

SPIRITUAL UNDERSTANDING

By G. E. Jones

INTRODUCTION

In putting forth this new book the writer is endeavoring to accomplish a two-fold purpose. First, he is answering an attack on himself by Eld. E. R. Harper of Little Rock, Arkansas. Some time ago, Eld. Harper took this writer as his subject for several radio addresses. It was originally the writer's purpose to answer Harper only, but after undertaking the work he has decided to also furnish the reader a clear cut discourse on Spiritual understanding.

Mr. Harper's attack was brought about by an article by this writer on "Does the Spirit Aid in the Understanding of the Bible?" In this article the writer took occasion to answer an attack on Bible practices by Eld. Harper. In his attack upon the writer, Eld. Harper accused him of misrepresenting Campbellite teachings and practices. These radio addresses Mr. Harper put out in) book form. They may be obtained from Eld. E. R. Harper of Little

Rock, Arkansas. In this discourse the writer is answering this book and those radio addresses.

In this book we shall further endeavor to go into the teaching of the Word of God on Spiritual Knowledge. This writer is also presenting several new and convincing arguments against Campbellites that have never before been used, so far as the writer has been able to ascertain. One of these new arguments is on John's Baptism. Another argument throws new light upon Gal. 3:27. In his library research the writer has discovered in "Roman Antiquities" the Roman custom which gave rise to the expression: "Put on" used in the Gal. 3:27 and other places. The writer also shows that Campbellites' position not only makes water baptism essential to salvation, but Holy Spirit baptism as well.

--G. E. JONES.

Spiritual Understanding

"For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not (lease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and Spiritual Understanding." Col. 1:9.

Does the Spirit Aid in the Understanding of the Bible?

In order that the reader may have before him a knowledge of the article which Mr. Harper attacked, the writer is re-printing that article as it appeared in the Baptist Message.

Does The Holy Spirit Aid In Understanding The Bible, And Are Christian Experiences Real

"Now we have received, not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God." 1 Cor. 2:12.

Spiritual things are not understood by a process of natural reasoning. The Bible is unlike any other book. It is not understood by the philosopher, or the wise of this world, but by the one who has the Spirit of God. If a person be sufficiently keen in intellect he can master the problem of arithmetic, science, or history. But it is not so with the word of God. Unless that person has the Spirit of God he will never understand spiritual things. This is where the world blundered. They have tried to understand spiritual things by a process of natural reasoning, when a knowledge of things of God must be received by faith. Jude writes of those who "Speak evil of things they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves."

The lost man cannot understand the things of the spirit, because he does not have a spiritual understanding. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he

know them because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things." 1 Cor. 1:14-15. We are told in Eph. 4:18 that their understanding is darkened. Paul wrote "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew." 1 Cor. 2:7-8.

He also tells us in the following verses that the things that eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, and that hath not entered into the heart of man, what God hath revealed unto us by His spirit. Jesus said "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes," Lk. 10:21. It is just as true today that the wise of this world do not understand, and God has revealed these things to those the world despises. It is still true 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 the weak things to confound the mighty, that no flesh should glory in His presence." 1 Cor. 1:26-29.

Not long since I heard a certain preacher broadcasting over the radio a tirade against what he called "Mourner's bench religion." He asked why the big preachers, those in cities had discarded the mourner's bench system.

By that I suppose he thinks that only the preachers in the city are wise and the fellow in the country is ignorant. By this I guess that John the Baptist, a wilderness preacher, or Elijah the prophet would not have qualified in this preacher's sight. The greatest debater, if not the greatest preacher among Baptists in the modern times, J. N. Hall, did most of his preaching in the small towns and country. This preacher went on to say that such as that could be put over on country people but not our boys and girls who had been to school and learned psychology. They were too wise for that. That is exactly right. Too wise in their own conceits. Paul said the Greeks seek after wisdom. Here was this preacher glorifying in his worldly wisdom. Glorifying in the flesh, if you please. The wisdom of the world and human psychology had freed him and his tribe from such weakness as this. I wonder if that is not

why Paul wrote "You see your calling brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." The word of God says "Be not wise in your own conceits." He also said, "Condescend to men of low estate." Rom. 12:16. It might be that some of these of low estate (These little preachers) could show a big fellow like this conceited fellow a few things.

This preacher went on to say to the people that you are wise enough, smart enough, and intelligent enough to obey the gospel. I wonder if this preacher has never read where the gospel is hid to the lost. If he will read 2 Cor. 4:3 he will find it. Does he not know that the natural man, cannot know the things of the spirit? Read 1 Cor. 2:14. Or does he believe that part of God's word? Does he not know that a man must receive the Spirit of God to know the things given to us of God? 1 Cor. 2:12. Does he not know that there is a veil over the heart of the lost man? 2 Cor. 3:15. Does this man know that posing as wise before the world and boasting about going to school and learning psychology, he was unknowingly advertising his ignorance of spiritual things? Did he not know that God has rejected all such as glory in the flesh? Has he never read where the Lord said "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways? Isa. 55 and calls man to forsake his thoughts? No wonder this man hates the doctrine of depravity. It cuts out by the roots of his system of theology. He wants to appear wise. That is the trouble with the world. They are not willing to confess their ignorance and become like a little child that they may learn of Christ. They desire to glory in their psychology. I would advise this preacher to read John 9:39. "For judgment I came into this world, that they which see not might see; and they which see might be made blind." Judging things naturally he speaks evil of those things he understands not. 2 Pet. 2:12; Jude 10.

Now just a word about the mourner's bench. It is not true that all city preachers have discarded mourner's religion as he calls it. Many have, but what does that prove? Why have they done so? Mainly because of the pride

of the human heart. Man resents the call to repent, and wants an easy way. Some preachers do not have the nerve to contend for what they know is right for fear of men. But I wonder if that preacher has not also read where it is written "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but will of their own lusts heap to themselves teachers having itching ears." 2 Tim. 4:33. What this preacher was pleased to call the big preachers, in the main, pastor churches made up of the rich, the cultured, and worldly wise.

The country churches he referred to are in the main, composed of common people. Now I wonder if this big preacher has not read where it is said of our Lord, "The common people heard him gladly." Mark 12:37.

What is wrong with this man? He has no spiritual understanding. He is one of the false teachers Peter wrote about who would speak evil of the way of truth. The trouble with him is that he knows if a person has to come to God by the way of mourning, he has never been saved. For every scripture he will quote for the hearer's bench I will quote one for the mourner's bench. It is not the bench that offends him—if so why does he not prate about furnishing benches for the hearers to sit on? There is not a single passage that tells us to put a bench in the house for hearers to sit on. Why does he not prate about that? It is not the bench but the mourning that offends him. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? Jer. 17:9.

His deceitful heart has made him believe that he is offended at the bench when it is the mourning that offends him. Why does he not come out in the open and fight the doctrine of mourning? That is the thing he is against. He knows he is defeated at the start; therefore, he resorts to subterfuge. Does he ever call upon his hearers to mourn? Will he tell us yes? Does he ever tell them, "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted?" Does he preach as James, "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts ye double minded. Be afflicted and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned into mourning, and your joy into heaviness. Humble

yourselves in the sight of God and he will lift you up" James 4:8-10? No. He does not: Why? It is the mourning, and not the bench that gives him offence. He calls upon them to be baptized and obey the gospel. We are offering \$5 for the passage that says that being baptized is obeying the gospel, or any part of obeying the gospel.

