, and come and follow me and you shall have reward yonder. You say you love God supremely, that your heart is obedient to the divine statute. If you have rightly judged yourself, it will be to you an absolute pleasure to exchange an earthly pleasure for a heavenly one.” Look at it this way: One man has silver, but alleges a preference for gold. He claims to estimate an ounce of gold to be sixteen of silver. As a test of the sincerity of his estimate of relative values, put down by the side of his silver an equal weight of gold, ounce for ounce, and let him take his choice. Now on your theory of sixteen to one, will you. exchange the onesixteenth for the whole number? If he says, “No, I will keep my silver,” what will it prove? It will prove that he did not tell the truth when he said he estimated the gold to be of more value than the silver. Another has gold but alleges a preference for diamonds. “Diamonds,” he says, “far exceed gold in relative value.” Test him the same way. Put clear, large, lustrous diamonds over against his gold, equal weight, ounce for ounce, and give him his choice. “Give me that weight in gold and I will give you this weight in diamonds.” “I cannot do that; I would rather have my gold.” What does it prove? It proves that he did not tell the truth when he said he estimated the diamonds to be more valuable than the gold. Apply these illustrations to this young man. He said that from youth up he had kept the law. The law said, “Thou shalt love God supremely. Thou shalt prefer God to earth. Thou shalt prefer heavenly treasure to temporal treasure. Thou shalt prefer moral and spiritual good to physical and temporal good. Now, if you have kept the law, if this is the attitude of your mind and heart, when I offer you a fair exchange, heavenly treasure for earthly treasure, you will joyfully take it.” What happened? The young man’s countenance fell. What an expression! His countenance fell. Why? He went away sorrowful. And why? True, he had great possessions, but here, according to his own theory, was offered him greater possessions in exchange, and he declined to take them. The besetting sin of that young man, as is the besetting sin of this age, was the love of money. This is absolute idolatry. I mean counting money the chief good. Evidently he so counted it. Because he was not willing to exchange it for what on his own theory was a better and a greater good. When the two came of an alternative possession, he refused the one and elected the other. Here are all the elements of a decision. Here are the two things put over against each other by contrast. Here the elector looks first upon this picture and then on that, and, looking, deliberately chooses. His choice established the fact that money was his chief good. “Why askest thou me concerning that which is the good? God is the good. You, in heart, say money is the good, and as a proof that you worship the money, when I put money and God directly before you as objects of

affection, as comparative objects. of human love, you turn your back on God and you cling to the money." So it made manifest the awful fact that he had never kept a commandment in his life, never had. He never had even approximated keeping a commandment. Now, I want to press a question on you with all the solemnity of which I am capable. I know I am in earnest about it. I know I have so deliberated upon it that I feel that I am touching eternal things here today and that today there will be a touchstone applied to human hearts. I have prayed God that you may propound this question, "What lack I?" And that when you have discovered what it is, that your decision will be different from the decision of this young man. Some things about which others have been much exercised may never even have interested me. I am utterly unable to appreciate their obstinate hold on the human mind. For instance, sacramental salvation, ritualism as a means or condition of life. It always seemed to me to be as small a thing as a man's mind could belittle itself with. How did any one ever say, If you are baptized you will be saved? If you are not baptized you will be lost? If you commune you will be saved? If you do not commune you will be lost? Salvation never turns on things of that kind. It turns rather upon a supreme principle, your recognition and acceptance of Jesus Christ as sovereign, as good, as supreme. I do not care what else you do, if you leave that out you are lost, whether you be preacher, deacon or unofficial church member. You may have paid money every day of your life. You may have attended service; you may have observed rituals; you may have busied yourself about many things, but I do know that if you have never recognized and bowed to the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ you are not saved and you lack the supreme thing. The test may come up in various ways; in your case perhaps on a different thing from that which exposed the idolatry of the young man. It may not be that love of money is your besetting sin. But no matter in what form the test does come, when it clearly reaches you, when it comes as an alternative proposition, when it sets before you in competition, heaven or earth, when your soul must take one and leave the other, then if there be on the face of the earth any one thing that you prefer to God, you fall all along the line. You lack one thing. My own mind never studied a question as great as the subject of the supremacy of God. God alone is great. God alone is the good. "He went away sorrowful because he had much possessions." Now I want to show you how the Lord Jesus Christ brought out the thought in another way. It was not a full disclosure to show him where His chief thing was, his king-thing, the royal thing, that which took precedence of everything else. There is quite another view to be seen. Let us suppose that this young man had said: "Here is the title to everything I have. I will turn it all over to you now. Let it be sold and distributed among the poor, since you require it. My money, yes, take it all of it but my personal service, no." "Sell it all?" "Yes." "Give it to the poor?" "Yes." "Follow you? No." Right here, it would seem, is an important point. I shall never forget a conversation I had with an old friend in a certain city when canvassing for the redemption of Baylor University. He accorded me a brief interview, but desired to end the whole thing in a minute. "I know what you want, I approve your work, here is a check for $50." "Excuse me," I replied, "you misunderstand. The check is very far from all I want." "Well," he said, "what is it?" "I mean to say that if my mission is what you conceive (and if it is not, you ought not to give any money to it) you owe to it some personal service as well as your money, and more than the $50 the cause needs your influence. Now you cannot discharge that duty by a financial contribution." His good sense grasped the situation in a moment, and his kindness and loyalty accorded promptly, gracefully and lovingly, just what I wanted, and just what was become in him to do for such a cause. He fixed a convenient hour, heard me patiently and thoroughly, became deeply interested, increased his own

contribution, furnished me much valuable information, gave some good advice, of which he was quite capable, wrote some letters of introduction, went with me to other places and every way made the cause his own for such time as he could spare. When I left him I thanked him, not for courtesies to me, but I thanked him for Christ's sake. His face glowed with the pleasure of personal service. It is not difficult to find business men who readily contribute to worthy objects, and are even willing to let the deacons say how much they ought to give, but who are unwilling to bring their personal service to bear in the cause of Christ; who are willing to have an evangelist come and hold a protracted meeting and never frown as they sign the check to pay him, but who will not personally labor in the meeting, pray in the meeting and work in the meeting for the salvation of souls. What, then, do such facts disclose: Put the disclosure in words: "Lord, I recognize your sovereignty over my money; you may check on me when you will; I will honor your check, but I do not recognize your sovereignty over myself." We have here some of this class. Oh, how I have longed to see them come to prayer meeting just occasionally! How I have longed to see them show a personal interest in the Sunday school! How I have longed to see them show a disposition to give personal help to the deacons in their work, to give personal help to the pastor in seeking to build up this church! I witnessed this scene once, and could give you the names. I was sitting in the office of a wholesale house in a certain city which did an immense business, far, wide-reaching business. The proprietor was a liberal man, too, as the world goeth. While there, word was brought to a gentleman present, whose office was just across the street, notifying him that a man, according to his appointment and at the time designated, was over at his office waiting for him. He uttered an impatient exclamation which I will not repeat and added: "I have an appointment with him. He wants me to give money to him. I suppose I must go." The wholesale proprietor laughed: "Don't you know the way out of that? Why, just send your check over to him. Sign it here and send it over. Of course, you ought to give it. We have to do these things; that is right, but I would not be bored with an interview." There was a cold-blooded insolence of tone and manner no words can describe. It made me shudder at the brutality to which money-getting degrades men. I could not be silent. Knowing all the facts in the case, that the waiting one represented not himself but the Lord Jesus Christ, whom both these men professed to serve and honor, that he was a most honorable gentleman, unselfishly devoted to the cause of Christ and humanity, that this cause was entitled to a hearing upon the part of those who claimed to be Christians, I said: "Did you accord this interview, designating time and place?" "I did." "Do you concede the worthiness of the cause and its claims on you?" "Oh, yes!" "Do you understand that the waiting gentleman desires any favor for himself?" "Oh, no!" "Whom then does he represent?" "Oh, well, he represents our church." "Do you mean your church, or Christ?" "Of course, our church does Christ's work." "Will you answer me plainly one question do you regard him as representing Christ in this matter?" "Well, yes." "Then you have-insolently refused an interview with Christ. You have brutally affronted His representative. How do you interpret this Scripture: 'And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when you depart out of that house, or city, shake off the dust of your feet' (Matthew 10:14). 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward' (Matthew 10:40-42)? Now apply it. You say this is a good thing, but deny it a hearing, deny that it

is entitled to enough of your time for you to investigate it, or to be even civil to its representative." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." Now listen to a statement from Paul. He tells of a model offering. The Philippian church was a very poor church financially. They were not only financially poor, but they were under a very great stress of persecution. Well, these people thoughtfully considered the subject that Paul presented to them, a subject that related to God, and considering it and praying about it they made an offering which Paul marks as a model offering, by saying: "Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power I bear record, yea, and beyond their power they were willing of themselves; praying us with much intreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints. And this they did, not as we hoped, but first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God" (2 Corinthians 8:1-5). Go read that Scripture. They first gave themselves. Not only my money, but myself, Lord. Mark that they gave themselves not only unto the Lord, but unto His representative, and both "by the will of God." Then what is involved in being a Christian? This, much is involved, that there be an absolute surrender to Jesus Christ. I mean that you recognize Him as Lord of person and of time and of property, of everything. And if He is God, He is entitled to it. If He is not God, He is a usurper and an impostor to demand anything at your hands. This is where we fail. We do play at things. People play at being Christians. They are always knowing and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. They are always splitting hairs and caviling and discussing this little boundary, when the heart of the question is one question: Do you yield yourself and all that you have to the Lord Jesus Christ? I do not care on what comes the issue; it may come upon a yard of ribbon. It may come upon a silver thimble. It may come upon the most infinitesimally small thing in which the human mind can take interest, but if the point on which the controversy arises be as narrow in its boundaries as the point of a cambric needle, and on that thing, however small, a soul says, "God, here you are not supreme," that is a lost soul. That is the whole of the question. and it is all involved. I know that it is personally distasteful for me to refer so much to myself, but when one discusses a personal experience he speaks within his knowledge. Now, if I have any consciousness, if I have any just recognition of the processes of my own thought, if I am able faithfully to chronicle the principal facts of my own past, I do know that this was the supreme question that addressed itself to my mind for settlement when I was converted. After you settle that, you never find any hard question. There are none others that can approximate it. Whether you do this or that particular thing amounts to but little when the supreme - question is settled, the one that has the heart of the whole matter in it. I think I understood what the old preacher meant when he said: "With my view of my allegiance to Jesus Christ, if I could get the evidence upon my mind that Jesus Christ commanded me to go out yonder in that graveyard and stand over the dust of the dead and say, 'Live!' I would go out there and say it expecting to see them come up from their graves." He just meant this: The only thing that I have ever to settle is, What does He want me to do? Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? That is all I want to know. There is where the question comes in. It is not as to the way, but what is the thing to do? Now, Paul settled that supreme question when Jesus says, "Saul, why persecuteth thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goads." You may think you are only persecuting the people. I tell you that you are persecuting the Son of God when you are unjust to His cause. But what replied Paul? "What shall I do, Lord! I recognize your sovereignty, I see you are Lord. I see that you are the only Lord. You are the one king. You are sovereign. Now what will

you have me to do?" "Go to Damascus." "I will go." "Go to a certain street called Straight." "I will." "There wait for a man to come called Ananias." "I will." "Then do what he tells you to do, for I will send a message by him." "I will do it." "I will show you that I have marked out for you to be a great sufferer." "Send it, Lord, send it. I will rejoice in it. I accept it." "I will show you that you must suffer a great many things for my sake." "Send them; let them come." "You must leave home. It will nearly break your heart. You would a great deal rather preach to your home people." "I will go." "I will send you far hence." "I will go." Notice he never fought the real battle but once, and notice that the battle did not consist in simply saying, Will you go to Damascus, or will you go to the street called Straight? It didn't consist in that. Those were details, all settled in the main question, in the sovereignty of Jesus Christ over him, to send him here, there, or anywhere. Well, let us take one other case and then I am done. "Gaius," "Here, Lord! Lord, are you going to make me a missionary?" "No." "Why, you let Paul go." "It is not for you to determine whether you go or whether you stay. I appoint you to stay, not to go. You serve me here." "How?" "Well, I will pour wealth on you." "You don't mean that I have to sell all that I have?" "Not at all; you do what I tell you to do. I will pour wealth on you. As fast as your soul prospers, I will make your money prosper." "Well, Lord, haven't you got any sickness for met" "No, I am not going to send affliction on you. I am willing for you to be well in body as long as you are well in soul." "Well, what am I to do then?" "You are to be a fellow helper to the truth. You receive those whom I send. You greet those whom I send.. You contribute to those whom I send." God says, "I am sovereign. I say to Gaius, 'Be rich.' I say to Paul, 'Go.' I say to Gaius, 'Stay.'" So you see it does not consist in whether you will do this or that particular thing, but whatever thing, leave it to Him. Paul says to Silas: "Let us go over into Asia and preach." The Spirit says, "You cannot go." "All right, I won't set my face that way. Let us go over then into Bithynia to preach." The Spirit says, "No, you cannot go there." "All right, I won't try to go there. Lord, you are sovereign. You select my field; I don't want to select it. I belong to you. Not only when you want me to work, and not only what you want me to do, but where you want me to work." The sovereignty extends to the place as well as to the time. Now that is the thought that I wanted to get before you today, the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. Let His mind be in you, the mind that was in the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. "I came not to be ministered unto but to minister." He came to serve and to do the Father's will. So, adapt yourself to God's methods as well as to His work. Take one illustration: God might have made the Bible ready bound, given it in the English tongue, pictures in it, gilt edge, marginal notes and all, and handed it right down from heaven just that way, but it would have been a very mechanical way of handing it down. It would have been a way that imposture could have imitated and did imitate in the Mormon Bible. So he did not pursue any such way. He gave His revelation in His own way, and by giving it as He did He called out, He engaged, He employed the thought of ten thousand Christians in ascertaining the true text, in collating the passages, in sifting, in holding up before us at last the reliable Word of God. Tischendorf felt that God called him not to go as a missionary and not to stay at home, but he wanted the truest text of God's Word that could be found. That meant to travel and spend money. That meant hardship and poverty. "Let it come. My soul is on my work and I don't care how much I suffer and I don't care how much I labor. Paris, Rome, Egypt, Arabia, anywhere:" At one time, begging those stern guardians of the Vatican manuscript to just let him look at it, let him copy as much as he could copy on his finger nail; another time on Matthew Sinai dealing with the stupidity of ignorance, making three trips there at great personal cost, in order to be able to bring away the famous

Sinaitic text of the Bible. See another yonder in that old convent in the desert of Africa, where for a consideration he is let down through a trap door into a room that had been filled with old parchments of bygone ages, and gathered them up and exhibited his inestimable treasures to the courts of Europe and to the world. He had his work. The same thing was in the heart of Wyclif when he said, “My mission is to see to it that every plow boy shall have the Bible in the Anglo-Saxon tongue to read as he plows.” And he brought it about. So then, divergent as may be the paths, different in themselves as may be these avenues to work, the one and the only question to be considered is, “Do you let God decide, do you make Him sovereign? Lord, art thou my Lord?” That is what Lord means. It means sovereign, potentate, king. I press that question now on you. As you go out of this house ask yourself: “Do I recognize Jesus Christ as Lord of myself, Lord of my time, Lord of my money, Lord of all?” And you might just as well write on and engage your room in hell if you deny the jurisdiction of Jesus Christ over your money, over your time, over everything.