To understand spiritual things one must be given a spiritual understanding. "We know that the Son of God hath come, and given us an understanding, that we might know Him that is true." 1 Jon. 5:20. David prayed unto God, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of the law." "We read where the Lord opened Lydia's heart that she attended unto the things spoken of by Paul." So understanding of spiritual things must be imparted to man by the Spirit of God. The Lord said, "Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you." Prov. 1:23. If any wish to object to this because it is from the Old Testament, then let him consider my text which is from the New Testament. When man is willing to forsake his own wisdom, and, in his helplessness call upon God for the wisdom he needs, then the Spirit of God gives the ability to understand and trust in Christ

Let me say again in closing that no lost man can understand spiritual things. When Israel went out of Egyptian bondage, they were led by the pillar of fire that gave light by night. When their enemies pursued them, this pillar of fire removed from before the face of Israel and stood between them and the Egyptians. It was a cloud of darkness to Egypt, but it gave light to Israel. So the Spirit of God makes light to the child of God—that which is all darkness to the world. See Ex. 14:20. These Israelites also received the blood of their Passover lamb before starting toward the water. The wise Egyptians, those led by human wisdom, went to the water without the blood and were all destroyed. Those ignorant slaves who had mourned were led of the Lord safely through the Red Sea where the wise all got drowned. "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." 1 Cor. 3:19. "The thoughts of the wise are vain."

The Natural Man Is Without Spiritual Understanding

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth (discerns) all things. Yet he himself is judged (discerned) of no man." 1 Cor. 2:14-15.

This shows positively that the natural or un-renewed man cannot know the things of the Spirit. They are spiritually discerned. To discern means to understand. Then spiritual things are understood only by the one with a spiritual mind.

In the first paragraph of his book Mr. Harper starts with the heading "Natural Man Can't Understand Bible—Jones." He then seeks to show that it is not the Bible that teaches that the natural man cannot understand the Bible, but Jones. Now reader, does not 1 Cor. 2:14-15 show plainly that the natural man does not know the things of the Spirit? Does not the apostle say they are spiritually discerned? Does he not say "He that is spiritual discerneth all things"? Is the natural man spiritual? Does he have a spiritual discernment? If not, then he does not understand spiritual things. Why does Mr. Harper want to deny this positive statement of the Word of God as though it were Jones instead of the Bible that teaches it?

Mr. Harper tries to escape the issue by applying this to the receiving of the inspired word by the apostles. But the apostle is not talking about how the Bible was given, but how that same word is received in the hearts of men, and who can discern or understand it. Mr. Harper applies this to the apostles only. But Paul said "He that is spiritual judgeth all things." Were the apostles the only ones who were spiritual? Let us see. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness." Gal. 6:1. From this we see that others were spiritual as well as, the apostles. Now. Paul said such "Judgeth (discerneth) all things."

In the beginning the apostle said "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." 1 Cor. 2:4-5. Whose faith was Paul talking about standing in the power of God? It was the faith of those Corinthian brethren. Were they apostles? Certainly not. If it was necessary for the gospel to be preached in the power of the Spirit for the Corinthians' faith to stand in the power of God, then is it not necessary for the gospel to be preached in the power of the Spirit today for our faith to stand in the power of God? Does the faith of a child of God stand today in the wisdom of men or the power of God? So we see that the apostle had under consideration the salvation of those Corinthians and their spiritual discernment. "But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day when Moses is read the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord the veil shall be taken, away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." II Cor. 3:14-17.

From, the above passage we see that Israel had, a veil over their hearts. Their minds were blinded. This veil shut out the light of truth from their hearts even as a curtain shuts out the light from a room. Before light can shine into a room the curtain or veil must be removed. So it is with the heart of man. This veil, the apostle said, is taken away when it (the heart, in the above verse) shall turn unto the Lord. Then he says, "The Lord is that Spirit." So we see it is the work of the Spirit to remove the veil that is over the hearts of the lost that they might receive the light of the truth. If Mr. Harper had a thick veil over his eyes could he see what was before him? Must not that veil be first removed? Even so is it with the heart of the lost man.

In the next chapter the apostle goes on, to say, "If our gospel be hid (R.V. veiled) it is (R.V. veiled) to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the

glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God should shine unto them." II Cor. 4:3-4. When I said the gospel was hid to the lost and gave II Cor. 4:3 as a reference, Mr. Harper said I misquoted this verse. I did not quote it at all. I merely gave the reference. Then he implies that I put the wrong construction on, the verse and that it is not hid to the lost. Mr. Harper said, "Notice it did not say that the gospel is hid to them that are lost", but "If it be hid." Thus you see Mr. Harper does not believe that it is hid to the lost. Does not the next verse go on to say "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, etc."? Now is this not plain that the devil, who is god of this world, has blinded the minds of the unbelievers? Here is the veil that Paul said was over their hearts in the passage above. II Cor. 3:15. Paul emphatically asserts that this veil is upon their hearts. Then he goes on to teach that the gospel is hid (veiled) to the lost man. The unbeliever's mind is blinded.

Now let us read further—"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." II Cor. 4:6.

When a curtain is removed from over a window then light shines into the room. Even so when the Spirit of God takes away the veil (II Cor. 3:16-17) that is upon the heart (II Cor. 3:15) then God shines in our heart to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, etc. When does this light shine in our hearts?

When the heart turns unto the Lord, and Spirit takes away the veil.

Now reader, did I misrepresent the Word of God when I said the gospel was hidden to the lost man? Is it not Mr. Harper who is unwilling to accept the truth of God's word? Mr. Harper says the lost man can understand.

In his radio address against the mourner's bench he said to the people "You are smart enough, intelligent enough to understand and obey the gospel. What does the Word of God say? "There is none that understandeth,

there is none that seeketh after God." Rom. 3:11. The ninth verse of the same chapter tells us he is speaking about Jews and Gentiles and that they are all under sin. So none of those under sin, neither Jew nor Gentile, "understand". Mr. Harper says they can. God's word says they do not. This veil over their hearts keeps them from seeing the truth.

The Lost Man Has a Darkened Understanding

"This I say, therefore, and testify in the Lord that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, having the Understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them because of the blindness of their heart." Eph. 4:17-18.

Mr. Harper says the young people of today have been to school and have studied psychology and that they are smart enough, intelligent enough of themselves to understand the gospel and obey it. The Word of God says, they do not understand but their understanding is darkened. God's Word says they are ignorant, not smart. God's Word says their hearts are blind instead of seeing. Why does the man want to deny all that? It is the fruit of his "salvation by works" doctrine. His position forces him to deny the plain teaching of the Word of God. If he accepts God's Word as to the condition of the lost, his doctrine goes down, therefore he rejects the Word of God and holds his traditions. "Full well ye do reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." Mark 7:9.

FATALISM

Mr. Harper says this is "Fatalism". Page 10. Yes, it is fatal to Mr. Harper's doctrine. It digs it up by the roots. But it is not the fatalism Mr. Harper would have you to believe. Quoting from Page 10 of his book we read, "Here we have a man lost and has to obey the gospel or go to hell. But he can't even understand it, unless God fills him with His Spirit. Well, if God does not fill me with His Spirit, who is to blame, God or Man?" There you are in plain words. You see the man rules out the Work of the Spirit. He, like

Adam tries to throw the blame on God. Now let us see what the Word of God teaches on this point.

"Turn you at my reproof; behold I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you." Prov. 1:23. I quoted this in my first article, but for some reason Mr. Harper failed to notice it. Here God calls upon a man to turn at His reproof. This even means to turn from one's own thoughts. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts." Isa. 55:7. "My thoughts are not your thoughts." Isa. 55:8. God promises that if one turns at His reproof. He will pour out His Spirit unto him; He will make known His words unto him. Now isn't that plain that in pouring out His Spirit God makes known his words to man? Man's part is to turn at God's reproof. So. Mr. Harper, you, and not God, are to blame. Man cannot help being spiritually blind, but he can help remaining that way. Let us illustrate. There is a blind man. He has cataracts over his eyes. He is not to blame for not seeing. Here comes a skilled surgeon and promises to perform an operation that will remove the blindness if the man will submit himself to the operation. Now, if the man refuses to submit to the operation. he is not to blame for being blind, but for remaining that way. When man turns at God's reproof, the Great Surgeon performs an operation that opens a man's spiritual eyes.

"Behold, thou desireth truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom." Ps. 51:6. Here is God giving knowledge in man's inward or hidden part. But the poor man will not believe it. He had rather have his psychology than to have God make him to know wisdom in the inward part. He prefers to lean to his own understanding. Prov. 3:5.

God Must Give To Man a Spiritual Understanding

We have found that there is a veil over the heart of the lost man and that this veil hides the gospel of Christ unto him. II Cor. 3:15; 4:4. We have found that man's understanding is darkened. Eph. 4:18. We have found that

their hearts were blinded. II Cor. 4:4; Eph. 4:18. We have found that there is none that understandeth. Rom. 3:11.

Since man is in the above described condition God must give to him an understanding. The veil must be taken away to let the light of the gospel shine in. Apart from this work of the Spirit man could never know the truth. Can we prove from the Word of God that God does give this inward wisdom, or this ability to understand and accept the truth? We certainly can prove this.

"Behold thou desirest truth in the inward parts; and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom." Ps. 51:6. "The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, until this day." Deut. 29:4.

"We know that the Son of God hath come and given us an understanding that we may know Him that is true." I John 5:4.

"Nevertheless when it (the heart of verse 14) shall turn unto the Lord the veil shall be taken away." II Cor. 3:16. What veil shall be taken away? That veil that veils the gospel to the lost. "If our gospel be hid (veiled R. V.) it is veiled unto them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded their minds, etc." II Cor. 4:34. This veil hides the gospel to the lost is the veil of II Cor. 3:14-15, that is over their minds and hearts. Until it is taken away the gospel remains hidden to man. David prayed, "Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statues; and I shall keep it unto the end. Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law." Ps. 119:33-34. Here we have David praying that God will give him an understanding. We have found in I John 5:20 that God does give an understanding.

"Thy hands have made me and fashioned me: give me understanding that I may learn thy commandments." Ps. 119:73. Thus we see that God must give an understanding before man can learn His commandments.

The Lord asked Job? "Who bath put wisdom in the inward parts? Or who hath given understanding to the heart? Job 38:36.

James wrote "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not." James 1:5. But Harper will not ask God for this wisdom. He has studied psychology. He thinks he is wise enough, smart enough, and intelligent enough to understand and obey the gospel without the work of the Spirit of God. He says "Here we have a man lost and has to obey the gospel or go to hell". But he can't understand it unless God fills him with His Spirit. Well, if God does not fill me with His Spirit who is to blame, God or Man? If I go to hell can I help it? I can't obey the gospel for I am not smart enough to understand it, so says our (Jones') article." Page 10.

From this we see that he thinks he is smart enough, he thinks he has understanding apart from God's Spirit. "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." Rev. 3:17. There is Harper's picture. He thinks he sees. He thinks he knows. He thinks he needs nothing. He does not need the Spirit of God to give him an understanding. Psychology has made him wise enough to understand independent of the Spirit of God. But what does God say, "Knowest thou not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and blind", etc." Poor man, he thinks he does not need God's Spirit to enable him to see, when God says he is blind. Like the Pharisees, he claims to see, therefore his sin remaineth.

"For judgment I am come into the world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. And some of the Pharisees said unto Him, Are we blind also? (They did not think they were, but, like Harper, claimed to see.) Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind ye should have no sin: but now ye say, we see, therefore your sin remaineth." John 9:39-41.

What do we get from these passages? Simply this, the one who claims to see when in reality he is blind, he will remain in his sin. But the one who is willing to confess his blindness, renounce his psychology, and cease to lean on his own understanding, (Prov. 3:5), God will cause that person,

though blind to see. He shall be given an understanding (I John 5:20) and be made to know wisdom in the inward parts. Job 38:36. God will give him an, heart to perceive, ears to hear, and eyes to see. Deut. 29:4. Here is the hidden wisdom God puts in the inward parts, the wisdom the world does not know.

The difference between Harper and the Word of God is this: Harper tells the young people they have been to school and they are smart enough, intelligent enough to understand the Word of God for themselves without any aid from the Spirit of God, whereas God says "Knowest thou not that thou art wretched, miserable and blind, etc." They prefer to lean on their own understanding rather than the Spirit of God.

Now compare Prov. 1:23 with I Cor. 2:12. The first reference says if man will turn at God's reproof God will pour out His Spirit unto him and make His words known unto Him." I Cor. 2:12 says "Now we have received not the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit of God, that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God."

If I Cor. 2:12 refers only to the apostles, then Prov. 1:23 applies only to the apostles and they are the only ones called upon to turn at God's reproof. These two verses teach the very same identical thought, viz, that God through His Spirit must enable man to know the things of God. Here are two witnesses, one from the Old Testament, and one from the New Testament, testifying to the same thing. Mr. Harper ignored the Old Testament witness because he knew he could not switch that to the apostles, yet it teaches exactly what I Cor. 2:12 teaches. Better try again, Mr. Harper.

The Holy Spirit Gives Further Understanding To the Saved

Paul wrote to the Ephesians and said, "I cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus. Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him; the eyes of your understanding being

enlightened: that ye may know what is the hope of His calling, etc." Eph. 1:15-18.

The apostle wrote to the brethren of Colosse, saying, we "Do not cease to pray for you and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and SPIRITUAL UNDERSTANDING." Col. 1:9.

Here we see the apostle prays that God might fill these saved people with all wisdom and spiritual understanding. What kind of understanding? Natural understanding that comes from studying psychology? No, but it is a Spiritual Understanding.

We are not disparaging the study of the Word of God, but we are insisting that along with our reading of the Word there must be the enabling power of the Spirit for man to understand what he reads. The word which was given by the Spirit, must be received through the Spirit. Seeing you have purified your souls in the obeying the truth through the Spirit, etc." I Pet. 1:22.

There we see this Spirit revealed truth is obeyed through the Spirit. It must also be spiritually understood. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally" James 1:5. "Filled with all wisdom and Spiritual understanding." Col. 1:9.

The objectors to this position ask "If this is so why do not all of God's children see alike on all things?" Here man puts his own reason against the plain teachings of God's Word. But in reply to that we will say there are many factors that enter into this. There are many who do not wish to understand the things about our Lord's Second Coming. When that subject is brought up they shut up like a clam. Certainly God will not give such an one understanding on that line. The same principle applies to the doctrines of election, predestination, and the security of the believer. If a person does not desire wisdom on these things God certainly will not give it. Paul wrote Timothy, "The Lord give thee understanding in all things."

Naturalism Vs Supernaturalism

The cause of Christ has suffered immeasurably by putting emphasis on mere human training, and leaving the Spirit's work in the background. This trend is leading professed Christianity step by step into modernism. The writer has tried to maintain a safe balance on this point. He neither believes that God will impart to man an understanding of Spiritual things apart from the study of the Word; neither does he believe that simply studying that Word independent of the enlightening work of the Spirit will lead to an understanding of the same.