Chapter 106

# S. WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? PART 1.

WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? PART 1

I am fifty-three years old today. I desire to celebrate the anniversary by a discussion of the plan of salvation in answer to the momentous question: What shall I do to inherit eternal life? The discussion will be predicated on two paragraphs of Luke's gospel, one in Matthew 10:1-42 and one in Matthew 11:1-54. The two together outline one great subject in its several parts.

Commencing with Matthew 25:10, I read: "And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted Jesus." "Lawyer" here does not mean a pleader before a court, but an expounder of the Jewish law, which was both civil and ecclesiastical. The word, "tempt," may have a good or bad sense. My judgment is that the sense here is good. It means, "to try." "And behold a certain lawyer stood up and tempted Jesus, saying, 'Master (that means teacher), what shall I do to inherit eternal life?' And Jesus said unto him, 'What is written in the law?' i.e., you are a lawyer and your business is to expound the law. "What is written in the law? How readest thou?"

"And he answering said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself.'"

Well, that is written in the law. It is a summary of the Ten Commandments-not a New Testament summary, but the synopsis given by Moses himself, not all in one place, but in two different books of the Pentateuch.

Here it is a quotation: "It is written in the law that thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength and with all thy mind and thy neighbor as thyself." "And Jesus said unto him, 'Thou hast answered right. Do this and thou shalt live.'"

Mark that answer: "Do this and thou shalt live." "But he, desiring to justify himself said unto Jesus, 'And who is my neighbor?' Jesus made answer and said: 'A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho and he fell among robbers who both stript him and beat him and departed, leaving him half dead.'" That road from Jerusalem to Jericho was down hill all the way, the grade very steep and in certain parts of it almost a canyon through the mountains; a very narrow passway, with dangerous rocks on each side, honey-combed with caves. From time immemorial robbers have harbored in those caves and attacked travelers passing over that road from Jerusalem to Jericho and from Jericho to Jerusalem. In the time of the Crusaders an organization was formed called the "Knights Templars" for the sole purpose of establishing their headquarters on that road and protecting travelers, keeping robbers off. That organization of the Knights Templars increased and changed its original form until it became the mightiest organized power of chivalry at one period, and of rascality at another period. Kings found it necessary to the peace of their realms to banish them. The romance readers will recall Scott's vivid description in "Ivanhoe" of their expulsion from England by Richard the Lionhearted. In modern times we have the Knight Templars, a continuation of the old organization, but with different objects.

Here it is well to note in passing that the illustrations of Christ, while always supposititious, are always natural. His illustration is always a verisimilitude of real life; the thing could have actually happened just as He stated.

"And by chance a certain priest was going down that way; and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. And in like manner a Levite also, when he came to the place, and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was; and when. he saw him, he was moved with compassion, and came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on them oil and wine; and he set him on his own beast and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the morrow he took out two pence and gave them to the host, and said, 'Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee.' Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbor to him that fell among the robbers? And he said, 'He that showed mercy on him.' And Jesus said unto him, 'Go, and do thou likewise.'" So says the paragraph of the tenth chapter. The paragraph from Luke 11:1-54, continuing the subject, commences with the thirty-seventh verse: "Now as He spake, a Pharisee asketh Him to take breakfast with him and He went in, and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that He had not dipt himself before breakfast. And the Lord said unto him (replying to his thought), 'Now do ye Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter; but your inward part is full of extortion and wickedness. Ye foolish ones, did not He that made the outside make the inside also? But rather give for alms those things which are within and behold, all things are clean unto you.' "Do you recall how the King James version reads on that?" 'But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.' "But this reads:" 'Give for alms those things which are within and all things are clean unto you.' "There is no doubt in anybody's mind as to the words in the original Greek - ta enonta. The same word was before the King James translators and the Canterbury revisers, but that word grammatically can be derived from either one of two words, eni or eneimi. If from the first word it means "such things as ye have," but if from the other it means "those things that are within." Now, where the grammatical construction favors one derivation as much as another, you go to the context to determine the true word from which it is derived; and the context here unquestionably shows that the Canterbury revisers derived it from the right word.

I recall many books which I have read and hundreds of things which I have heard, predicating an awfully false theology upon the King James rendering, "Give alms of such things as ye have and all things are clean unto you," that is, if you are benevolent, if you are open-hearted, why the Lord will forgive everything else; and the way to get to heaven, the way to inherit eternal life, is just to give alms. But that is far from the meaning of Jesus. To resume the reading:" 'But woe unto you Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and every herb, and pass over judgment and the love of God; but these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Woe unto you Pharisees! for ye love the chief seats in the synagogues and the salutations in the market places. Woe unto you! for ye are as the tombs which appear not, and the men that walk over them know it not.' And one of the lawyers answering said unto him, 'Master, in saying this thou reproachest us also.' And He said, 'Woe unto you lawyers also! For ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! For ye build the tombs of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. So ye are witnesses and consent unto the works of your fathers; for they killed them, and ye build their tombs. Therefore also said the wisdom of God,

I will send unto them prophets and apostles; and some of them they shall kill and persecute; that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary: Yea, I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation.'"

What an awful thing is God's dealing with a nation or with a race! Just as He deals with an individual, so with a nation or the whole race. And how the long treasured wrath that has been massing up from the beginning of a nation's history until its iniquity is full, bursts over the barriers, and on that last generation falls all of the accumulated woe. Instance the French Revolution. Louis XVI was about the most moderate, the most amiable, of all the Bourbon kings, and yet on him and in his day came the doom that the predecessors of his dynasty had garnered up. "Woe unto you lawyers! for ye took away the key of knowledge!" Not the key that unlocks knowledge, but the key, knowledge; knowledge itself is the key. "Ye took away the key." What key? Knowledge. "Ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." So ends the second paragraph. The subject, of discussion today is vital and fundamental; indeed, the most important ever presented to human consideration, and I would deal with it in the simplest and clearest form possible, but I want to discuss the whole subject. I want to show you that this paragraph from Luke 10:1-42 and the paragraph from Luke 11:1-54, are but parts of one whole subject, and that subject is a question concerning eternal life ¾ what a man shall do to inherit eternal life. Taken together they disclose the ways by which men seek to obtain eternal life, and how any plan to which a man is wedded, necessarily influences his own character either helpfully or hurtfully, and is bound to influence his own community helpfully or hurtfully. But such extensive discussion is impossible within the limits of a half or three-quarters of an hour, and hence my proposition is to devote to this subject both the morning and evening services, and I invite all present now to come tonight and hear the end of it. I want you to have the whole subject before you.

I ask you to note first our Lord's method of dealing with men. He always addressed himself to the man's own standpoint in such a way as to awaken thought and produce self-conviction. Here was an expounder of the law relying upon his conformity to the law for eternal life; an expounder of the law who wanted to call out and try Jesus on this standard. Hence he comes with this most important of all questions: "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Oh, what a question!

What a question for you, for me, for anybody, for everybody! "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Or, "What shall I do to escape eternal death?"

Jesus says to him, "What does the law say?" You are a lawyer. It is your business to expound the law. "What does the law say?" "Well, the law says this: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength and with all thy mind and with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself.'" Jesus replied to the man, "You have answered right. That is what the law says. That covers the scope of all the commandments. That summary comprehends every detail, not only of the decalogue but of every other statute, civil, ecclesiastical, ceremonial, or of any other kind. That is the whole of it. On these two hang all the law and the prophets."

What was the question? "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Mark the answer ¾ "The law says thou shalt love God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself. Do this and thou shalt live." Do this and thou shalt live. You are standing on the law. You are an expounder of the law. You are seeking justification before the law from your standpoint. Here is your chance. Do this and thou

shalt live. Fail to do this and thou shalt die.

Just here comes up a question. As men now are ¾ I am not talking about how Adam was, but as men now are ¾ is this a practicable way of life? That is, is it possible for eternal life to be obtained this way? And the answer to it is prompt and clear: "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in the sight of God." That makes it absolutely impracticable. There is God's inspired declaration, that while it remains true if a man will do what the law requires, that he shall inherit eternal life, yet under present conditions it cannot be done. No man can obtain eternal life that way. And here arises a question in morality. Why then did Jesus say, "Do this and thou shalt live?" Why did He answer the question that way? For this reason ¾ it was the object of Jesus to convict that man. That man did not think he was a sinner. Jesus knew he was. The Bible says that by the law is the knowledge of sin. And Paul says, "I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived and I died." Now that man stood before Jesus without any consciousness that he was a lost soul, and there in that delusion, he was going along a road that he thought would certainly land him in heaven, and the only way on the earth to cause him to turn from his hopeless and doomed path was to produce the conviction in his mind that he was a lost sinner. Hence Jesus says, "This is what the law says. Do it. Come and look in this mirror and let it, as you look, reflect back yourself to your sight, that you may see that you are not loving God with all your heart, and with all your strength, with all your mind, and that you are not loving your neighbor as yourself." In other words you turn Mount Sinai, trembling with the touch of God's foot and crested with the fire that shows His presence, and throbbing with the thunders of His power, you turn Mount Sinai over on a man not to save him, but to bring him to Calvary. You see Moses as a schoolmaster unto Christ. When he stands there and says, "I am for the law. I am going to stand on my own record. I am going before the bar of God at last, and according to what I have done I will seek justification." Now the sooner you get that man to see what is the heart, the spirit, as well as the exceeding broadness of the divine commandment, the better for him. That is the object that Jesus had.

We notice the next point. What sort of a man seeks justification that way? Let us take a look at him. Paul describes him. He says he is a man, busying himself to establish his own righteousness; an exceedingly active man, going to and fro, concerning himself exceedingly much, to establish his own righteousness. Now, when you know that it cannot be done, when you know that if he persists in walking in that road that he is lost, what ought to be the attitude of your mind toward him? What feeling in your heart, you that are better informed, should be excited by a contemplation of this man's hopeless quest, of this man's despairing activity? There ought to be excited in your mind something kindred to what was excited in Paul's mind when he looked at such a man. Well, how was it with him? He is a good example because he was once right there himself. There was a time when he was exceedingly zealous after the law, trying to establish his own righteousness. There was a time when he thought that from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet there was not a spot in him. And when the awful revelation came to him it so impressed his heart that when he looked on anybody else in that same dangerous condition, how did he feel?

Let his own words speak for him: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Ghost, that I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh." (Romans 9:1-3.) "Brethren, my heart's desire and supplication to God is for them, that they

may be saved." (Romans 10:1.)

Such a picture as that is enough to excite in the mind of one who is better informed the deepest commiseration. It is enough to put him down on his knees and induce him to cry out unceasingly, with an importunate supplication, "O God, open that man's eyes; there is death in that road. There is no life in that road. I pray for him." Now, why is it that a man cannot be saved that way? Let us see if we cannot get right to the very bottom of it. Why is it? I cite three insuperable difficulties. Any one of them is insuperable. If there were just one of these three it would he impossible for him to inherit eternal life that way. What are they?

First, the carnal mind is enmity against God, and not subject to the law of God, neither can be. What is this way of salvation? It is to do what the law says and live. And what does the law say? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." But here is a man trying to live that way whose mind is enmity against God and not subject to the law of God, and cannot be subject to the law of God. What is his chance? With his fallen, unrenewed nature how can he love God, love him with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his strength, when that heart is enmity against God, not subject to the law of God, and cannot be subject to the law of God? That difficulty then is insuperable.

What is the second? The second difficulty is this: The man is already a sinner and the wages of sin is death. God looked down from heaven to see if there was just one that did good, just one. No, not one. They are all under condemnation. Now, just as he stands right there he is a sinner, a condemned sinner, a sinner already obnoxious to the extreme penal sanction of the law. How is that man to inherit eternal life by keeping the law? That difficulty is insuperable.

What is the third? I want to read that to you. Some people ,you can get to appreciate the force of it, but it takes education to get even the few to ever fully realize its deep significance, and therefore I want to read it to you from the Bible itself. This I want you to hear in the very words of God: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point he is guilty of all. For He that said, 'Do not commit adultery, said also, 'Do not kill.' Now, if thou commit no adultery, if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." (James 2:10-11.) Again, "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.'" (Galatians 3:10.) What does that mean? There is a big word used a good deal now, "solidarity"-the solidarity of the law. It means that if a man is to seek justification by the law, it will avail nothing that he has obeyed 999,999 of its 1,000,000 precepts if he has broken one, just one time. To live by obedience means not partial, but total obedience; not obedience temporarily but universally; not obedience last week and this week and next week, but from the beginning of his life to his death; absolute obedience, not only to every divine requirement of God, but to the full spiritual power of that requirement.

Now, if a man can think ¾ if he has the germ of analysis and logic in him ¾ and he looks at these three obstacles in the way of keeping the law; first, an unrenewed nature that is hostile to God; second, to the fact that he is already a sinner and guilty of death; and third, that if he were not now a sinner that the obedience must in future be perfect to every commandment, at all times, then I ask you, in view of these three things, if any man under present conditions, can be saved by the law. This suggests three other questions: How are these three difficulties to be removed? The first one is removed by regeneration, what is called the new birth, taking away the stony heart and giving the heart of flesh. But let us hear the Scriptures themselves: "A new heart also will I gave

you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." (Ezekiel 36:26-27.) "Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God…That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.'" (John 3:3-6.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus 3:5.) But you seeking justification by law, where is your right to demand regeneration? If you get regeneration, it must come outside of any claims you have upon the law. I admit that regeneration would remove that first difficulty, but deny that regeneration comes by the law.

How is the second difficulty removed? This difficulty arising from the fact that the man is already a sinner and the wages of sin is death ¾ how is that to be removed? I venture to say that there is no way to remove it except to find a propitiation for the sin, such a propitiation as the law-giver will accept. It is to find some substitute upon whom that penalty can be inflicted and which will be acceptable to the one whose law has been violated. The Scriptures teach that. They teach that the law-maker must set forth a propitiation and that the substitute must expiate the offense, and as expiation means death, He must die. He must die under a curse. Hear the Scriptures themselves tell how this difficulty is removed:

"Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." (Romans 3:24-25) "But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all... Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief; when thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand." (Isaiah 53:5-10.) "For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." (2 Corinthians 5:21.) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.'" (Galatians 3:13.) "Who gave himself for us, that He might redeem us from iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." (Titus 2:14.) "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." (1 Peter 1:18-19.) "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed." (1 Peter 2:24.)

Unquestionably such expiation is able to remove this difficulty, but if you are seeking salvation by the law, how can you claim that anybody should do that for you? But how shall the third difficulty be removed? That difficulty lies in the solidarity of the law, requiring the perfect keeping of every commandment in all of its parts at all times. I know of but one way in the world in which that can be removed, which is, that a substitute be found whose obedience of the law is perfect; so that by the obedience of one many sinners may be justified. So testifies the Scripture: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made

righteous." (Romans 5:19.) But you, seeking justification by the law, how are you to claim the benefit of anything of that kind? Here arises another question, a question that goes right to the heart of a modern agitation. Let us suppose that two of these difficulties are removed, two of them-.that a man is regenerated and, being regenerated, now has a heart that prompts him to love God, and has good motives to prompt his good deeds, and let us suppose that he has received forgiveness of past sins through the expiation of his Substitute. Now why must that other difficulty be gotten out of the way by a substitute?