The infidel and atheist try to account for the origin of the universe and man through a natural process. Thus we have the evolutionary theory. They rule God out of it. The Christian believes the universe and man are a product of a supernatural power. The infidel thinks the Bible is merely a human book. The Christian believes it is a supernatural revelation from God. The infidel thinks Christ was a mere man and that His birth was the result of natural causes. The believer believes His birth was supernatural. Some professing believers forsake the supernatural and take the ground of naturalism and make the new birth the result of mere human works. The real child of God believes the new birth is a supernatural experience brought about through the Spirit's work. When it comes to the understanding of the Word others forsake the supernatural and cross over and take their stand with the infidel and modernist, and rule out the Spirit. Others go this far with us but when it comes to the security of the believer they too leave the supernatural and take their stand with the rationalist and teach one must preserve himself by his own works. We still maintain the supernatural side and contend that our security is a matter of divine power. Now, when it comes to the resurrection of the body, Campbellites and others who believe in the resurrection are forced to leave the ground of the naturalist and come back to supernatural ground. Thus they dodge back and forth.

The Spirit wrought in creation. Gen. 1:2. The Spirit wrought in the inspiration of the Word. II Pet. 1:21. It wrought in the birth of Christ. Matt. 1:20. The Spirit works in the receiving of the truth. I Pet. 1:22. The Spirit

works in enabling us to preach the word. I Cor. 2:4-5. The Spirit works in our understanding of the Word. Col. 1:9, and Eph. 1:17-18. The Spirit works in our security. I John 4:4. The Spirit will work in our resurrection unto life. Rom. 8:11. Let us keep our stand on the side of the supernatural and not be crossing back and forth. Man has ever tried to rule God out of human affairs. This spirit of unbelief tries to slip in under the guise of being Christian and rule God out in the new birth and spiritual work. Let us guard against this subtle work of the devil which seeks to contest the supernatural at every step of the way. If we depended more on the Holy Spirit and less on human wisdom and organization we would be better off.

Mr. Harper Appeals to Scholars

Mr. Harper claims that all of the second chapter of I Corinthians applies to the apostles and not to us. In order to prove his statement he does what all Campbellites do, he leaves the Bible and runs to Mr. Adam Clark and some other scholars to prove his contention. When these gentlemen are cornered with the word of God and cannot meet the argument they fly the track and try to brow beat people with what some scholars have said. They never talk very long or write much without telling us what some scholars have said.

In the first place I would like to know when and where God made any scholar or bunch of scholars an authority to interpret the Word of God for us and we common people must accept their interpretation without question. This smacks of Roman Catholicism. The Catholic priests teach that the common people are incapable of interpreting the Word of God and must depend on the priesthood to give them their ideas about God and His Word. Campbellites seek to force us to take the opinions of those men whom they call scholars, and whom they wish to choose. Mr. Harper, when and where did God make Mr. Adam Clark or any other scholar, or bunch of scholars to be our authority on Bible interpretations? I have known all along that Campbellites' faith stood in the wisdom of men and not in the power of God. 1 Cor. 2:4-5. And now, Mr. Harper proves it by appealing to the wisdom of

man to establish his point. I am not under obligation to take Mr. Adam Clark's interpretation, any more than Harper's. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater", I John 5:9. I establish my doctrine with the Word of God, Mr. Harper seeks to establish his with the witness of men. His faith stands in the wisdom of men. I Cor. 2:5.

In the second place, I would like to ask Mr. Harper if he does not know that the wise of this world, even religious teachers have, as a rule, been wrong concerning the things of God.

"I thank Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Matt. 11-25.

"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, that no flesh should glory in his presence." I Cor. 1:26-29.

The wise men of Egypt led the Egyptians to destruction at the Red Sea. The wise men of Babylon could not interpret the handwriting on the wall. Thus Mr. Harper's appeal to the wisdom of man betrays him and his bunch as having their faith to stand in the wisdom of men.

Third, this is the weapon of the devil. He used it on the woman in the Garden of Eden. "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, etc." Gen. 3:6. In short, the devil said, "If you would be wise, you must eat of the forbidden fruit." The evolutionists use this same weapon and say "All scholarship is agreed that evolution is true." Campbellites resort to the same weapon and try to make it appear that all scholarship is lined up with them.

FALSE RELIGION CATERS TO THE GREAT

One of the distinguishing characteristics of a false religion is that it caters to the big men. When Nebuchadnezzar would bring all faiths together and unify them in the worship of his golden image, he called together all the great men of his province. Dan. 3:1-28. Campbellites erect their image of salvation by works and call together a bunch of men they call wise and say, "See here who we have on our side." The three Hebrew children stood out alone against Nebuchadnezzar's great men. They were right and Nebuchadnezzar and his counsellors were wrong, though in the majority. The very refuge Mr. Harper takes betrays him as being one of the false teachers of the last days.

"These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts, their mouth speak great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage." Jude 16. Such swelling words as psychology, and complaining at God's people who shout and praise Him, and glorying in great men. Paul told the Corinthian brethren that they were "Not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against the other." I Cor. 4:6. By appealing to wise men whom he exalts above that which is written he becomes puffed up. "Let God be true and every man a liar." Rom. 3:4. In leaving the Word of God and appealing to wise men he unknowingly betrays the fact that his faith stands in the wisdom of men. He rules out the work of the Spirit of God and leans on his own understanding and the wisdom of men. God's Word says, "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding." Prov. 3:5. Mr. Harper prefers to lean on psychology and his own understanding, rather than in the Spirit of God.

THE MOURNERS' BENCH

Mr. Harper tries to wiggle out of his former broadcast against the "Mourners' Bench." In that first broadcast, he accused some city preachers of going out into the country and using the mourners' bench and coming back to the towns and cities and not using it. He asked why they used it in the country and not in the city. He asked "If it was good for country people,

why would it not be good for the city people?" (This writer uses it in town as well as in the country). Then Mr. Harper went on to say that these preachers knew they could not put it over on town and city people. Our young people had been to school and had studied psychology and were too intelligent for that. Now, reader, if this is not implying that the country people are ignorant and the town and city people are wise, I am unable to understand language. And he charges me of trying to create prejudice. I simply took his words at their meaning.

In Mr. Harper's answer to my article he tries to fix that all up with the country people by telling about being a country boy and holding country meetings. Well, I was taking notes on his former broadcast and most certainly heard him accuse the city preachers (Baptists, I suppose) of using the mourners' bench in the country and not using it in town. Some may do that and they are inconsistent if they do, but this writer knows many who do not. Those who do not use it in the city and do the country do so mostly because the Baptist country churches will not let them run this Campbellite formality over on them.

WHO MISREPRESENTS?

Mr. Harper in his book goes on to say "Let me say to the credit of our country people, that they no longer go on as they once did. They too, have learned that to mourn does not mean that you have to become hysterical and lose your mind and have to be carried home hog-tied as they have been from my home because they have been worked up by some preacher and a lot of folks standing around them telling them all the scary stories that they have ever heard or could think up."

Now talk about misrepresentation, here it is. I have never read a grosser one. I challenge Mr. Harper to bring the proof where a mourner was ever tied with ropes or cords like a hog and was carried home that way. This writer is fifty-one years old. He has attended Baptist and Methodist's meetings since he could first remember. He has held over one-hundred and

fifty meetings himself and yet he has to see the first mourner who had to be carried home, to say nothing of being hog tied. He has seen mourners unwilling to leave and go home because of their great desire to be saved, but has yet to see one who could not get up and walk out on his or her own legs. Talk about misrepresentation, and an effort to prejudice the minds of the people, this is the limit. This is about the gist of the whole matter. Mr. Harper has perhaps seen some person with Campbellite connection go to the altar. They did not want to leave, and their Campbellite kinsfolk took them away forcibly against their will to their homes. They, like the Pharisees, would not go into the kingdom and would not suffer those who were entering to enter. Matt. 23:13.

Now he says that "In a few days when the excitement is all over they didn't know whether they had it or not." Some more misrepresentation or ignorance of the facts. This writer personally knows that more of those who make a profession at the mourner's bench prove steadfast than those who do not.

Mr. Harper against the System, Not the Bench

In Mr. Harper's broadcast, in reply to my article, he said it was not the mourning he was against but the system. He said you get some people on the mourners' bench and they go to singing some old song, and some woman goes to shouting that is the thing he is against. Now, Mr. Harper, why did you not put that part of your radio message in print? Why did you leave it out of your book? Were you afraid that would backfire?

It certainly will. You need not say I am misrepresenting you because you left it out of your book. I took notes on that broadcast and knew at once what I would do with you. So, it is the shouting you are against is it? Here it is. I said it was not the bench he was against but the mourning. Here he says it is the system. There is a confession that it is not the bench that gives offense but the system of mourning. Now he unknowingly admits the things

of which I charged him. There it is at last. If you are not against shouting, say so. Say your people believe in shouting and do shout for joy.

DID BIBLE SAINTS SHOUT?

"Let all those that put their trust in thee rejoice; let them ever shout for joy." Ps. 5:11.

"But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice, and many shouted aloud for joy, so that the people could not discern the noise of the shout, of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people: for the people shouted with a loud shout, and the noise was heard afar off." Ezra 3:12-12. Does this sound like a Campbellite meeting or an old fashioned Baptist revival? When did anything like this ever take place in a Campbellite meeting? Had Mr. Harper been there on that occasion he would have said these people were hysterical. Perhaps these people in Ezra 3:12-12 had not been off to school and studied psychology.

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly; and riding upon an ass, etc." Zech. 9:9.

We find the fulfillment of this prophecy in Luke 19:35-40. Here the multitude of our Lord's disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice. The Pharisees, like the Campbellites, were disturbed at this and asked Jesus to rebuke His disciples. Jesus answered "If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." Mr. Harper, maybe Jesus and these disciples had not been to school and studied psychology like you and the Pharisees. Do you think those disciples were hysterical? If you had been there on that occasion which crowd would you have joined, the hysterical crowd that was shouting, or the Pharisees, who did not want any shouting? Those Pharisees who studied the Word of God were too blind to see the fulfillment of their own scriptures in this occasion. You, who think you are

well posted on the scriptures are too blind to see that you are condemning yourself and putting yourself in the class with the Pharisees. Tell me, Mr. Harper, why the Campbellites never shout for joy? You claim to have put your trust in the Lord. Well, the Word of God says for such to "Shout for joy." Did you ever hear a Baptist "shout for joy"? If the Baptist do and the Campbellites do not, who is carrying out Ps. 5:11? Did you ever see people who used, the mourner's bench shout for joy? Yes, you have, because in your broadcast you said some old woman would get to shouting and get them at the mourner's bench excited. Well! Well! Well! These mourner's bench people were "shouting for joy" just as Ps. 5:11 said to do. These objectors to the mourner's bench do not shout, but object to shouting just like the Pharisees. "Ye shall know them by their fruits." Matt. 7:16. Bring in your psychology.

Mr. Harper says "I am against this system that gets a man all worked up and then trying to make him think that the Lord sent His Spirit into the man's heart and saved him while he was in that condition before the man obeyed the gospel." Here we have it. Mr. Harper objects to a man being saved before he is baptized. Here is a man with a godly sorrow. He is repenting. "A godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation." II Cor. 7:10. Mr. Harper says he must have faith before he can repent. So here is a man with both faith and repentance, but according to Mr. Harper he has not obeyed the gospel. You did not say "Before the man had fully obeyed the gospel." So you make being baptized "obeying the gospel," and then when Baptists expose you, you holler misrepresentation.

Now, those who come to the mourner's bench (most, but not all) claim to be forgiven and always rejoice and frequently shout for joy. You Campbellites claim to get forgiveness when baptized and never shout for joy. Now isn't that strange that you who claim to have the Bible truth never shout for joy as Ps. 5:11 tells us, and as Bible saints did; and those who follow what you call unsound practice and teaching do "shout for joy". If you should go into the chemistry room, would you expect to get the right results

using the right formula or using the wrong one? If you Campbellites have the correct formula in the plan of salvation why do you never "shout for joy", (Ps. 5:11) like Bible saints? Luke 19:37. If we Baptists have the wrong formula why do our people "shout for joy" as did Bible saints? Now, Mr. Harper, you will never answer this. You may make fun of it and like the Pharisees laugh for scorn, but you know it is the truth. Have you ever shouted Mr. Harper? I have, both in the church house, and in my room alone with God, studying His Word. Was that excitement? May God have mercy on you and give you repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.

You asked if Elijah and John the Baptist used the Mourner's bench. Did they use the hearer's bench? You (did not answer that, did you? In the next verse where it says they used the hearers' bench it says they used the mourners' bench. I do not find where they ever used any benches, either for hearers or mourners, but I do find the same "system" as you call it.

THE SYSTEM

"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 clown on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." I Cor. 14:24-25. Did you ever have a convicted sinner fall on his face in one of your meetings? I have seen it in Baptist meetings.

"Therefore also now, saith the Lord, turn ye even to me with all your heart; and with fasting, and with weeping and with mourning and rend your hearts; and not your garments and turn unto the Lord your God, for He is gracious and merciful, etc." Joel 2:12-13.

"And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you this man went down to his house justified, etc." Luke 18:13-14.

Here we have all that is practiced in the Mourners' Bench System", as Mr. Harper calls it. We have a convicted sinner falling on his face. I Cor. 14:24-25. We have great heart rending sorrow, weeping and mourning. Joel 2:12-13. We have a sinner smiting his breast. Luke 18:13-14. Baptist meetings have all of this along with the shouting. Campbellite meetings have none of it. We also have the sinner praying. Jonah, 3rd chapter, and Luke 18:13. Campbellites teach them they should not pray. The Ninevites prayed, and Jesus said they repented. "Let man and beast be covered with sack cloth and cry mightily unto God, etc." Jonah 3:8, and Matt. 12:41. Apply your psychology to this great demonstration at Nineveh.

Harper Admits It Condemns Him

I said in my article it was not the bench that offended Mr. Harper but the mourning. He has virtually admitted that when he said "It just proves this: That if you have to have it that way, by that system, by the mourner's Bench System of getting religion, then all those who do not practice it that way and do not get it that way are lost." There you are. He has admitted that I was right when I said, "The trouble with him is that he knows that if a person has to come to God by the way of mourning he (Harper) has never been saved." Now in the quotation above he gives this as his objection to the Mourners' Bench System. Now, Mr. Harper, since we have found the system in the Word of God, what will you do? We have found everything but the bench. We are not contending for the bench but for the "system" as you call it. We have found weeping, mourning, crying mightily unto God, a convicted sinner falling on his face, and another smiting his breast. We have also found Bible saints "shouting." What more do you want, Mr. Harper? Now, if it is the seats or benches that offend, pitch them all out the window—hearers seats along with mourners seats, but for the sake of lost souls, and for God's sake, do not throw out the mourning, weeping, crying mightily unto God, and the shouting for joy along with the benches. The Campbellites throw out the mourning, weeping, crying mightily unto God, the breast smiting, the falling on the face, and the shouting for joy, and

keep the benches. Better discard the benches and have the other. Baptists do not care if the mourners' bench is the front seat or the middle seat. Only recently we had three mourners on their knees in the choir.