"Surely," one of these agitators may say, "the regenerated, forgiven man, can keep the law perfectly." I will tell you why he cannot. This regenerated man ¾ this forgiven man ¾ falls upon the remarkable discovery that when he would do good evil is present with him; that what he allows not, that he does, and what he allows, that he does not, and that while with his mind he consents to the law that is holy, just and good, yet how to perform he finds not. He finds in his members another law warring against the law of his mind, and bringing him into captivity to sin. Isn't that so, brother? After you were converted, after you were justified, did you not find it so? So that before there is personal capability of perfect obedience another provision must come in, a provision that shall eradicate the last remnant of the carnal nature and complete what had commenced in regeneration. In other words, there must be another exercise of divine grace that shall take this justified man and sanctify him wholly, body, soul and spirit; make his spirit perfect, and glorify his body. But it is a hard job when you attempt to glorify the body. How can it be done? It can only be done when mortality puts on immortality and corruption puts on incorruption. It can only be done by the power of the resurrection. So that before any man is even in condition personally to love God with all his heart and strength and mind and his neighbor as himself, he must have been regenerated; he must have been justified; he must have had a Substitute to keep the law for him; he must have been sanctified; he must have been glorified.

Well now, that disposes of a good many questions. Let us go on with this: If that man is saved ¾ now here is a question for you-if that man is so saved, what kind of salvation is it? Is it law-salvation? Here is God's answer. I do wish you could take it right down into your souls: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves. It is the gift of God and not of works, lest any man should boast." Grace provided the regeneration. Grace provided the propitiation. Grace provided the perfect obedience. Grace provided the santification of the spirit. Grace provided the resurrection and glorification of the body. It is all of grace, from turret to foundation stone, without any mixture of human merit, so much as the thickness of a spider's web-that is the kind of salvation. But here comes in with perfect coolness a man who looks over his spectacles at you and tells you that his objection to this grace ¾ business is its tendency to immorality. But how can it tend to immorality? Right after the "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God and not of works, lest any man should boast," it adds, "For we are His workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." (Ephesians 2:10.) And also it says that the "grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that we should live soberly and righteously and Godly in this present world." If this grace teaches anything, if it has any trend, that trend is in the direction of morality.

Here, then, let us answer a great question. I have turned it over and over in my mind. I have had occasion to do it and to think the thought clear, out, and to think of it in its several connections and

to co-ordinate its parts, and that question is: Does not grace through faith make ,void the law? I want to show you how it does not. It honors and magnifies the law, first in its precept by the perfect obedience of the Substitute. It honors and magnifies the law in its penal sanction by the death of the Substitute. It honors and magnifies the law in that the beneficiaries of this grace have implanted in them a principle of holiness that shall cause them to love God and give them good motives to obey God, though imperfectly. And then it provides for the sanctification of that regenerated spirit, that the soul may love God perfectly. And then it provides for the glorification of the body, so that being put in heaven at the resurrection day, there is now at last a man who in himself, not in his Substitute, will love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself; so that personally and not through a proxy, at the end of it, the outcome of it, the subject of this grace fulfills the law.

Finally, this grace does not make void the law, because all the time that this regenerated and justified man is being preserved by it until the full work in him is accomplished, he is under the law. But no, you say, that is not scriptural; he is not under the law. Yes, he is under the law. He is indeed under the law as a rule of conduct, and no thoughtful man can deny it. Do you mean to say that the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," is not over a Christian; and the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," and the commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and the commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" ¾ do you say that the Christian is not under that rule? The answer to it is: He is not under it as a rule of life, but he is under it as a rule of conduct. So on these five points there is nothing in salvation by grace through faith that makes void the law at any point, but in every point it honors it, in every point it magnifies it. As Paul says, "The end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, out of a good conscience, out of a faith unfeigned." But perhaps some of you say, this is getting a long way from that lawyer. No, it is not. We come right back to that lawyer, for the concluding part, so far as this morning's service is concerned. I wanted to show you why Jesus told that lawyer to do this and live, that He wanted to convict him, jostle him off of that platform he was on and turn his attention to the true way.

Pursuing the discussion our next question is: What is the constant attitude of the mind of a man who is trying to get to heaven that way? Our lesson says of the lawyer, "He desiring to justify himself." There it is. The constant attitude is a desire to justify himself. But what does that desire to justify himself prompt him to do? Look at it. Here is that high, broad commandment of God: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself." And here is a man trying to save himself by obedience to that law, and very anxious to justify himself. What result follows? He lowers that law to suit the grade of his obedience. How does this lawyer manifest that? By the question, "Who is thy neighbor?" He is saying, "O, yes, I am seeking salvation by the law. The law says I must love thy neighbor as myself. Now, in order for my obedience to that law to be practicable, I must so limit the meaning of that word 'neighbor' as that my obedience will be co-extensive with it." The very first thing that it induces is the lowering of the divine commandment to suit the grade of the obedience. The lawyer in his mind was saying, "My neighbor is a Jew, and a Jew of my own sect, a Pharisee; of course, not a Sadducee. He is not a neighbor of mine; a Samaritan, pah! I would not even look toward a Samaritan. I love my neighbor as myself, but you must let me say who my neighbor is, and it means my' brother Pharisee."

Now you can see why Jesus gave him that answer, and to expose that man's profanation of the divine commandment, and the sophistry with which he sought to justify himself, He tells the

parable of the good Samaritan. As if He had said: "I will throw a sidelight on that subject of neighbor, and I will throw such a sidelight as you yourself with your own mouth shall condemn yourself." Didn't he condemn himself? What does the record say? When Christ got through with the story of the good Samaritan He put the question now to this lawyer: "Which of these three thinkest thou proved neighbor to him that fell among the robbers?" And out from his very lips the answer had to come, "He that showed mercy to him." But where does this answer land his law-righteousness?

If that is what the word neighbor means, looking back over your past life, O

Pharisee, where is your justification? How have you loved your neighbor as yourself? You that seek to be justified by the law, in the light of this parable defining neighbor, you are a lost soul and you know it. You know it. You know you hate a Sadducee. You know that you hate the Gentile. You know that you have wrapt the mantle of your exclusiveness about you, lest you should come in contact, and by contact, receive defilement from other men, and you have kept narrowing the law, narrowing it until you have got a little bit of a circle here, described by the word neighbor, that confines only you and your wife and your son and his wife, and nobody else in the world.

You never saw a man on the face of this earth that stood on the basis of his morality, that stood on his own record, either before or after his conversion, that did not lower the divine law in order to make his obedience fill what the law required. A sliding scale! A sliding scale! I can keep the law perfectly if you will let me reach up and slide it down to fit what I do. The parable of the good Samaritan disposes of the lawyer's quibble on the second commandment, but our second paragraph deals with a whole class under both commandments. It shows that what that man did as an individual the Pharisees did as a class; that in order to obtain justification by the law they were sliding God's law down on everything. How? Well, the law requires us to be clean, clean, clean. But they said we will slide: the law down so that it justs mean on the outside ¾ that it only means to keep the outside of the cup and platter clean. That is all. Inwardly full of rottenness and dead men's bones. Ye foolish ones! Did not He that made the outside make the inside also? Does not the law of God require truth in the inward part? Does it not say that the inward part shall know wisdom and righteousness? And now you will slide it down until it only means obedience in little things, but not the great things; tithing mint and rue and herbs and leaving undone love and judgment and mercy. Ye hypocrites! It says, honor thy father and thy mother, but you do not want to honor your father and your mother; so you slide that law down, so that it says, that if I take some of my property and write, "Corban," on it, and say it is a gift, then I am under no obligations to take care of my old worn-out father; I am under no obligations to support the last days of my infirm mother. Thou hypocrite, sliding the law down, and it must be slidden down to get any justification.

How shall I be clean? How shall I keep clean? "Give alms of those things that are within and all things are clean unto you." Here is a question of how to be clean and how to keep clean. You say, "Wash externally." Jesus says, "Wash inwardly," and let the soul be made clean. What a man has on his hands, the little dirt on his hands, that when he goes to eat may get into his mouth, that does not defile him, but defilement comes from within. "Out of the heart of man proceed murder and blasphemy and adultery and every foul and loathsome thing." That is where defilement comes from. And they are right here in Waco, people sneering at your grace, people sneering at your salvation by faith, people telling you that your doctrine tends to immorality, because desiring to

justify themselves.

Ah me! Look at the other man. Are you a Christian, desiring to justify yourself? "O, no! God be merciful to me a sinner." Look at him as he stands before you, a sinner saved by grace, imperfect in doing right; he knows it, but striving to go on under the promptings of divine grace, and ultimately by that grace to be altogether clean. O thou supreme question, thou paramount interrogation, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Before thy burning point I bare my guilty heart. Tonight we will conclude the discussion. Tonight we will find the true answer-the answer toward which our Lord was driving the lawyer. The way to which He ever sought to shut up the Pharisees, the only way, known under heaven and among men whereby any man can be saved.

Chapter 107

# S. WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? PART 2

WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? PART 2 SCRIPTURES: Acts 16:29-31; Romans 10:1-10; John 3:14-18, John 3:36; Luke 11:37-52.

It has been said that our Savior in the Sermon on the Mount and in the conversation with the lawyer recorded in Luke 10:25-37, discussed this morning, taught one way of life, but that Paul at a later day taught a contrary way of life; and it has become a fashionable thing with those who make such a statement, to contrast our Lord's theology with what they are pleased to call Pauline theology. Of course, if it can be established, that Paul's theology is at variance with our Lord's teaching on the same subject, the apostle's doctrine must fall and with it the inspiration of all the books containing it. Paul himself claimed that he received his gospel direct from the Lord.

Bearing on this statement and in refutation of it, I now cite three passages of scripture, the first two embodying Paul's conception of the plan of salvation, and one containing our Savior's epitome of the gospel-way of life preached by himself. In Acts 16:1-40 we have this question and answer, which is the true question and answer with reference to eternal life: "Then he called for a light and sprang in and came trembling and fell down before Paul and Silas and brought them out and said, 'Sirs, what must I do to be saved?' And they said, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house.'" The second scripture is from Romans 10:1-21 : "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved, for I bear them record that they have a zeal of God but not according to knowledge; for they being ignorant of God's righteousness and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise: Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above:) or, who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring Christ up again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." This is the Pauline theology. Now let-us hear the Savior. I read from the third chapter of John; "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." Our question this morning was, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." "He that believeth on Him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not on the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." In the discussion of the subject this morning under the question, "What shall I do to inherit

eternal life," I found why it was necessary for the Savior to answer the question in that instance as He did; that He answered it in that way in order to suit the standpoint of the man who propounded the question, and with a view to bring about a conviction of sin in that man's heart, and in order to extort from that man's own lips the virtual confession that in attempting to justify himself he had lowered the requirement of God's law concerning "Who is my neighbor?" The discussion this morning closed at this point: "Howbeit, give for alms those things which are within and behold, all things are clean unto you." This presents the subject in another phase and under the question, "How shall we be clean and how shall we keep clean?" The Pharisee said that the way to be clean and to keep clean was by external ablution, and the Savior's plan was by internal ablution. The proposition embodying the plan of salvation, speaking from the standpoint of cleanness then, is this: The way by which a man shall become clean and remain clean in the sight of God, is by internal, spiritual cleansing, cleansing by the power of the Holy Spirit. In support of this proposition as bearing upon the true way of life, you have but to consider the following things: First, there is only one thing in the world that does defile, and that is sin; whatever transgresses the law, that is sin and that defiles the man. Second, all sin is without the body, to put it in somewhat plainer language, all sin must be spiritual. The body can not sin. It is without the body. There must be the action of the mind and of the will and of the judgment, the powers within. The outer man can not commit a sin. It is the inner man only that can commit a sin. Third, and therefore the law of God constantly requires truth in the inward parts, in the inner man. These three thoughts alone establish the position in the Savior's statement, that if you give for alms the things that are within, all things shall be clean unto you. Leaving out the figure of alms-giving employed, the substance of the thought He designed to teach, as the context shows, was this: You are very much concerned, if you go out into the market place, lest by outward touch with some publican you contact defilement. You are concerned if you go to eat, lest certain kinds of meat shall defile you. You have concern about everything you touch and everything that you eat. You wash your hands lest you should be defiled by dirt going into your mouth. Contrary to all of that is the doctrine of God that if you are clean inside, if you give alms of the things that are within, that is, repentance, which is internal, and faith, which is internal, and you receive regeneration, which is internal, then everything is clean to you, i.e., nothing external can defile one internally clean. That is what it means.

We come now to consider then what the true question is if a man wants to be saved, and that question and its answer I have read to you; that if you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ you have and shall have and forever have eternal life; that you now have eternal life so far as justification is concerned; that you shall have eternal life so far as the purification of your spirit is concerned when sanctification is complete; that you shall have eternal life when your body is raised from the dead, a spiritual body that can die no more, that you shall have moral, spiritual life when you are made conformable to the image of the Lord Jesus Christ in your sanctified nature and powers, so that you, in heaven, can and will perfectly obey God, which salvation comes, some of it instantaneously, as justification, and all of it ultimately, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

I now read but do not discuss, for I have other things to present, the links of this chain of salvation by grace, through faith. Listen at it. I read from Romans 8:1-39, beginning with the twenty-ninth verse: "For whom He did foreknow," that is the first, the foreknowledge of God, "He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son." That is the second link of the chain.

"Moreover, whom He did predestinate them He also called." That is the third link. "Whom He called them He also justified." That is the next link. "Whom He justified them He also glorified." And so the chain is complete. The object in reading you these connected links in the plan of a salvation which is purely by grace and not of works, is to show that from its conception before the foundation of the world to the consummation at the end of the world, it is all of God.

Now I read but do not discuss, the four pillars upon which such a salvation abides without any shaking. Here they are:

First, "It is Christ that died." There is the expiation of the sins which we commit, the death of Christ. As long as virtue in that cleansing blood remains, as long as that propitiation is acceptable unto God as a sufficient atonement for sin, that pillar upholds the superstructure - salvation. The second, "Yea, rather that is risen again;" the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, for if He be not risen our faith is vain. I say that Christ, bursting the cerements of death and emerging from the grave, and thus being demonstrated the Son of God with power, is the second pillar upon which our salvation rests. The third is this: "Who is even at the right hand of God." By virtue of what He has done, and as a consequence of His resurrection, He is placed at the right hand of the Majesty on high, enthroned and invested with the sovereignty of the entire universe. All power in heaven and on earth is in His hands. And the, fourth is this: "Who also maketh intercession for us." There is perpetuity of His priesthood, that King who is Priest upon His throne.

Now with these links in the chain and these four pillars upon which salvation rests, let us look, but not tarry in looking, simply look at the security of the salvation, and here let us read again: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? … Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." My only remark on that is this, that when the momentous question is propounded to me, as to how I shall inherit eternal life, and when, my soul seeks a solution of that question, the conclusion which I reach in order to comfort my soul in all of life’s vicissitudes and emergencies must depend upon the character of the foundation, and if it be an unshakable foundation, then I can rest; I am at the end of my investigation. I have reached peace. I do not disturb my mind any more on the thought that I shall be lost.