That is exactly the point Mr. Harper. If you get salvation (not religion) you have to come by the way of deep mourning and prayer like the Ninevites and the Publican. There is no repentance without it. You are lost if you did not come this way. I do not mean the front seat or any seat, but I mean the "system" you are against, one that brings bitter weeping and mourning: one that brings crying unto God. Jon 3:8. Reject it if you will and be lost. Study psychology if you please and be spoiled through the philosophy of this world. Have you never read where it is written "Beware lest any man spoil you through Philosophy and vain deceit"? Col. 2:8. This word philosophy, you know, comes from two words which put together mean "Love of learning." Have you never read where it says, "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth." I Cor. 8:1. Have you never read where Jude says "But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, (not spiritually) as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves," Jude 10. Leaning on your psychology you are speaking things you know naturally. Where do you get your psychology? Did you get it from the Word of God; from the Spirit of God; or the wisdom of this world? Didn't you know that this word psychology was coined by a French infidel to account for religious phenomena he did not understand? And here you are tracking with this infidel. You seek to account for the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men producing Bible mourning, weeping, and then shouting by a world taught psychology. The Pharisees tried to account for the work of Jesus by attributing His work to the devil. Mark 3:22-30. You try to account for the Spirit's work by attributing it to psychology. You had better beware. I would not stand in your shoes for the whole world. Had it ever occurred to you that there might be something about this affair you do not know anything about? What is psychology anyway? Do you know? Isn't it just a big high sounding phrase (as Peter said, great swelling words of vanity, II Pet. 2:18) coined by an ungodly man to account for something he knows

nothing about? Does the Spirit of God work on the minds of men? How do you know but that accounts for a lot of phenomena in the world? If the Baptists in their "Mourners' System" show the same phenomena as shown in Bible days, viz, mourning, weeping, heart rending sorrow, crying mightily unto God, and then "shouting for joy", (Joel 2:12-13; Jonah 3:8; Ps. 5:11; Luke 19:37,) why should you attribute it to psychology? For one reason only. It condemns your formalistic system. Like Cain, You became wroth, and your countenance falls. Gen, 4:5. God had respect to Abel's offering, but He did not for Cain's offering. Gen. 4:5. If God has respect to your Campbellites System why do not your people become filled with the Spirit and "Shout for joy" and "Praise God with a loud voice?" If God does not have respect to Baptist way of repentance, why does He make them "shout for joy"? Answer it Mr. Harper.

Mr. Harper Takes Refuge under Scholarship Again

This time Mr. Harper runs to Matthew Henry and others for comfort. But there is nothing in Matthew Henry's words to help him. I agree that even, after we are saved we should and do have a habitual seriousness of mind. But what about that "Godly sorrow that worketh repentance unto Salvation?" What about the Ninevites who sat in sackcloth and cried mightily unto God? Were they saved people before they did this? What about the Publican who said "God be merciful unto me a sinner"? Was he justified before this mourning and praying or after it?

Mr. Harper says "This mourning mentioned here (Matt. 5:4, the verse on which Matthew Henry commented) is not for an hour, then get saved and start screaming and then it is all over." (Mr. Harper were the Ninevites screaming when they cried mightily unto God?) Let us not dodge the issue. We are talking about mourning on the part of the sinner seeking the Lord. Is he to mourn? Does he mourn?

"The Lord is nigh unto them of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of a contrite spirit." Ps. 34:18.

"Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded. Be afflicted and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned into mourning and your joy into heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of God and he will lift you up." Jas. 4:8-10.

Now, don't try to dodge the issue, Mr. Harper, these verses teach mourning and weeping on the part of the sinner. What if he does weep aloud? Did not the Ninevites cry aloud? Did they not repent? Jesus said they did. If so, was not crying aloud connected with their repentance?

Mr. Harper says Mr. Jones never touched the hem of the garment with reference to mourning as mentioned by our Lord. "He said this mourning was for ever day and ever minute souls are going to hell." Well, well, well, what does Mr. Harper know about Jones' private or public life? This preacher has wept many tears in the pulpit, in private, and at the altar with and over sinners something he never saw a Campbellite do. Some might do it, but I have attended their meetings, and have yet to see it.

Mr. Harper says Mr. Jones and his brethren have their victims at the altar or mourners' bench for hours mourning, as they call it, and crying to God for hours and sometimes years, and sometimes they never get it. Did not the Ninevites cry mightily unto God? Jonah 3:8. Did not Jesus say they repented? Matt. 12:41. If they cried mightily unto God when repenting, why do you object to sinners crying unto God today? Isn't it because the pride of your heart resents this? Isn't it that old carnal mind that is enmity against God? Rom. 8:7. He implied on page 30 at the bottom that his father might have been one that never got it. It is true that some go mourning for a long time before they are saved, and some may never find salvation. Why? There may be an old grudge in their hearts they are unwilling to give up. I knew a man who had had a falling out with his neighbor over a ditch and had started a suit against that neighbor. He got under deep conviction and wept and mourned, but stubbornly held on to his intention to carry his vengeance through to a finish. Finally he quit the meeting unsaved. The fault was not in the "System" but in the grudge this man steadfastly held.

John 3:5, and the \$5 Offer

I offered Mr. Harper \$5.00 to show where being baptized was obeying the gospel or any part of it. In his attempt at doing that he advanced Mark 16:16 and John 3:5. Paul shows us that believing is obeying the gospel. "They have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" Rom. 10:16. Here we have it from an inspired writer that we obey the gospel in believing. As the result of obeying the gospel or believing, we are saved. John 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 1:16. After that we symbolize it in being baptized. I Pet. 3:21.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16:16. Yes, really, when he believes; and in a figure when baptized. Not being baptized will not condemn a man. What will cause him to be condemned? "He that believeth not is condemned already, BECAUSE (here is your cause) he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:18.

Mr. Harper asks, "When the apostles went over the country preaching the gospel, if they did not tell men to believe in Christ, how would they know to believe? If they did not tell the people that Christ commanded baptism how would they know they should be baptized? Page 19.

We will answer this by asking Mr. Harper a few questions. If they did not tell the people Christ commanded that the Lord's supper be observed how would they know to observe it? If they did not teach that the ministry be supported, how would they know to support the ministry? Then, according to his own logic, eating the Lord's Supper and supporting the ministry is part of obeying the gospel and essential to obtain the remission of sins, since they could not have known to do so unless taught by the apostles.

Christ nowhere commanded a lost sinner to be baptized, or eat the Lord's Supper. Mr. Harper has never yet learned the difference in what God commanded the lost to do, and what He commanded His children to do.

Now let us look at John 3:5. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." Mr. Harper thinks born of water in John 3:5 means being baptized, or receiving water baptism. Let us meet him on his own ground. If that means baptism, it will do no harm to read it that way. Now let us read, "Except a man be baptized of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God. If born of water is water baptism, then born of the Spirit is Holy Spirit baptism. So, according to Mr. Harper's logic, it will take both water baptism and Holy Spirit baptism to get the man in the kingdom. The verb "born" in John 3:5 precedes both "of water" and "of the Spirit" and is modified by both phrases. He cannot make born of water, water baptism, without making born of the Spirit, Holy Spirit baptism. Now, Mr. Harper has gone to the Holy Rollers.