I want to look back and see how each link in the chain has been fused and welded together, in the secret chambers of eternity by the divine Architect himself, whose hand forges and gives eternal strength to each part of the chain. I want to see that. I do not want to feel that unless I myself look out here and look out yonder, and keep this little point secure and that little point secure, that after all I am going to be lost. I do not want to feel that I am under obligation to go into the garden with a microscope and ascertain the smallest herb there and tithe that, or else have the feeling in my heart that by overlooking some infinitesimal portion of duty that my soul will be lost.

We come now to what I want to discuss tonight. I promised to show you the awful consequences that flow from an attempt to seek life in any other way, and the demoralizing character of a doctrine which avows that a man can keep the law of God perfectly either way before or after his regeneration at any time prior to glorification. No man who ever seeks to enter heaven on the

score of justifying himself by his own righteousness, and no man, who after he has been regenerated and forgiven of all past sin can from that time on expect to perfectly keep the law of God, without falling into grievous and hurtful errors. The whole theory or any part of the theory, is based upon three false conceptions, the first of which is, as indicated this morning, that the law of God is not a fixed and unchangeable and universal standard, but that it is a sliding scale of requirement that must be lowered to suit different conditions in different places and different grades of obedience ¾ that it may be one thing in one place and quite another thing in another place. This conception of law, when it is followed to its logical consequence, is after all, a simple denial of law at all. It logically says there is no such thing as law outside of special circumstances. It is equivalent to the position of the infidel that law is only custom. The second false conception is in regard to sin. The modern holiness man, the perfectionist, has in his mind, a very limited view of sin. Take what Mr. Wesley writes on the subject, that sin is only a voluntary act of disobedience; that a man can not unconsciously sin, unintentionally sin. Here must you lower the transgression in order to suit the degree of the knowledge of the subject of the law, and all you have to do to make him entirely innocent of any disobedience to any moral law of God by such process, is simply to make his ignorance supreme. If his ignorance be supreme, his innocence is perfect. But God's Word teaches that it is the dark places of the earth that are the habitations of cruelty and that the people perish for lack of knowledge. That is the very charge brought here against the Pharisees, that they have taken away the key of knowledge; and every principle that is inculcated in the New Testament is predicated upon the fact that knowledge must underlie faith, and that not to know is to die, and to die is to be lost. This false conception of sin, which confines it wholly to voluntary transgression, also loses sight of what are called states or dispositions; a man may be naturally as averse from God as possible; the ruling bent or disposition of his mind and heart may be whatever you desire to state it; that state of mind and that disposition of heart is not sin according to this theory; there must be a certain act and that act willed, before any sin may be committed. It is equivalent to saying that the moral law of God does not reign over the heathen world. It logically denies that the law of God is written in the human heart. In the next place, it is based upon a false conception of the human will. It assumes that the will of the unconverted man, and the will of the regenerate, the imperfect man, is at all times able to choose the right thing, and denies that that will is enslaved and corrupted.

Now these three misconceptions-the misconception of the law, the misconception of sin, the misconception as to the power of the human will, belong to this system as a whole, or to any of its parts. What else? It is directly contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures. There are passages in the Word of God that speak without any sort of equivocation and leave no just ground for caviling, that there is not upon this earth a just man that liveth and sinneth not that if we say we have no sin we make God to be a liar and the truth is not in us.

Then it is contrary to human experience. I mean the experience of the race as well as of the individual. In all hours when the moral atmosphere is clear enough for us to get a clear view of things, and the spirit of proper insight and candor is on us, we know we are sinners. The rebukes of conscience teach us so. The apprehension of some sudden evil proclaims it. The dread of going into the dark that may be peopled by some indefinable phantoms is a demonstration of it, and all human experience falls into line with the teaching of God's Word. But I come now to the capital point and the closing point, and that is that the seeking of eternal life in the way that this lawyer

was seeking it or the profession of sinless perfection in life after regeneration, for it is all based upon the common ground, makes hyprocrites, Pharisees. It is the Pharisee question with which we are dealing in this whole discussion. I say that the doctrine in any of its parts, or as a whole, not accidently but inevitably and irresistibly, brings about a product, and that product is Pharisaism.

Now in order to see whether such a result is disastrous or not, let us outline a

Pharisee as he is presented here in this context. What is it? If a man lay stress on the seeming more than the real, if a man attends more to external than to internal cleanness, what do you call him? What word is the first stroke of the outline? The one word, hypocrisy ¾ hypocrite. A child knows it. No mind removed a hair's breadth from imbecility, or idiocy, but what can somewhat recognize hypocrisy and hypocrites. You seem to be, rather than you are. You are whited sepulchres, beautiful without but inwardly full of rottenness and dead men's bones.

What is the next word employed in this outline? "Inwardly full of extortion," is a characteristic, but what one word expressed it? Covetous! I venture to say that tie history of this world has produced no greater examples of greater and downright and outright idolatry in the shape of covetousness, than has been found in the Pharisee, whether of ancient or of modern times. A man by keeping clean outside, being externally obedient to God's law, may reach out a stealthy hand and snatch the heritage from the orphan and the widow, extort and extort, pile up and pile up, while a world perishes, until the heart becomes as hard as the nether millstone, granite, cold, impenetrable granite, that never permits a tear of mercy to fall, nor extends a helping hand to the suffering. The stingiest man that this world has ever known is the man of this very kind.

What else? "Full of extortion and wickedness." Cruel, is the term I use. Cruel! A Pharisee is cruel. How else could he take a widow's house by fraud? How else could he rob her and devour the orphan? Cruel? Oh, how pitiless! How unmerciful! Our parable illustrates: Yonder lies the man whom robbers met and stripped and beat and left half dead, and here comes this man whose righteousness is external and cruelly and coldly he walks around him the other way.

What is the next stroke of the outline? Scrupulosity about little things while neglectful of greater things. You never saw one of them in your life that did not do it. I never saw a man yet who was seeking to justify himself in the sight of God on his own record, that did not magnify some little thing into a mountain and minify some mountain into a molehill. The form, more than the power of Godliness, the shell, the shell, even if it shall so harden as to prevent expansion and thereby bring death to the life in the shell. The shell on the beach never sings until it is empty and dry.

Why, you see a touch of it going on in the papers now, where it counts for nothing that the commandment of God, "Go and carry the gospel to every creature," is neglected. It counts for nothing that the ear be closed to the pleading cries for help that come from destitute places. It counts for nothing that the cold waves of infidelity are inundating the land. The great thing is to be parliamentary and to preserve church sovereignty; to be able to say at the judgment, "O Lord God, I hindered when need held out her emaciated hand and gasped with swollen tongue, swollen with thirst; I helped not because the method was unconstitutional. The world was lost but I preserved the form of church sovereignty!" It is just as downright Pharisaism and hypocrisy as that which occurs here in the text. And you ask what is the moral effect of such a teaching on the world? Let us notice this character yet more. Spiritual pride! They loved the chief places in the synagogues

and the salutations in the market places. There never was one yet who attempted to justify himself before God upon his own record that was not eaten through and through with the cancer of spiritual pride; not one. You may take him in the form of an infidel and it is there. You may take him in the form of one who claims to be religious after that fashion, and it is there. You may take him after he claims to be religiously perfect and it is there, a spiritual pride, and towers up to the very heaven and that will not say, "I am a sinner." "Through pride the angels fell." Notice the next point. They are always cheap-glory people. What does the record say? "Ye build the tombs of the prophets whom your fathers slew." Now that is a fine point. I want you to see it for it touches the whole question. You remember it is said, "Seven cities claimed a Homer dead, In which the living Homer begged for bread."

What is the point of the sarcasm? It would cost something to be kind to the blind old bard of Scio's rocky isle while he was alive. It did not cost a cent to shelter under his glory and claim him as a fellow-citizen after he is gone.

You remember how the mother of Robert Burns, with aching heart and quivering lips stood and looked at the cold towering monument erected over her son, and remembering his poverty and his want and his need in his lifetime, said with a pathos that is indescribable,, "Ah, Robbie, you asked them for bread and they gave you a stone." Oh, it is cheap to raise a monument to a dead hero, far cheaper than while he is living and the issues of the hour are on him and he, is facing them, to stand by him. "Ye build the tombs of the prophets."

Yonder in England, what is that crowd gathering? You can scarcely look to its outskirts. Who are they? They are the titled ones of Great Britain. There are dukes and marquises and knights, and there are long-robed ecclesiastical dignitaries. What ought them together? They are going to erect a monument to John Bunyan and bask in the cheap glory of admiring him, gone. When he lived they put him in jail. They said he should not preach. Now that is Pharisaism again, and all on the same line.

I want to show you the hideousness of the character when it is drawn out fully. There are men today who will get up before an audience and with a declamation that is amazing in its elocutionary power and rhetorical force, speak concerning William Carey and Adoniram Judson, but when you go to them and say, "Do thou likewise," they close their purse strings, because it is cheaper to glorify a dead missionary than to help a live one.

What else? Pharisees are heaven-shunners. Jesus says, "You do not go in yourselves." Oh, ye men that are seeking eternal life on, your own merits, you heaven-shunners, you do not get in-no, never. You do not enter the kingdom of God here in the practical form in which it comes to your door. You do not enter its spirit of pity and mercy and love. How can you expect to enter it in its glory phase up yonder?

Now comes the very climax of it, as to what is the moral effect of Pharisaism. If that way of seeking eternal life through a man's own personal justification is based upon three false conceptions, to wit: of law, of sin and of the human will; if it be contrary to express declarations of the Scripture; if it run athwart universal human experience, and if it makes Pharisees such as have been described, now what is the moral effect on other people? That is the part that I want to speak to you of in the climax.

First, "Ye are tombs which appear not, and men walk over them and know it not." If a man under the Levitical law touched death, it defiled him. Therefore, when anybody died the dead body had to be put in an isolated place, a sepulchre, and a mark put upon it, "This is the realm of death. Whoever touches death is defiled."

Hence there could not be a more hurtful means of disseminating defilement than to have a tomb that did not show, and men walking over it and did not know it; coming in touch with it, because there was nothing to tell that it was there.

What is the principle involved here? If some workmen under a city contract go to digging up the streets and digging down to the sewer, and when night comes are usable to close the pit they have digged, and the stranger comes along, as the has a right on the public highway, and falls into the pit that does not appear, no piece of timber put across, no warning red light to say, "Don't come here, here is danger," nothing of that kind-it is a criminal offense. It is a criminal offense to leave near a road an old well that is uncovered, lest unthoughtedly, not knowing it, a man should fall into it.

Now, the Pharisee is a tomb which does not appear, a death trap that has no mark to designate it, and every day, and every hour of every day, thoughtless thousands are coming along and falling into that trap where no sign, has been put, "He who comes here dies." That is the character of Pharisaism. That is the character of it even if an infidel speaks it, who superciliously says, "You church people are saved by somebody else. I stand on my own record." And the little boy does not see the death that is there, and he walks into it without knowing it. Just as far as that influence goes it is death, and it indicated no warning.

What else? A Pharisee is an oppressor of men. "You put heavy burdens on men and you do not touch them with your little finger." There never yet has been placed on human conscience such a burden as the law and the traditional requirements by which a man shall be justified along that line. Why, you can just think of it and it will run you crazy as to its details. You are all the time apprehensive that you have forgotten something. The mind is on a stretch, a strain, lest perchance some little formality, some little external ceremony, has been omitted.

Look at the land where salvation by such forms is the dominant theology. Burdens! It comes to the laborer and stops not at one day in seven as a holy day, as God requires, but plucks nearly every day in the week from the privilege of honest toil and puts it in the calendar as a holiday. Burdens! It puts a burden on birth, on the cradle, on the barefooted boy, on the stripling going to school, on the young man when he marries, and the grave of his baby, when it dies; a burden that mortgages life after death and says, "You must pay me this and that, or that soul can never get out of purgatory." Burdens! Oh, who can live under them?

Behold a picture: An honest man, honestly striving after righteousness, striving to attain unto it, reaching up, after self-justification ¾ went to the city of Rome and thought to find a high degree of righteousness if he would only come to that famous marble stairway, and on each step, crawling up, stop and on naked knees recite a prayer, and go up another step and kneel down, and recite another strain of supplication, and half way up that man (Martin Luther) received a flash of light. The Word of God came down to him. What word? "The just shall live by faith." By faith, the salvation that we are talking about tonight, and he leaped to his feet. The whole world was bright

to him. Oh, that made salvation attainable and precious, and he became. the great apostle of salvation by grace through faith.

Let us look again. "Persecutors." "I sent the prophets to you and you persecuted them. I sent others and you killed them." Now I want to ask a question, and I do not care whether you have read just a hundred pages of history or a million pages. I want to ask you this question! (If you have read any history, you can answer it.)

Judging from the statements that are recorded upon the pages of history, what power has persecuted men most? It is the Pharisaical power. That power built the dungeons. That power invented the rack and the thumb-screw. That power will say, "Outwardly conform, Never mind about what you think. Never mind about your soul's individual sense of responsibility to God in secret. Just simply submit to be baptized and conform on the outside." And the fires of persecution have glowed and martyrs have died on account of Pharisaism all along down the ages.

What else? "Nation destroyers." On this generation shall come all the blood that was shed from righteous Abel down to Zachariah, that was slain between the porch and the altar. I have looked at that many a time and I could understand how upon the Jews, considering the nation as an individual that had its birth and youth and maturity and old age as a nation I could understand how, the sins committed in the early days of the nation would have to be atoned for somewhere, and how they would come on the last generation, but this goes back to Abel. That is the part of it that puzzled me. Abel was before the Jews. How then does it leap over that long period and get back to Abel? I will tell you. It is the responsibility of an idea. What were the two ideas that crossed swords at Abel's altar? The idea of self-righteousness as embodied in Cain and the idea of salvation by faith through the blood of the lamb in Abel. And there the believer in one way of getting to heaven persecuted the believer in the other way, and there self-righteousness struck its first murderous blow that has been perpetuated from that day until now.

Now the last point is the effect upon other people. It bars heaven. "You will not go in yourself and others that would go in, you hinder." Oh, how many times, in some great meeting where Jesus has been lifted up as the only hope of the world, somebody in the audience deep down in his heart has felt, "I am a sinner; I am a lost sinner," near the kingdom of God, close up to the line; but when he steps out of the house there comes a Pharisee and takes away the key of knowledge and hinders him from going in; comes with his scorn of salvation by Christ and plucks that man from the very threshold of eternal life and hurls him to the deepest depths of eternal death. Is it any light matter then that this view should be propagated among our children; anything which ministers to hypocrisy, to covetousness, to cruelty, to extortion; anything which ministers to oppression and not to helpfulness; anything which causes one to shun heaven; anything which makes a man an unmarked source of defilement, a hidden source of death, and that, too, right in the path where children walk, that right on the highway where men must go, there is death and no sign to tell that death is there, and then a destruction, that saps the foundation of the nation, that masses a great flood of future woe and holds it in reservation until a generation comes on whose unsheltered head it shall burst in one awful, overwhelming deluge? The sin, the awful sin of self-righteousness, whether held by the men outside of the church or in it, is the sin of this world. And that is why Saul was the chief of sinners. He was the embodiment of self-righteousness. He hated Jesus. He persecuted that way unto the death and it made him the chief of sinners. So I have presented this

subject to you, and I think there will be no harm in my telling you about an impression made on my mind this morning. Just at the close of the sermon, when my own soul, with every finger of it, was touching salvation by grace, salvation by Christ, I sat down there. The choir sang that old-time hymn with that old-time tune, that I heard when I was a little child, and it melted me down. I never thought about its being any fine display of singing. I didn't think of the choir, but their song made me think of Jesus and heaven and precious grace. I would to God we had more of those songs that touch the soul.