Mr. Harper, when did you receive water baptism? Have you ever received Holy Spirit baptism? If not, and baptism is meant in John 3:5, you have never fully complied with that verse and have not gone into the kingdom. If you leave off Holy Spirit baptism you leave off the last part of John 3:5, and cannot get a man in the kingdom.

Pentecost Kingdom Theory and Holy Spirit Baptism

Not only will Campbellites' construction of John 3:5 .compel them to have Holy Spirit baptism, but their kingdom theory also does that. The Apostles received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost. Will you deny that, Mr. Harper? Acts 1:5. They received water baptism at the hands of John the Baptist. Will you deny that? Do you not teach that these apostles did not go into the kingdom until Pentecost? Did they go into the kingdom before they received Holy Spirit baptism? If so, did they go in before Pentecost? And did the kingdom exist before Pentecost? If the kingdom came, as you teach, when the Holy Spirit came, and the apostles went into the kingdom when the Baptism of the Holy Spirit came did it not take Holy Spirit baptism, as well as water baptism to put the apostles in the kingdom? Now, if you do away with Holy Spirit baptism, have you not destroyed your Pentecost plan and left yourselves without a plan of salvation?

If you keep both do you not have two baptisms? Better call in your psychology and wise men again to help you out of this tight place.

BAPTISTS BORN OF WATER

Mr. Harper says Baptists are born of water. We do not deny it, for John 3:5 says we must be born of the water and of the Spirit. But this is not the water in the creek. We are born of the "Living Water". John 4:10-14. We are buried in the water in the creek. Rom. 6:4. A man who doesn't know a birth from a burial is dumb indeed. Baptism is called a burial. It is never called a birth. Neither is a burial ever called a birth.

Mr. Harper and His People under a Bogus Commission and Convicted by His Own Testimony

In trying to answer Eld. Bishop on what he said about Campbellite teaching sending everybody to hell prior to John the Baptist, Mr. Harper surely gets himself and people into a fix. He puts them all under a bogus commission on his own testimony. Turn to Harper's book, "Truth Vindicated", Page 25-26, and read: "Now under this new law, under this new priesthood, under this new testament that we (Harper and his people) are under, baptism in the name of the Lord was given. It was never given nor practiced in His Name before His resurrection and ascension. This accounts for why those back before John did not have to submit to the command of Baptism in the name of our Lord. Now what do you think of Mr. Bishop's argument?"

Here Mr. Harper states that baptism in the name of our Lord was not given nor practiced before our Lord's resurrection and ascension. Now, Mr. Harper, give us the chapter and verse where Jesus ever gave a commission after His ascension, and commanded baptism in His Name. Away goes Mark 16:15-16. That was before our Lord's ascension. Away goes Matt. 28:18-20. That also was before our Lord's ascension. Read it and see if you did not say it. That, then, takes you out from under Mark 16:15-16, and Matt. 28:18-20 for you say "Under this new testament we (you and your people) are under,

baptism in the name of the Lord was given. It, (baptism) was not GIVEN nor practiced in His name before His resurrection and ASCENSION. Your commission to baptize then was given after Christ's ascension. Who gave it to you? Christ did.

He gave His commission before His ascension. Therefore, since you cannot find where Christ gave the commission after He ascended to heaven, you are under a bogus commission, and are guilty of perpetrating a fraud and practicing deception, and convicted upon your own testimony. Now, try your psychology on that. Better call in Adam Clark and a few more of your wise men to help you out on this. They will do you about as much good as the wise men did Belshazzar, when the hand was writing on the wall. Now, what do you think of Mr. Harper's argument?

This is not all. Mr. Harper has left the apostles and all the first members who went into the church which he said started at Pentecost, without remission of sins. He teaches that one must be baptized in the name of the Lord to receive remission of sins. But the apostles and the hundred and twenty of Acts. 1:15 were never baptized in the name of our Lord, if it was not given nor practiced until after His resurrection and ascension. They were all baptized by John or during our Lord's personal ministry. John 4:1-2. So, according to Mr. Harper, they never received baptism in our Lord's name. Then, if it takes baptism in our Lord's name to give remission of sins, the apostles and the hundred and twenty never received remission of sins. Call in your psychology and wise men again. Help wanted. Mr. Harper is in a hole! Now what do you think of Mr. Harper's argument?

But, let us not leave the apostles in that shape. Baptists to the rescue. We will get the apostles and the hundred and twenty out of this scrape, but down will go Harper: - There is salvation in no other name but the name of Jesus. Acts 4:12. All who believe in Him receive remission of sins in His name. Acts 10:43. The apostles believed in the name of our Lord. "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." John 1:12. "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." John 3:18. They were already clean. John 13:10-11: John 15:3. Mr. Harper. I challenge you to deny that the apostles (beside Judas) believed in our Lord's name. I challenge you to deny that they were clean before Pentecost. You said Baptism in our Lord's name was not given nor practiced before His resurrection and ascension: Then the apostles must 'have received remission of sins in the name of Jesus, through believing in His name, and not through being baptized in His name, for you say this baptism was not given nor practiced in His name before His ascension. Thus you establish the Baptist position that remission of sins in the name of Jesus is received through believing in His name, and not through being baptized in His Name. Now, what do you think of Mr. Harper's argument? Help wanted! Harper is sinking.

Questions:

1. If it takes baptism in the name of our Lord to put one in Christ when and where did the apostles get into Christ?
2. When and where were they baptized in the name of the Lord, if baptism in His name was not given nor practiced before His ascension?
3. If it takes baptism in the name of our Lord to put one in Christ, and the apostles never were baptized in that name did they ever get into Christ?
4. Can your psychology help you out on this?
5. Why don't you call in your wise men like Belshazzar did and see if they will help?
6. Now what do you think of Harper's (not Bishop's) argument? "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Matt. 15:14.

JOHN'S BAPTISM

Campbellites claim that John's baptism was dis-annulled. They refer to the twelve that Paul baptized in Acts 19:1-5. They claim these twelve were

first baptized by John. It is easy to prove that these were not baptized by John himself, but by someone who was trying to carry on the work of John. But, for sake of argument, we will let it remain as the Campbellites put it. It involves them into an inescapable difficulty. We find that John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Luke 3:3. They claim that means John was baptizing them in order that they might obtain remission of sins. If so, and John baptized the twelve in Acts 19:1-5, did they not receive remission of sins as the result of this baptism? Then, for what purpose did Paul baptize these same twelve? Did he also baptize the same twelve in order to obtain the remission of sins? Why baptize people in order to obtain remission of sins when they already have obtained it? If they did not get remission of sins both times when did they get it, as the result of John baptizing them, or as the result of Paul baptizing them? If they did not get it as the result of John's baptism, then "For the remission of sins" in Luke 3:3 does not mean "In order to obtain". If it does not mean "In order to obtain" in Luke 3:3, then the same expression in Acts 2:38, does not mean it, and away goes Campbellite contention on Acts 2:38. If they did get remission of sins as the result of John's baptism and not as the result of being baptized by Paul, then Paul was not baptizing them in order that they might obtain remission of sins. Campbellites say this was Christian baptism. Then Christian baptism is not "In order to obtain the remission of sins". So their position on John's baptism catches them both ways. Maybe Mr. Harper's psychology can help him out here.

Baptism in the New Covenant

Mr. Harper puts baptism in the new covenant and then makes it a condition of getting into that covenant. Now, if baptism and the Lord's Supper are in the new covenant, then we could not possibly be under obligation to observe them until we were brought into covenant relationship. That is like having a man go to bed to get into the house. The bed is in the house. He cannot possibly reach the bed until he is in the house. But Harper's logic would put a man to bed in order to get into the house.