Away back yonder some of you sitting here used to be in meetings, where ministers preached the gospel and not philosophy. They held, up Jesus as the only way of life for sinners, lost sinners, and somehow, old-fashioned as they may have been, homespun backwoodsmen, there was something in the power of those services to touch the heart, to break down the barriers of fictitious distinctions between classes, and bring all together as brothers and sisters, until tears flowed down their faces and they would take each other by the hand and bless God for the power of grace. And that old-time religion is good enough for me. I do not ever want any other. I would not give a snap of my finger for another kind. I have tried this right in the presence of death and it is very sweet.

O Waco church, when I came here this morning, while I was sorry for you on account of your having as worthless a pastor as you have, I rejoiced that I had such a church. But I do want to see you have one more old-time meeting, a meeting when salvation will come from God, grace, all of it grace, and men under the power of it shall feel and acknowledge that they are lost sinners. I want to see that come. I hunger for it. I thirst for it. My soul stretches out its hands in supplication to God that one more time before I pass away I may see this house full of the glory of God, and I know that it won't fill that way with anything but that old-time religion and preaching. So I have celebrated this anniversary.

Fifty-three years old today, and I have been very happy all day long, and I do testify here that if I never see another birthday, that the thing that has made me happy today is my personal and conscious touch with the power of the Christian religion. That is what it is. As Brother Cole, my old friend said, "I would not give fifteen minutes of its joys for the world."

Sinner, what shall you do to inherit eternal life? Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you shall have eternal life. God help you to hold out the hand of faith and receive the gift of God, which is eternal life.

# S. WHEREFORE THEN THE LAW?

WHEREFORE THEN THE LAW?

TEXT: Wherefore then the law? - Galatians 3:19. The "wherefore" is based upon the preceding statement that the covenant of grace antedated the law by 430 years; and another statement that no man can be justified by the law; and another statement that ye are not under the law but under grace; and yet another statement that you received the Spirit through faith and not the words of the law. Hence the pertinence of the question, "Wherefore then the law?" What purpose did the law serve?

Try to get, first of all, a scene before your minds. The Arabian Peninsula has about 22,500 square miles. It is a triangle. The Southern part of the triangle is a high table. land, 4,000 feet above the sea, and the mountains tower 2,500 feet still higher. Now, in that triangle of the Arabian Peninsula, there is a place perfectly level, two miles long and half a mile wide. On three sides of it this level place is enclosed by a mountain, rising somewhat abruptly, and at the far end of it, a solitary, tremendous peak uplifts itself 6,500 feet above the sea. That was the scene of the giving of the law. On that level place, two miles long and half a mile wide, the millions of Israel were gathered. On that mountain peak at the end of this plain, the cloud and pillar of fire settled to indicate God’s presence there. God on the mountain, Israel on the plain ¾ and that mountain has always been an historic one. There Moses was prepared for the ministry of the leadership of Israel for forty years and in its neighborhood the next forty years of his life were spent. There Elijah came after he was driven away by the threats of Jezebel, and, like Moses, fasted forty days and nights. And there, I believe, our Savior fasted forty days and nights in His preparation for His work. And certainly there the Apostle Paul spent three years of his life in preparation for his work. The Crusader and the Saracen fought around the foot of the mountain. Mistaken piety erected convents on that mountain, and there, not a great while ago, was discovered an ancient manuscript of the Bible, in that old convent on the mountain. Such the scene and such the history of the mountain. The time when that law was announced I can give you a date that you will have no trouble recalling 1491 years before Christ, God gave that law on Mount Sinai; 1491 years after Christ, Columbus discovered America. Thirty-four centuries ago, what we call the law was given-the law concerning which the question is asked, "Wherefore then the law?" Why was it given? The people of Israel had been wandering from the time of the faith of Abraham unto the time of this giving of the law, 430 years, and now being delivered from Egyptian bondage, and having been trained in hunger and thirst, and sickness and war, and being made to feel that in any of these trials God was sufficient, He now, while great clouds gather over the top of this mountain, mighty thunderings are heard, and the blackness is gored by the vivid flashes of lightning, in a voice that every man could hear distinctly, the most penetrating voice that ever fell upon human ear, made an overture to the people, and that overture was this: "Will you enter into a covenant of life with God? God will announce, so that you can hear every word He says, just what you will do on your part to carry out this covenant, and He will announce on His part what He will do to carry out this covenant. Now, will you do it?" And the people said that they would. The overture was accepted.

Then He said, "Take three days to prepare. Let every one wash his body and wash his clothes, and come clean before God; and do not come until you hear the sound of the trumpet. No earthly lips will blow it, but the sound can not be mistaken. It will be the sound of a trumpet, and when you hear that trumpet, come up and stand before that mountain, and God will come down on the mountain; but don't touch it, and don't let a beast touch it. You won't see any similitude of God. You will see evidences that He is there, and every one of you will hear what He says." And so on the third day the people came, as prescribed, and when the mountain began to stagger like a drunken man, when it began to shake and tremble, when the blackest clouds covered it from summit to base, when the thunder reverberated through all that peninsula, suddenly, clearer than the thunder, rang out on the air the unearthly sound of a trumpet, and the record says it waxed louder and louder. There will be no other trumpetsound like that until the archangel blows the trumpet and wakes the dead. And from out that cloud came a voice, and that voice pronounced ten words-the Ten Commandments, we call them. He announced, one after another, the ten words of the law, and the people became more terrified at the voice than at the trumpet, and Moses himself said, "I do exceedingly quake and tremble." And the people said, "Don't let us hear that voice any more. You go and commune with God and hear what He says, and you come and tell us." And so Moses sent the people back and he went up and communed with God. God told him the ten words and then God took two pieces of granite, about 27 inches long by 18 inches wide, perfectly smooth, and on them, with His own finger, He wrote in the Hebrew language the ten words. But in the meantime Moses had written them. It was Moses' copy that the people had. God's copy was for an entirely different purpose.

Moses wrote the Ten Commandments and then wrote all of the elaborations of the Ten Commandments that God announced to him during forty days, the Ten Commandments being the constitution, the elaborations being the statutes evolved from the ten, harmonious with the ten, and all of the enactments in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy (and there are hundreds of them) are but statutes derived from the constitutional law, the Ten Commandments.

Moses wrote the first constitution, the ten sections; then he wrote what he called the judgments-that is, the judgments derived from interpreting the Ten Commandments ¾ and on a day appointed, the people again came before God; and Moses read from his copy (not from God's copy) both the constitution and the statutes, and an altar was erected, and sacrifices were slain, and the blood of the victims was sprinkled first upon the altar, and then upon the Book of the Covenant, and then upon the people; and by this solemn religious ceremony the covenant of life records upon the part of the people with God was ratified. This covenant they shall keep - every one of the ten words - and all of the subsidiary legislation growing out of the ten words. They agreed that if they violated any one precept, the covenant was broken. They admitted the solidarity of the law, that he that is guilty in one point is guilty in all. It was only necessary to put in the evidence that he had failed at one point, that just one link of the chain was broken, and he must die. The law is spiritual. The commandment is exceedingly broad. It relates not merely to the overt act. It takes cognizance of the heart, of its desires. Thou shalt not covet thou shalt not desire ¾ thy neighbor's goods, anything that thy neighbor has. Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not hate with the malice to kill; whosoever hateth is a murderer. The law is spiritual. When that covenant was read and blood was sprinkled upon the Book and upon the people and upon the altar, all the parties to it were bound. God is bound by the blood on the altar. The people are bound by the blood sprinkled

on themselves, and Moses tells them plainly, "They that do these things shall live by them. Whosoever faileth to do any one of them shall die. I call heaven and earth to witness that in this Book of the Covenant I have set before you life and death. To obey is life. To disobey is death." The capital thought, the governing thought in the whole matter, is that the Ten Commandments constituted a covenant, a covenant of mutual obligation, and that it was a covenant of life and death. It was solemn engagement, ratified by blood, and the people said, "We will do this and we invoke on our heads the penalty of not doing it, and we take the oath of the covenant, made sacred by the witnessing of blood, that we deserve, and upon us and our children may come, all the recompense of reward in the way of penalty, if we do not comply with every jot and tittle of this law."

Well, what then did God's copy amount to? He wrote His, as I told you, on tables of stone. The people broke the covenant, and the covenant being broken, Moses broke the copy, which was a witness, and then Moses came and pleaded: "If thou wilt, forgive these people-if not, blot my name out of thy book." He meant everything that he said. He did not mean, "Kill my body." He did mean, "Exclude me from the land of Canaan." He meant all that is involved in the word death, and banishment from God. He was the type of the Redeemer, in that he offered to die for his people.

God forgave the people that breach of the covenant, and the covenant was renewed and God wrote another copy. Moses wrote a copy for use among the people, but God wrote a copy for A witness. The Ten Commandments that God wrote were deposited in the Ark of the Covenant. They were not read by the people. They were in God's handwriting. They were the witnesses of the compact. And when the nation ultimately and permanently violated the covenant, then there went away God's copy, and no man knows what became of it, and it is utterly immaterial. It would serve no purpose if we had it. We have Moses' copy. God's copy was a witness of the compact, and the compact being broken, broken is the tablet of the witness.

Now comes up this question of our text. Before this law was given was there not a way of life, through mercy, held out to the people? Yes, 430 years before. And was not that way of life to be through faith? Yes. Wherefore then the law? Why was that law enacted? Why were the people permitted to go into that covenant? God knew they would not keep it. God knew that on account of the weakness of the flesh they could not keep it. You could not now. Only one man ever did, and that is the man Jesus Christ. Wherefore then the law?

Now I ask your patient attention to the following thought: When we say the law, we mean that law as then promulgated and written. Why promulgated and reduced to writing? That is what that meant. But the promulgation of these ten words, and the writing of them by Moses and the writing of them by God himself, did not create the obligations they imposed. The obligation of that law did not commence with its announcement and was not dependent upon the people's knowledge of it for validity.

Law is law, not because it is put in the form of a statute, but it is put in the form of a statute because it is law.

Law is not law because you know it, but you should know it because it is law. The intent in the mind of the Creator when He brings a being into existence, is the law, at the last analysis, that governs. Whether it shall afterwards be expressed in a statute depends, but when it is so

expressed and so published, that expression and that publication do not originate obligation. Obligation arises from the nature of the being and his relation to God. So then, the question I ask, "Wherefore then the law?" means, "Wherefore the written law?" Not law per se, not law as embodied in the mind of God, but wherefore put that law in writing, and announce it, and make it known to the people? What is the object of that? The intent of the Creator when He makes a being, is the law of that being, whether that being knows anything about the law or not, and if that being is one who propagates his species, then that intent, as the primal law, is binding upon that posterity to the remotest generation, and that posterity is under that law, entirely regardless of environment.

Environment may be favorable or unfavorable. If it be favorable, nothing is added to the commandment; if it be unfavorable, nothing is taken from the commandment. It is a fixed quantity, being the intent of God when He made man. If some of that posterity, through an ancestor, however remote, has inherited certain vicious propensities and tendencies to evil, that does not modify the law an atom. Over that child, inheriting from an ancestry a predisposition to evil, weak through the flesh, the law of God, in its unclouded serenity, shines just as bright as it does over an angel in heaven. No jot of it, no tittle of it, at any time, or under any circumstances, upon any descendant of the original man, is for one moment mitigated.

Now, as man has fallen, as his posterity are weak through the flesh, as now they cannot keep that law, wherefore write it out, accompanying its promulgation with thunder and lightning and trumpet and voice? Why ratify it solemnly with blood?

Well, the answer is that the object is to bring out in a written code, clearly expressed, the original intent of the Creator in making man. That written code was added because of transgression. Now what does that mean? It was added because of the transgression. It was added to discover the transgressor. Paul said, "I had not known sin except by the law," i.e., when that law said, "Thou shalt not covet," and he had that in writing, as he had that statute of God before him, why that revealed to him how much he had been transgressing. The law was added then because of transgression ¾ that is, with a view to disclose transgression.

Here were the fallen descendants of a fallen ancestor, continually crossing the path of rectitude, now to the right hand, now to the left hand, not knowing they were in sin; and their knowledge did not affect the question of sin, not knowing that they were continually going against the law. The law now was added in order that these transgressions might be made manifest; as if men in the dark had been continually going out of the path, and light comes and shines down, revealing a straight and narrow path, revealing the pitfalls and quagmires to the right and to the left. The object of the law was to disclose, to make known, the sin of which the man had been guilty; not only to disclose it, but to disclose it as exceedingly sinful; that sin might be made to appear as sin-that it might be stripped of its disguises, that it might stand in its own naked reality and deformity and beastliness and ghastliness, as odious and abominable in the sight of God. A standard was brought and placed by the side of men to help them to walk and follow a light, and that straight rule would instantly reveal any deviation, as that plumb-line, let down from the top of the wall going up, would show whether that wall had been going up straight. It was judgment to the line and righteousness to the plummet. The object of the law was to bring out the inequality, the deviation, the irregularity, the sins of men, and make them appear to he sin.

Now, the real law was there all the time, but the man did not know it. Wherefore then serveth the law-that is, the written law, the promulgated law, the Sinaitic law? It was to show that all mankind had gone astray-that there was none that did good, no, not one. No man loved God with all his heart. No man loved his neighbor as himself. The shining of that light upon the lost world brought out the startling fact that among the descendants of Adam there was not one ¾ no, not one ¾ that could expect to be acquitted at the judgment bar of God on his own righteousness. Wherefore, says the Apostle, "The law was our school-master to bring us to Christ." How that? If a man who has no clear light, and has no conception of the broadness and spirituality of the commandment, whose standard of righteousness has been lowered to his own life; if that man is under the delusion that when he comes and stands before the judgment bar of God, he will be acquitted and not condemned, I am sure you can never induce him to look to a Savior; but if you can take that man and drag him to the mountain that smoked and was crested with fire and shaken with thunder, and if you can turn that mountain over on him, with its denunciations and penalities, if he can hear that trumpet and hear that voice, and see how exacting is law, how undeviating is law, how holy and just and good is law, then he will know that he is a lost soul in himself. He will know that. He says, "The case is already against me. It is already adjudicated. I am gone. Who will deliver me?" By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. On account of the weakness of the flesh, on account of a fallen nature, the mind cannot be in harmony with God. The carnal mind is enmity against Him and not subject to His law, and neither, indeed, can be. The revelation of the law is a revelation of death. "I was alive without the law once," said Paul; that is, "I did not know it, but when the commandment came sin was made apparent and I died. I saw myself a dead man, a lost man."

Prior to any looking toward Christ, must come the conviction that you are lost. Conviction of sickness precedes an appeal to a physician; conviction of death precedes an appeal to a Savior; conviction of bondage precedes appeal to a liberator. "Wherefore then serveth the law?" "The law is our schoolmaster unto Christ." It, by showing us the utter groundlessness of any hope of salvation in ourselves, our unworthiness, our fallen nature, our utter and hopeless condemnation, makes us see our ruin, when a voice says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Now, I come to a thought that you may not be willing to accept, but it is true. If, then, God knew man could not keep that law as a covenant of life, when a man becomes a Christian, is he under that law? The Apostle says, "Wherefore you are not under the law, but are under grace." Does that mean that when it says, "Thou shalt love God," I am not bound to do it? That when it says, "Thy shalt honor thy father and thy mother," I am not bound to do it? That when it says, "Thou shalt not kill," that I am under no obligation to restrain a murderous hand? No sir, it does not mean that. Well, what does it mean then?

It means that I am not under the law as a covenant of life. That is what it means. The writer to the Hebrews says that we are not come to that mountain, that smoke, that fire. We do not enter into an obligation that if we fail in any particular that we are lost. We are not under it as a covenant of life, but as a standard of righteousness we are under it, and if we go to hell we will be under it. In hell that law, that original intent in the mind of God, as to its oughtness will be just as when God first made man. But if we go to heaven, in heaven, brought there by grace, the oughtness of the Ten Commandments will be our standard of righteousness there.

There never will come a time when it will be right for us not to love God. There never will come a time when it will cease to be wrong for us to dishonor our parents. There never will be a time under any economy when it will be proper for us to covet anything that is our neighbor's.

Well, what follows then? Now, here is the thought that I said that you might not be willing to accept-that as the law was the schoolmaster unto Christ, so Christ is the schoolmaster under the law. I mean to say that Christ's work, all of it ¾ the obedience ¾ part of it, the dying-part, of it, the sacrificial part of it, the intercession, the whole of it, from His birth to His glorification is designed to bring us ultimately into a state of conformity, in heart, life and action, with that unchanging law; and He is a schoolmaster under that law.

How does that operate? You are not under the law as a covenant of life, but you are under the law to grace, and the first thing that grace does for you, of which you have any consciousness, is the work of the Holy Spirit upon your heart, convicting you of sinning against these very Ten Commandments. That is the first thing. Then when your nature, by regeneration is changed, what is the object of the change? It is to give you a disposition to keep the law, or the Ten Commandments, to love the Lord your God with all your heart and your neighbor as yourself. That is the object of it. That is the work of grace.

You do not by faith make void that law. It is the object of faith to bring you into conformity with the law. By your regeneration a new nature is given, a new life is implanted, and the outgoings of that life are longings after conformity to the law. You no longer say, "I hate God," but "Oh, how I love Him!" You no longer say, "I hate my neighbor," but "I love him. I am grieved that I do not love him more. I am grieved that I fall short in my duty to my neighbor." So Christ is the schoolmaster under the law. He is reversing the process now. You are doing it imperfectly. You are falling short in loving God and in loving your neighbor. You are falling short on every one of these Ten Commandments, but your mind, your inner man, is in harmony with Him. Your mind approves it. You wish you could do it. You want to do it. You try to do it.

Now comes in the next work of grace, and that is the work of sanctification. What does that work do? That makes a man love God more and more. That makes him love his neighbor more and more. That process continually goes on and on, until he comes to the last lesson of death, and then the soul goes into the presence of God. And what is the state of that soul in the presence of God? John says, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that had been slain for their testimony to Jesus." Paul says, "Thou art coming unto the spirits of the just made perfect." What is made perfect? Why, that soul up there loves God supremely. That soul keeps the Ten Commandments. When Christ was the schoolmaster under the law, the object of what He did was to bring that soul back into conformity to that law, and when that body sleeps and rots and moulds and decays and turns to dust, and ages elapse, and that voice of the trumpet is heard again, unlike anything else on earth, and those dead people wake up, they wake up in what condition? They were sown in weakness. The law could not be performed on account of the weakness of the flesh. They were sown in weakness. They were raised in power. They were sown in dishonor. They were raised in honor. They were sown in corruption. They were raised in incorruption. They were sown mortal. They were raised immortal. And now that body like that spirit is in complete conformity with the law.

Sinai may thunder on the portals of hell; it may frown in clouds of ominous blackness, and growl in thunder and glare in lightning; but the raised body, reunited to the soul, can come up in front of it and say, "O Sinai, I am in perfect accord with every requirement you make."

I say that the object of Christ's death is that you may escape the penalty of the law broken, but not intending to turn criminals loose; not intending to snatch murderers and liars and adulterers from the jaws of death and let them remain liars and thieves and murderers, to the great confusion of the universe, but to remake them, that they may be, not murderers, not liars, not thieves, but pure and holy men. That is what Christ does.

Now you see the truth of what I said, that the law is the intent in the mind of the Creator when He made the man; that the subsequent expression of that intent in a statute did not originate obligation, but that it was subsequently expressed in a statute to bring out lack of conformity, to make it appear that conformity had not been, and to drive the nonconformist to a Redeemer, and then, through the power of that Redeemer, working through the Holy Spirit, to refit him inside and out, until he is at last in full co-operation with every requirement of that law. So faith does not make void the law. It conforms to it, and the law is not against the promises, and the promises are not against the law. And I will tell you that you deceive yourself with an antinomian delusion if you think that because Christ was made the curse of the law for you, that therefore you can go on and love sin. If that work has been efficacious in you, you have now a mind that hates sin. You have a mind that loves God. You have a mind that wants to do right.

I tell you, brethren, you could not do any better than to go and get that old Presbyterian catechism on the Ten Commandments and study it and teach it to every one of your children. I tell you those Ten Commandments constitute the standard of righteousness in heaven, and they will remain the standard of righteousness over the lowest hell. There never, never will be a time when any of those ten words will lose any of their obligatory force. That is why, all over this earth, rulers and statesmen lift their hats when they go to Matthew Sinai, when they look at those Ten Commandments, as the sublimest expression of the principles of law the human ear ever heard, the human eye ever saw, the human heart ever conceived of. It is true that you are not under the law in the covenant of life. It is true that the law as a standard of righteousness never changes. It is true that the object of grace is to make you square with that standard ultimately. It will put you there. But there is the sin of unbelief. There is the justification of hell, that men are not able to keep the law, and their inability not disproving its righteousness, for it is holy and just and good, and it cannot be lowered, not an atom, not a jot, not a tittle.

Law is law, and those men that cannot keep it, and with an unrenewed nature turn away from Christ, who removed the curse of that law through His death on the cross, and who by the Spirit renews the fallen nature, giving a love for God and man, and by santification perfects the love for God and man, they, by unbelief in Jesus Christ, have earned and richly deserve and certainly will receive the eternity of hell. That man is a rank anarchist, that man is an advocate of confusion, for social rottenness and world destruction, that says, "I do not need Christ. I do not need my nature renewed. I need no atoning blood. I need no Holy Spirit to regenerate and sanctify." And all his life he walks high-stepping through the world, and he says, "I believe in law. I believe in a man's bearing the penalty of wrong doing, and I stand on my record."

Well, let him stand on it, and if that law does not show him to be exceedingly sinful, if it does not show that he has broken every one of the Ten Commandments, if it does not show that he has broken them in spirit and in letter, if it does not show that he has broken them in all of his life, if it does not show that he has broken them in nature and in practice, then there is no such thing as the manifesting power of light. And God could not ¾ I speak reverently of Omnipotence God could not save a man and leave him a bad man.

He could not pardon a man and turn a criminal loose on society, on the universe. If he saves him, He must save him by works of grace, bringing him back into perfect correspondence with every requirement of the law of God.

Ever since my mother took my childish hands and held them while I knelt at her knee and repeated those ten words, "Thou shall have no other God before me; thou shalt make no graven image to fall down and worship it; thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; honor thy father and thy mother; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbor's," from the day that my mother taught me those ten words they have been to me as the one unvarying standard of real righteousness, and all that Christ has done for me so far has been in the direction of bringing me into conformity to it. When His work is ended and my soul is sanctified, being now regenerated; when it is made perfect, and when my body is raised from the dead, and sanctified soul and body I stand before God, then I will love God with all my heart, and I will love my neighbor as myself, and the commandments of God will show clear through, ten thousand times more powerful than an X-ray, and find nothing in me at variance with its requirements. That is my answer to the question, "Wherefore then the law?" Let us pray.

# S. Winning Christ

WINNING CHRIST TEXT: That I may win Christ. Php 3:8, last clause. There are here today preachers who have been in the ministry a long time, and white-headed deacons who for a third of a century, perhaps, have held that office, and old men and women who for many years have been devoted followers of Jesus. But in all of this congregation I do not see one in whom this text is fulfilled, “That I may win Christ.” Not a man of you, not a woman of you, no matter what may be your spiritual attainments, can lay your hands on the heart and say in the sense of this Scripture, “I have won Christ.” And yet the winning of Christ is presented as an object of such great desirability that all of the things in this world estimated highly among men, when put in an opposite scale, are counted but as fine dust in the balances when compared to it. I do not mean to affirm, nor do you understand me to say that nobody here is a child of God. I do not mean to say that you have not found Christ as a Saviour, but I do mean to say that you have not won Christ in the sense of this text. I want to speak therefore to Christian people about winning Christ. If there - be any in this house today without a reasonable hope of salvation in Christ, my sermon cannot be anything to you unless by awful contrast it may suggest your condition and excite alarm concerning your distance from God. In order to get, the thought of this text before you I want to explain quite briefly, but I trust clearly, some of the passages of Scripture read to you in the introductory service, commencing with the thirteenth chapter of the first letter to the Corinthians, where the expression is used after this fashion: “We see through a glass darkly now, but then face to face. Now we know in part but then we shall know even as we are known.” Here the word “darkly” is an attempt to translate three Greek words, and none of them is an adverb. Literally it means “in an enigma,” for the word “enigma” is an anglicized Greek word. In an enigma; that is, “We see through a glass in an enigma.” What then is meant by “seeing through a glass”? It means a mirror, the word “glass” being not a correct rendering. We see through a mirror; that is, by means of a reflector. The mirrors in use in Paul’s time reflected but dimly the object before them. They were only polished metal. The thought of modern application is, We see not the real thing, but a dim reflection of it, a mere shadow. The modern photograph is a permanent shadow. Suppose I held before an orphan who had never known her mother a photograph of that parent and said, “Little girl, behold your mother,” and after a tearful contemplation of it, she should reply: “Now I see my mother by means of a shadow, but in heaven I shall see her face to face, she would express the meaning of this text. All the difference between a dim shadow and the reality is the thought presented. We know in part. Our knowledge of heaven is very imperfect, because so unreal. Again, the thought may be expressed: Now we know the truth about heaven as reflected in an obscure speech. That would make good English and would fairly convey the meaning of this Scripture. Now we behold the truth about what shall be, not face to face, not in a realizing sense, not as being in touch with it, but we know it is as imperfectly reflected in an obscure verbal description. I stand before you and I try to give you an idea of heaven, of Christ, of the world to come, and all I can do is to make a dim shadow. You look at that. It is a shadow in speech, in an enigma, not a reality, and you do not get the fulness of it, and the reality of it; but I say to you that then,, at the time referred to in the text, you shall see it itself, face to face. Consider attentively Paul’s illustration. He says, “When I was a

child, I thought as a child, I reasoned as a child, but when I became a man, I put away childish things." Or "Now we know in part." Who can make a child understand what life is at fifty years of age? The child listens to you, hears you as a child, thinks about it as a child, reasons about it as a child, but there is no realization. Children have only the vaguest idea concerning the realities of life in this world. So the most advanced Christian in the world, the one who has experienced the deepest joys and revelations from heaven, knows no more about heaven in its actuality and cannot understand any more about it than a five-year-old child can be made to understand the maturity of womanhood and manhood or the cares and joys and sorrows and responsibilities of adult life. But one other word needs exposition. Now we know in part, in a riddle, in an enigma; then we shall know even as we are known. The idea can be best conveyed by putting it in the past tense: "Then I shall know even as I was known, or as I have been known." What does that mean? When I get to heaven, when I attain to the full felicity of that heavenly state, I shall then know, even as I was known. Known by whom? Let us so see that as never to forget it. Suppose we stand on a mountain-side where marble is being quarried, and a huge piece of this marble is put on a float. There is no realization on the part of this marble as to what it shall be. It is jagged on the edges, of unequal thickness, utterly unpolished. But somebody knows. There is one who knows. In his studio yonder is a sculptor. He selected that piece of marble and in his mind he saw in it the statue of an angel. From the beginning he saw it. It was all just as clear to him in the beginning as it was in the end. It is brought into that studio and work commences on it. At first, there seems to be no particular design in the work. There is a striking off here and there and shaping and chiseling and the hammer is still being used. But after a while there stands out a statue, leaning forward as if listening, as if about to speak, and as if breathing, with wings half-poised, as if about to fly. And as it thus stands, so it was in the beginning known on the part of the artist. Paul says, "I do not know, except in part, what I am going to be up yonder. I see a dim shadow of it conveyed in the revelations that are made to me. I do not know but in part, but then I shall know even as I was known." Was known by whom? By the One who commenced the work of redemption in that soul. And "known unto God are all His works," from the beginning. His knowledge when in eternity he was elected, is just as perfect as when after the resurrection the salvation is consummated, which was known then unto Him. In the second Scripture read, the thought is exactly the same. Paul, looking forward to that consummation, what he shall be, says, I have not attained to it. I am not perfect. Brethren, I do not count myself to have laid hold of the things for which Christ laid hold on me. When yonder at Damascus He laid hold on me He had a purpose. He knew what I would be in glory. He knew of my transition from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God. He knew of the conquest of the spirit over the flesh. He knew of the glory that should come to my beautiful spirit when it was released from the frail tabernacle of clay. He knew the power of the resurrection that should transform the body of my humiliation into the similitude of His own glorious. body. He knew it all when He laid hands on me, when He apprehended me. I, don't know it all yet. I count myself to not know it. I know some of it. I see through a glass darkly,, imperfectly, as a shadow conveys the idea of reality that forecasts it. I get some ideas about it, but not yet, not yet do I know as I was known." Now, is that thought clear to you? We shall know ultimately as we were known, as God knew us when He called us. Take a member of this congregation. Take him before the Holy Spirit had convinced him of his sins, while he is still the servant of sin, while oaths are falling from blasphemous lips. Take him when his mind is beclouded with dissipation, when his habits are habits of vice. Oh, how fallen a man! But God knew him then. God in eternity had

elected him. God knew him as he will be at the Judgment Day, in all the brightness and perfection of a complete salvation. There comes a time when thoughtfulness comes over him, when the penitential tear courses down his cheek, when in the midnight hour anguish pierces his heart, when he bemoans himself, as he thinks of blighted life and opportunities lost and manhood degraded. We see him when in the midnight hour anguish pierces him, and then after accepting Christ he says, “Oh, how sweet to sit at Jesus’ feet! I have a foretaste of heaven.” But he does not know. He knows only in part. He knows like a child would know the mother by looking at the photograph. But I tell you the time shall come when he shall know as he is known; when he shall know face to face. But what does “face to face” mean? Let us see if we cannot grasp it. A child sees me digging a deep hole in the ground. “What are you doing?” “I am going to put a tree here.” “What kind of a tree?” “An apple tree.” He sees me putting that shrub into the ground and he says, “I see no apples on it.” “No, there are no apples yet, but there shall be apples if God wills, on this tree.” “Tell me about an apple; what is it?” And I get him a book and show him a picture of an apple. “There, you see that picture?” “Will there be things like that on that tree?” “Yes.” And I begin to tell him about how it comes. At first a blossom, then a little green ball on the end of a twig, and how it swells, and how at last it matures, and gathers color to itself from the sunlight, and gathers mellowness and aroma. And then I tell about the sweetness of it to the taste. “Do you know?” “Well, I know in an enigma. I know in a riddle. I know in a word picture.” “I tell you if you live long enough you shall know face to face.” So one day I take the child into that same garden, when that tree is mature and full of fruit, every bough bending down, laden with its joyous fruit, and I select the richest, ripest apple on it, and hold it right to his face. “Face to face.” “Now taste it.” He puts it to his mouth and bites it and tastes it. That is face to face. That is realization. That is experience. Now, let me carry this thought on by showing you that the same thing is in the mind of Paul in the second Scripture. He tells about the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ. I heard a man preach about that once and he said that the excellency there referred to was reading the Bible and getting into your head a knowledge of the plan of salvation in Christ. Why, the Devil knows that much, and there is no excellency in it to him. The word “know” in the Bible frequently means more than information. It is employed oftentimes in the Bible to express approbation, and then it has a deeper meaning than that; it means realization, personal realization. When Paul here speaks of the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, as precious as the knowledge of conversion was, he is not talking about that; as precious as the knowledge of Jesus Christ was in justification, he is not talking about that. He is already a justified man, and yet says, “That I may know Him, that I may win Him,” the. excellency of a knowledge of the future, the excellency of a knowledge not yet attained, a knowledge face to face, a knowledge of realization, that is the knowledge he is talking about. He says not, “I counted all things but loss,” but, “I do now count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, that I may know Him, that I may win Christ.” What does it mean then to win Christ I What does it mean to know Christ in the sense of this text? You ask that child eating the apple what it is to know the apple now. He has knowledge that he could not get from a book nor from a picture, the knowledge, the realization by personal contact. Let us expound somewhat our third Scripture. John says, “Beloved we are the children of God now, and it doth not appear what we shall be.” That doesn’t appear yet, “but we know that when he is made manifest we shall be like him.” Like Him. Look at that ancient prophet, that sweet singer of Israel, and let me prove to you that there was a knowledge to which he had not yet attained, that there was a part of salvation that he had not known. We find him restless. We find him dissatisfied. Ask

him, “David, were you ever converted?” “Yes, God created in me a new heart.” “After your conversion and you had lapsed into sin, did you ever know the joy of salvation to be restored to you?” “Yes, I know all about that.” “So, then, for yourself by faith you have taken hold of the salvation of God?” “Yes.” “And you have had this salvation confirmed to you by the restoration of the joys after you had lapsed into sin?” “Yes.” “Are you happy all the time?” “No.” “Got everything you want?” “No.” “Why, what is the matter?” “I shall be happy when I wake in thy likeness. I shall be satisfied when I awake in the likeness of my Lord.” He had not yet attained that. “We are the children of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him.” “I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness.” Now, we come back to that knowledge of God. Paul says, “That I may know him.” What do you mean by knowing HIM? “That I may know Him and the power of His resurrection. If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead. I count not myself to have attained it. I have not that knowledge yet. I am here in the body that can be sick and full of pain, and that through its sickness will depress my mind. I am here in a land, cloud-covered and stormtossed, and I cannot be satisfied. I only know in part. I know in photographs. Oh, that I might know Him face to face! Oh, that I might realize in the fulfilment in my own body the power of the resurrection!” Now we see the meaning of our text. I have tried to lead up to the thought. I look over your faces today and I know that there is not a satisfied one in the house. I know you have not reached a stopping place. I know that you have not yet attained to a state where you can say, “Here is home.” You are all pilgrims. You are all strangers and sojourners. You are all seekers, seeking for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God. This is the precious thought of our text. Let us look at it in all of its context and see: “Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ. For our conversation is in heaven; from whence we also look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue even all things unto himself.” This is to win Christ and having thus opened the subject, let us attend to the application. What that is I say you do not know. I do not mean to say you have no ideas about it. The Bible gives us many. But I mean to say that all the knowledge we have of it is very imperfect, and it is not realization-knowledge. We are looking at a photograph of it. We are looking at it in an enigma. We are looking at it as imperfectly reflected in obscure speech that cannot convey the fulness and the sweetness of the thing itself. This estate of the resurrection of the dead, which is called the knowing of Jesus Christ, which is called the winning of Christ, “That I may win Christ and be found in him,” which is called the “‘face-to-face” knowledge, that is the most desirable thing in all this world. Do you desire it? What will you put by the side of it? To what will you liken it? What thing of value can you compare to it? To be conformed to the likeness of Jesus Christ, to win Him, to be found in Him, to feel in yourself that all susceptibility of pain is gone, all weakness gone, all corruptness gone, to be swallowed up in immortality, to have the power to move as swift as thought and outspeeding the lightning. No sin, no sorrow, no pain, no death, and to be thrilled through and through with the joy of personal likeness to the Son of God, and to know it as a child knows when he eats the apple, to know it by experience, and to look back from that height of bliss, to look back from that unperishable and unfading inheritance down to the struggling cloud-covered shores of time and say, “I was yonder and groping my way, and knew so little and caught hold of things so imperfectly. Now I know face

to face." Ah! how attractive, how magnetic, how drawing is that consummation! For it I am willing to turn around to the world, rich with its honors, and its gifts and its pleasures and say, "Vain world, farewell. This is not my world. That is better. I am drawn yonder, yonder! I count all things but loss for the excellency of knowing Christ, winning Christ, being found in Christ, knowing Him face to face." But let us make the application much more searching. Does one lie down and fold his hands and so glide into that state? Are you passive? I tell you, "No." To get into that state is service, is activity, is sacrifice, is striving. How do you prove it! I prove it by those Scriptures that I read to you: "Work out your salvation. For it is God that worketh in you to will and to do of his own good pleasure." "Add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance and to temperance patience, and to patience Godliness, and to Godliness brotherly kindness." "Make your calling and election sure." "Walk worthy of the vocation with which you are called." "I press forward to the mark for the prize of the high calling of God." He called me unto eternal life. He called me through His word. He called me through His providence. He called me through His Spirit. He called me by the example of Christians. He called me by the light of the church. He called me upward and I heard Him. "Now walk worthy of your vocation, your calling." That is what John L. Dagg meant when he said that the only infallible proof that a man is a Christian is perseverance in holiness. That is the only infallible proof. I tell you that only those who over-came, only those who held out faithfully to the end, only those who persevered, were ever God's children. Just as the upper side of conversion (and I mean by conversion in that use of the word, "conviction," "repentance" and "faith") is regeneration, so the upper side of perseverance is sanctification. Now, in conclusion, let us see what we do. Go back to the text. I do not want you to leave it. Let us see what we do: "I follow after." That is one way. "I pursue, for that I may lay hold of Jesus Christ." This one thing I do. Now the Greek of all that is just this "One thing." The rest is supplied. "One thing." What is the one thing? "Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press forward to the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." What is the picture here? There is a prize, and there is somebody reaching forth and pressing forward. What then is the picture? Why, you know it is the picture of the Grecian race. See the goal yonder. That is what the word "mark" means-goal. There is the prize, and here is a man running to that goal for that prize. What did he say? "I forget the ground I have gone over. I forget the exercise that was necessary to attain thus far. I do not stop to glory in the sacrifices that were made to bring me to this point. I forget all of that. One thing, one thing only, Forward! Forward!" And you see the runner. He is leaning forward, his attitude is that of one who anticipates, who reaches out after that which is ahead. Now my question: Is that a state of activity? Is that a state of work? Is that a state of motion? Answer the question for yourself. And I do say that when a man relies upon mere lifeless, unsacrificing orthodoxy, he is as dead as the seven sleepers. There is not one promise in God's Word that shines on his estate. There is not one rational hope to which he can look and say, "That tells me of heaven." Come we now to the climax of it. Listen at this, from the eighth chapter of the letter to the Romans: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. 'And not only they, but ourselves also, which

have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." I said that the sluggard could not lay his hand upon one rational hope-the hope that comes to the man now groaning; the hope that he shall see that for which creation travaileth; the hope of the liberty that comes to the children of God; the hope of the glory of the manifestation when their bodies are redeemed from the power of the grave at the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us return to one of the Scriptures read. I want to clinch the thought. I want to show you that one who does not persevere in holiness has no hope. Listen at it: "Beloved, we are now the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure." Every man that has that hope is moving on in sanctification. Every man that has a rational hope in the redemption of his body is crucifying himself, is turning from the world, is consecrating his life, is praying, "Nearer, my God to Thee, nearer to Thee." This hymn, then, expresses your condition. But if you are just resting on empty orthodoxy, then another hymn suits you better: "Mistaken souls who dream of heaven, when they are slaves to lust." Mistaken souls! Who of us can endure eternal burning? I say to you, brethren, that if the principle of the real life of Christianity be in us, it is an active principle that rejoices to honor God, that says to the blessed Redeemer, "Let me work. Let me labor. Let me suffer. Oh, let me be made conformable to the sufferings of our Lord, and have fellowship with His suffering cause! I know that these sufferings are not to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us in that day. I reckon that these light afflictions, which endure but for a moment, shall work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." This is my sermon to you. I determined to give you an individual view of the state after the resurrection. Next Sunday I want to give you the social view, I mean the church view-not the view of one man saved, one man rejoicing, one man happy, but the view of the bride of Christ, the view of the whole body of Christ, the view of the new Jerusalem, the view of Matthew Zion, the view of the whole company of the redeemed after the resurrection. As I look in the faces that I have seen; for many years in this congregation, one of the sweetest thoughts that comes to me is that I will know you yonder, not imperfect, but face to face, like that child who-said, "Show me my mother," but only a photograph could be shown. "little one, you shall see your mother, herself, face to face, in the glory world." There are sad hearts here today because loved ones have been taken away. You never more will see them in time. You only know the shadow of them, a dim picture. But, Christians, I tell you that the time will come when, on the blissful shore of everlasting deliverance, you shall meet and greet and rejoice in the company of those from whom you have been parted here, meet in Christ, found in Him. But we are here yet, and I want us to be faithful. I want us as a church not to be discouraged because sometimes we are misunderstood, not to be discouraged because so many needy objects appeal to us for help. In heaven you will be glad because there were so many; you will be glad that your hand helped so many; you will be glad that God multiplied the opportunities of glorifying Him in your pathway. But none will gladden your heart like this one, that God gave you opportunity to lead sinners to repentance-none like that. And I am sad, sad, that opportunities are so far apart. Oh, that He honored us more, that He counted us more faithful! Oh, that He thought us worthy every Sunday, to bless our prayers and our preaching in leading souls to Christ! Let us be ashamed. Let us prostrate ourselves in humiliation. Let us wrap ourselves in spiritual sackcloth and scatter spiritual

ashes on our heads and bemoan ourselves, that so long a time passes before this whole congregation leads a soul to Christ.

Chapter 110

# S.Judgment at the House of God

JUDGMENT AT THE HOUSE OF GOD

TEXT: For the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God: and if it begin first at us, what shall be the end of them that obey not the gospel of God? - 1 Peter 4:17. The history of Christianity is a marvelous history. There have been ebbs and flows of popular favor. At times it has become so attractive that men by violence have pressed into the church, if not into the kingdom. There have been times when its power was so recognized that all people who wished to get the benefit of power have tried by methods direct and indirect, to align themselves with it. This history shows that the greatest danger to the cause of Jesus Christ may arise from its popularity. There seems not to be half so much danger when the Gospel of Jesus Christ is not popular. The danger comes from people who would join the church without religion-who would join the church to use it as an instrument for accomplishing some secular or worldly purpose. On this account, as has been well said in a great sermon by Dr. Gordon, God has given to His cause a repulsive power as strong as its attractive power. If it did nothing but draw, then it would become corrupt through irreligious material brought into the church; but it has a repulsive force that drives those away who ought to be driven away. In John 6:1-71 we find our Savior deliberately stating certain doctrines in the harshest, strongest terms, and with a view to repelling people. He said to them that He was the bread that came down from heaven, and that unless a man would eat His flesh and drink His blood he could have no life in him; that He was the heavenly manna. And then He said: “None of you can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him.” At that time the crowds following Christ were immense. The gospel was drawing tremendously by its miracle-working force. Christ had been feeding thousands. They were following Him for the loaves and the fishes. He saw that this kind of following promised-no good to His cause, and so said, “No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him.” They said, “This is a hard saying: who can believe it?” Then the record adds, “From that time many of His disciples followed Him no more.” Now it was every way essential to the sure and permanent upbuilding of the cause of Christ that a certain following should be repelled. And what was that following? All who wanted to become open followers of Christ without regeneration. “No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him.” It was the doctrine preached to Nicodemus: “Except a man be born from above he cannot see the kingdom of God.” Strange as the doctrine may be, difficult to understand as Nicodemus found it, yet it stands before the door of the church like the cherubim with the flaming sword at the gate of Paradise, keeping the way to the Tree of Life, repelling any who would seek to attain eternal life except through the regenerating power of the Spirit of God. The lines of thought upon which I wish to speak today are these: God cares for His cause by a direct agency and a permissive agency. In the direct agency God Himself continually sifts His people as wheat, in order that the chaff may be separated from the wheat. And for the same reason God permits Satan to sift His people as wheat, in order that the chaff may be separated from the wheat. When God sifts, the design is benevolent; when Satan sifts, the purpose is malignant; but the end attained is the same. Now, let us see how this sifting process works as

conducted by these two agencies, one heavenly and the other from hell, one direct and the other permissive. When our Lord Jesus Christ sifted the crowds that followed Him after the miracle of the loaves and fishes, He had no evil end in view. He meant no harm at all, but only good. It was a sad thing to Him that when He came to save men, and great crowds would gather about Him, they would try to become His followers without entering in at the strait gate and walking over the narrow way that leads to life. He stood at the portals to sift that crowd. There has been no time in the history of the world when the necessity of preaching the same sifting doctrine was greater than it is today. The church of today needs to invoke all the repelling power of the cause of Christ, in order to shut out the unregenerate, those who are not at heart Christians, those who have never been drawn to Jesus Christ by the Father who sent Him, those who have never been really breathed upon by the Holy Spirit from on high. I say there never was a time in the history of the church of Christ when the necessity was greater than right now to insist upon this sifting process at the portals. Let us see how the same idea is manifested in the case of Simon Magus. Simon Magus could do a great many wonderful things. He himself knew that there was a large element of imposture in what he did, and when Philip came to Samaria to preach, it was not so much Philip's preaching that impressed Simon Magus as the wonderful things that Philip did, which were in the line of Simon Magus. He was himself a wonderworker and now here is another wonder-worker that surpasses him. He did not understand how Philip could do such marvelous things. He knew he could not do them. But never for one moment did he attribute this extraordinary power to the right source. He had been himself so much accustomed to practice deception upon the people in order to magnify himself before the community as some great one, he naturally supposed that Philip had found a way of trickery surpassing his own. It occurred to him in a moment that he ought to express his faith in Jesus Christ and be baptized. Jesus had said, "No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." Had the Father drawn Simon Magus? Was he really a-converted man? Was there a radical, internal, fundamental change in the man? He believed, and he was baptized upon that belief, but was his a gospel faith? Without some sifting process the church will be filled up with men like Simon, men who look at a proposition that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and reach an intellectual conviction that the claim is made good by the fact that certain miracles have been wrought. "I will accept that. I cannot account for it. I cannot explain it; but I concede the fact." When Peter and John came down to Samaria, they went a step beyond anything that Philip had done. Philip himself could work miracles, but Philip had no power of communicating this miracle-working capacity to others. Philip could not by laying on of his hands impart to others the same power to work miracles he himself possessed. But Peter and John did that very thing. They kneeled down and prayed for Philip's converts, and the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost came upon them. Now when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the holy ghost was communicated, he recognized its force, and he wanted to possess the power. He knew he did not have it. It was perfectly evident that these men had it, and he proposed to get it in a business way. All along it was business with this man. He thought that like everything else it could be bought, that it had its price and he also supposed that if he possessed it he could become immensely rich. This surpassed anything that he had ever known in the way of divination or witchcraft, or necromancy. And so he offered money: "I will pay whatever this costs. I suppose you have a world-wide patent right. I would like to get the patent right for a certain section of the country. I will pay you so much money for it." The proposition was a revelation. It revealed the internal attitude of Simon. It showed that the Father had never drawn

him. It showed that he had gotten into the church by a mere intellectual faith that bad not been wrought in him by the power of the Holy Ghost. Hence Peter said to him: “Thou and thy money perish together, because thou hast thought to purchase the gift of God with money. Thou hast no part nor lot in this matter.” There is the sifting, sifting at the portal, insisting that whoever is a member of the church should have a genuine part, a genuine lot, in this matter. But what was the trouble with Simon? “Thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Thou art in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity. Thy whole church connection is a fraud. There is nothing spiritual in it. Verily, verily I say unto you, except a man be born from above he cannot see the kingdom of God.” He cannot understand it. He cannot appreciate it. There is nothing in it palatable to him. The carnal mind is enmity against God and is not subject to His law, and with that mind unchanged, it is impossible to become a subject of Jesus Christ. You may whitewash, you may put on a thin veneer over the internal depravity and hide it from sight, but the dry rot is inside, the element of death is in the soul, and if a man be “in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity,”, there is no power in an ordinance to make him a child of Jesus Christ. We need now to stand right there with a sieve, and as representatives of Jesus Christ to sift the people as wheat, in order to separate the chaff from the wheat. Are you God’s child? Is your heart right in His sight? Are you “in the gall of bitterness?” Are you “in the bond of iniquity?” “No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him.” And it is time, as our text says, that “judgment should commence at the house of God.” Now let us see how it is that Satan sifts. Take the case of Peter. The case of Simon Magus shows how Jesus and His agents sift those who would become members of the church, but let us see how the devil sifts. The devil had looked at the group of apostles. There were twelve of them. One’ might have supposed that he would have contented himself with sifting the recent converts, or, at least, the unofficial members of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. But he had long been a student of human nature. He had a skepticism that had grown on him since the time he himself fell through pride, and his theory was that no man does anything except from selfish reasons; and while sometimes it is difficult to get at, yet if you can make a complete analysis you will be able to show that the best seeming men in the world are influenced in private and public life by self-interest. And he was not disposed to except any from the general classification because they were apostles. Just so he had his opinion about Job. He had walked around him. He had studied him. He arrived at a conclusion about him. And while Job seemed a good man, while he was very attentive to his religious duties, while he offered sacrifices for himself and for his children, the devil said, “Does Job serve God for naught? I would be a Christian myself if He would do me that way. Why, just look how the Lord has blessed him! Who has as many cattle as Job? Who has such healthy, stalwart sons, such beautiful, accomplished daughters? Who has such a reputation for sanctity? Who has such hoards of stored up wealth? God has built a hedge all around Job. The wind cannot blow on him. Enemies cannot get to him. Doth Job serve God for naught?” And with the very spirit that prompted him to sift Job, he proposes to sift the twelve apostles. He thinks that all of them are either hypocrites or deluded men. The devil knows that all men are not hypocrites, but he divides them into two classes, those who are hypocrites and those who are deluded. And he believed that if Jesus would let him do the sifting, that his sifting would be a fairer test than if Jesus did it; that Jesus would manifest too much love in the matter, too much tenderness. He would allow His great, warm, loving heart to be too partial. And so the devil comes up to Jesus and makes a request: “You say that you come to establish a kingdom here on the earth that is not to be of the world, but a spiritual kingdom, and you have selected the leaders. Here they are, these

twelve men, James and Andrew, Peter, John, Bartholomew, Judas and others, and with these twelve men you propose to establish a spiritual kingdom in this world that is not to be of the world. Now I request that you let me have the sifting of these twelve men." Jesus determined to grant his request, and He said to Satan, "You may sift them." But just as soon as Jesus gave the permission to Satan to sift them, He commenced praying for Peter: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." He knew there would be no mercy in the devil's test, that it would come from as deep a malignity as hatred could furnish, and that sorely tried would be each of these twelve men. It is somewhat remarkable that He prayed for Peter, but not for Judas. Why? Why this discrimination? It is said in the context that "Jesus knew from the beginning who believed on Him," who were at heart believers, and He knew Judas was not. Here was a man like Simon Magus. He had gotten into the external camp of God, but not into the spiritual camp. The Father had never drawn him. In order to the purity of the church there must be given to it a repelling power that will push off the Judases and the Simon Maguses. There must be some way by which the unspiritual element shall be eliminated or sloughed off and if necessary let the devil take the sifting process in hand. And so the devil put those twelve men in his sieve and commenced sifting. We have not much record as to how that sifting affected ten of these men. We have a little-not much -but that little says that they all, after Christ died and was put in the grave, became oppressed with gloom. They fled. They hid. They did not avow openly that they were the followers of Jesus Christ. All through the darkness of the time that Jesus was on trial, and on the cross, and in the grave, the hour of the power of darkness had come to each of these twelve men. But we have a particular account of the sifting of two of them, and when the devil sifted these two they bounced around in the sieve very much. Peter was light weight, but wheat. Judas was chaff altogether. As the devil continued to sift, it looked like Peter would go out with Judas, but Christ prayed for him: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Peter was retained and Judas was lost. Take another case; and this is the last historical instance for today. After the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit had been poured out and great power had been conferred upon God's children, and they had favor with all the people, it seemed then that the hazard was that everybody would come inside the church, ready or not ready. They were the centers of attraction. They filled men's vision. There was more talk about the apostles of Jesus Christ in Jerusalem than about all the great men of the world put together, and crowds that could not be numbered were going into the temple in order to hear them preach, and multitudes of men and women were professing the faith and were being baptized, three thousand in one day, five thousand men alone on another occasion, not counting the women. Thousands upon thousands poured in, and the apostles worked mightily in signs and wonders, electrifying and thrilling that capital of Judea with the displays of the power which God had conferred upon them. The heat became so intense that there was just one mind and one heart. First of all, unity, one mind and one heart; and then community; they had all things in common. Men were so much impressed with the power of the Christian religion, they were so drawn by the attractive power of the world to come that when they compared this life's wealth with the treasures in heaven, when they compared the fading with the unfading, the temporal with the eternal, the visible with the invisible, the transitory with the eternal; they counted property as nothing and began to sell it. You may understand the power of that meeting by this fact. They began to sell their property and to bring the price of it and put it into the common fund. "The earth is fading. Its foundations are shaking. Eternity is coming. Its dawn already has made rosy our sky. The judgment of God is at hand. Heaven has come down to earth. What do we want with property?" And they sold it, and

they brought the money and laid the price of it at the apostles' feet, saying, "Who is hungry let him be fed; who is naked let him be clothed. We are all one. We are brethren." Unity! Community! Well, there were some people in the church who could not understand this enthusiasm. Why didn't they understand it? They had no spiritual insight, and spiritual things can only be spiritually discerned. They were just as much puzzled with that phenomenon as Simon Magus was by the wonders wrought by Peter and John. They saw there was some tremendous power at work. They could not understand it, and they determined to do this: "I will divide my investment. This seems to be a bonanza. This new thing looks like it. I am not prepared, however, to venture all, but I will give a part, and lest this is only seeming, lest it is only a bubble that will burst, I will save back part of it. I will hold on here to earth with one anchor, and then I will cast an anchor to the windward." One man who happened to be a member of the church, not a Christian, but who got in like Simon Magus and Judas did, had a talk with his wife about this thing. That must have been a strange family conversation: "Wife, what do you think of this movement? There is something here. What do you think of it?" "Well, I don't know." "What are we going to do about it? You see how this enthusiasm is running. You see what Barnabas has done. You see what the others have done. Now, we cannot be behind the procession. What are we to do?" And they agreed together. The husband and wife conspired. They entered into a solemn covenant, each knowing what the other would do and say, and their conspiracy went so far in duplicity as to court the appearance of investigation. It was arranged that Ananias should go to Peter at one time, and his wife should come after, to avoid the appearance of collusion, so that Ananias could be examined by himself and the wife by herself, and therefore the husband would not seem to dominate the wife, nor the wife dominate the husband. And so, having sold a piece of land, they cut it in two. They kept back a part. "This new religion of Jesus Christ may come to an end in a little while, and we had better have something left down here in this world. We will keep that part hid." So they arranged that Ananias should go first, and his wife should come after. And Ananias came and laid his money down at the feet of Peter, saying, "I have sold my possession and here is the price of it. I want to put it into the common fund. I feel this new spirit. I want to move on with the rest of the disciples of Jesus Christ. Here is the price of my land." Peter had here the gift of discerning spirits just as later, in the case of Simon Magus. This case was too artificial. It was managed too cleverly. There were too many protestations concerning it. It did not ' come up naturally. So Peter says, "Tell me, did you sell the land for so much?" "Yes, so much." "Is this all of it?" "Yes." "Ananias, you have not lied to men; you have lied to God. You have lied to the Holy Ghost; you have committed an unpardonable sin. It hath never forgiveness, neither in this world nor in the world to come." And he fell dead at the feet of the apostles, and they took him up, the dead man, whose soul was in hell, lost forever. They took up the dead body and carried it out and buried it, to rest there until the resurrection comes. Just about the time they got back, here comes the wife. She looks very religious. She has all the external seeming of a Christian. She comes and stands before Peter. The wife has an interest in community property. And Peter puts the question, to her: "Tell me, did you sell that land for so much?" "Yes, for so much." "Is this the whole price of it?" "Yes." "Woman, woman, you have lied to God." And down she fell at his feet. There was one swift and sharp and fatal exposure of hypocrisy. There was a judgment in the house of God. There was a sifting under the direction of God Himself. This man, Ananias, had no part or lot in the matter. He was "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity." He thought to hoodwink the eye that never sleeps and lied to the Holy Ghost, and he perished. Now, why did God strike down Ananias and Sapphira?

Why did He? Were they greater sinners than all the sinners of Jerusalem? Not so. I doubt not there were in Jerusalem many sinners as heinous in God's sight as this man and this woman. But this man and this woman were in the church. This man and this woman were pretending to superior sanctity. This man and this woman at the very time that the spiritual evidence was being given of the power of God in the church, were knowingly perpetrating a fraud. They were not required to sell their land. There was no law in the church that everybody should sell his property and put it into a common fund. Peter said, "Before you sold it, wasn't it yours? And after you sold it, wasn't it yours?" There was no compulsion about this. Here were some good Christians so impressed with the power of the world to come that they sacrificed all their property and put it into the common fund, but there was no law to that effect. There was no statute demanding a community of goods. It was the voluntary, unprompted act of the soul of the religious enthusiast. Ananias and Sapphira did not have that enthusiasm, but they thought they must follow along after that procession some way, in order to keep up pretenses, to make it seem that they were all right. That this judgment in the house of God accomplished its purpose appears in this record, Acts 5:13-14 : "And of the rest durst no man join himself to them; but the people magnified them. And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes of both men and women." So now let not the unprepared dare to unite with thy people, so that the people may magnify their cause, and believers the more may seek admission. "The time has come that judgment should commence at the house of God." The repelling power is essential. If the church lays too much stress on the attraction, if the church uses worldly means of drawing people, don't you see how fatal that influence becomes? Out in the unregenerate world are a great many nice people. They do not belong to the riff-raff. They are exceedingly respectable and high-toned, and they are willing to belong to some church, saying, "If you will just let the gap down low enough-if you will not stand there with a flaming sword and demand regeneration, we will come in." If you will quit preaching the necessity of regeneration, if you will quit preaching salvation by the atoning blood of Jesus Christ, if you will lower the doctrine, why you can get the multitude. They will come in. And then lay a little more stress on the aesthetical parts of your worship. Bring in art. Be a little more artistic. Employ some fashionable singer, whose reputation is for song and song only, and put her in the church, and let her draw. Let her draw! Oh, the repulsion of the ancient Gospel, when the people of God would rely upon the truth and power of spiritual religion rather than factitious, adventitious aids from other sources! God needs no such help. It is a question of life and of death. You are lost if you are not regenerated, and you are guilty of suicide if you deceive yourself by any whitewashing or veneering on the subject of religion. "It is time that judgment should begin at the house of God." Away, and forever away, with every appliance that appeals to men except as to lost sinners, guilty before God and needing the regenerating power of the Spirit and the atoning blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. And when the church forgets, when it turns away from its ancient source of might, to make alliance with the feeble forces of time, and surrenders the dignity and majesty and sublimity and omnipotence of God's methods in order to adopt some time-serving method, it stands accursed. The curse of God is on it. I would rather see this house unroofed, each timber taken down, cast off brick by brick its walls, its foundations dug up and the trench of the foundations filled with salt; I would rather that the congregation itself, all in one place, by one bidding of Jesus, should be called through the portals of death to heaven, and leave not one upon the earth, than for this church to turn aside from God's holy way of saving men to the miserable frauds and shams and impostures that are sometimes employed. "It is time that judgment should

commence in the house of God." This is true, brethren. It is true no matter who is hit by it. Even if it lifts out your pastor and every other preacher in the church, and all your deacons, it is true that you have no religious power in the sight of God that is not in the line set forth in that book. You fail in your mission as a church when you abate one jot or tittle, when you lower the standard by a hair's breadth, when you turn aside to any flimsy method of time, when you go away from that simple foundation: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except you be born from above you can never see the kingdom of God." Let Judas go to his own place. Let Ananias and Sapphira, with lies on their lips, go down to their doom. Let Simon Magus clank the chain of his bondage, his fetters never having been broken. But let the church of Jesus Christ stand for the simplicity of the Gospel as it is in our Lord. Do thou, Lord, give equipoise to thy church and cause. Make great the centripetal attraction. But also make great the centrifugal force. Let thy cause draw all men, but let not it draw them except by spiritual force. Oh, let not the builders of Zion's walls daub with untempered mortar! Neither let them work wood, hay and stubble. Keep us forewarned of the trial by fire, lest we suffer loss in the day of fire.

sermon index

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**www.sermonindex.net**