Not a New Plan of Salvation, But a New System of Worship

What a confused mess Campbellism is anyway! Does not the poor fellow know that the Law of Moses was never given to make a man a member of the nation of Israel? It was given to regulate the worship, service, and conduct of a people already redeemed from Egyptian bondage. So baptism and the Lord's Supper are not the things that brings us into relationship with God, but it is the new form of worship and service given to people already in relationship with God. I did not become a citizen of this country by obeying its laws. I come under those laws by being born into this country. They did not make me a citizen, but govern my conduct after I am a citizen. Can't the poor fellow see that?

Mr. Harper says we are not saved like people were back in the days of Abraham and before Christ came. Page 25. Then the poor fellow has a lot to say about the Levitical priesthood. Pages 24-26. Does not the poor fellow know that Abraham lived 430 years before the Levitical priesthood was established? Gal. 3:17. How could Abraham be saved by or under a Levitical priesthood and the Law of Moses when they had no such thing in his day? Mr. Harper, was he saved by or under the Law of Moses? I dare you to say yes. Then, if people were saved by or under the Law of Moses and are saved through another plan today that would be two plans of salvation, would it not? Then if Abraham was saved, by what plan was he saved, by the Law or by the new plan? He could not have been saved by the Law of Moses for it was not yet given. Then, if Abraham was not saved like us today, he must have been saved by a third plan of salvation. Why all this tangled confusion? Because Mr. Harper does not realize that God has only had one plan of salvation all the way down. The law did not and could not give life. "If there had been a law given that could have given life then verily righteousness would have been by the law." Gal. 3:21. Mr. Harper, can't you see it is not a new plan of salvation we have today, but a new system of worship and service. Your whole trouble is in your salvation by works theory. We do not worship and serve God in order to be saved but we must first be

saved. How can one worship God in Spirit and in truth until he is given the Spirit? John 4:23-24.

The Scripture is Plain that We are Saved like Abraham

"He that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed' God and it was accounted to him for righteousness." Gal. 3:5-6. We are saved by the hearing of faith. Even as Abraham was accounted righteousness, yet Mr. Harper and his people will stand up and deny it. Deny the plain statement of God's Word to keep his salvation by water plan.

But perhaps Mr. Harper will say that Abraham had to offer Isaac before he was saved. Let him read Rom. 4:1-25. We find in Rom. 4:17-21 that Abraham believed God when as yet Sara's womb was dead and his belief was imputed to him for righteousness. Can't he see this was before the birth of Isaac? Then Abraham was not justified before God by offering up Isaac, but justified before man. A living faith justifies us before God. Our works which are the fruits of this living faith and a renewed nature justify us before men. Paul goes on to say in Rom. 4:23-25 that "It was not written for his (Abraham's) sake alone that it was imputed unto him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised Jesus from the dead." Thus we see we are saved like Abraham was saved. Abraham believed and it was imputed to him for righteousness. Rom. 4:21-22. We believe and it is imputed unto us for righteousness. Rom. 4:23-25. It was not through offering a lamb, or goat, or Isaac that Abraham was accepted of God, but through his faith apart from works. Rom. 4:1-6. "Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." So, are we accounted righteous when we believe, apart from any works of our own.

"The promise that he should be heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4:13.

So Abraham was not made righteous by the law. The promise to Abraham was through the righteousness of faith. The promise to Abraham's seed is through the righteousness of faith. Then why deny that we are saved like Abraham was saved? It is not a new plan of salvation, Mr. Harper, but a new system of worship and service. Your theory forces you to deny the Word of God at every turn. Put salvation before and without works (Rom. 4:6) and it will all clear up.

ACTS 2:38 AND SCHOLARS

From pages 37 to 47 in his book Mr. Harper takes up Acts 2:38 and goes to scholars again. In this part of his work he quotes from, or claims to quote from Dr. Goodspeed, Ernest D. Burton, Dr. Weymouth, Dr. Geo. Campbell, Dr. James McKnight, Dr. Phillip Doodridge, and Dr. C. B. Williams of Union University, Tennessee. Dr. Williams is a Baptist. He also gives us comments from Adam Clark and Matthew Henry.

Mr. Harper's scholars are not going to help him any more than did Belshazzar's wise men. Dan. 5:7-8. It is going to prove a boom-a-rang.

First, I want to show how Mr. Harper has grossly misrepresented Dr. Williams, and has purposely perverted what Dr. Williams said, in order to deceive people. I wrote Dr. Williams and here is His answer:

**"3518 Obispo
Tampa, Florida
October 2, 1940**

**Elder G. E. Jones
Neelyville, Mo.**

Dear Bro. Jones:

Yours received concerning Mr. Harper's twisting of my translation of Acts 2:38. I am glad you wrote me to clarify it.

I am quoting it from the book open before me:

Peter said to them, "You must repent -- and, as an expression of it, let everyone of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ -- that your sins may be forgiven." Perhaps, he did not tell the folks how it was punctuated, which gives the INTERPRETATION. He gave my translation WORD FOR WORD. But as you quoted it to me, he did not PUNCTUATE IT AS I DID.

You can see at a glance, I am sure, with my punctuation, it does not substantiate the Campbellite claim that you MUST BE BAPTIZED. THAT YOUR SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN, but THE BAPTIST POSITION (and the position of other evangelicals) that baptism is merely an "expression" or symbol of repentance and the work it does in the soul; that repentance is the indispensable condition of FORGIVENESS OF SINS. The two dashes after "repent" and "Christ", separate baptism from forgiveness but make the clause, "that your sins may be forgiven", dependent on "repent", not on "be baptized". This seems to be what Peter teaches in his epistle. (I Pet. 3:21.)

By the way, I am enclosing a review of my Translation. Why not put 'it in your library? It makes many a knotty passage look clear as crystal. I have on hand a few copies, etc.

(The rest of the letter is personal. G. E. J.)

**With good wishes, I am
Yours in Him Who Loves us all,
Chas. B. Williams."**

Reader, here is Dr. Williams' letter to me word for word, punctuation marks, capitals, quotation marks and all, just as he wrote to me. He said Harper twisted his translation of Acts 2:38. He said Harper left out the punctuation which gives the Interpretation. He said he made forgiveness of sins depend upon "repent" and not on "be baptized". Dr. Williams says his translation substantiates the Baptist position, and not the Campbellite claim.

In order that the reader may see that Mr. Harper has left out Dr. William's punctuation, I will give it as Mr. Harper gave it in his book and then as Dr. Williams had it in his translation.

Here it is as Mr. Harper gives it:

"Peter said unto them, you must repent and as an expression of it let everyone of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ that you may have your sins forgiven." (Note: the underscored words Mr. Harper has in italics.)

Dr. Williams' translation:

Peter said to them, "You must repent -- and as an expression of it, let everyone of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ -- that your sins may be forgiven."

You will notice that Mr. Harper left out the two dashes after "repent", and "Christ". This makes that part of the sentence enclosed in those dashes a parenthetical statement. As Mr. Williams says, it separates baptism from forgiveness, and makes the clause "that your sins may be forgiven" dependent on "repent", and not on "be baptized."

Now, reader, why did Mr. Harper leave out those dashes? He knew it changed the whole sense of the verse. By leaving out those two dashes, he made Dr. Williams teach the opposite of what he did teach. Here we have a fair example of "The sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive! Eph. 4:14. If this is a fair example as to how Mr. Harper deals with the works of other men, you can see that he will not do to trust.

Now, Mr. Harper, just why did you leave out those dashes? Were you ignorant of the fact that they gave the interpretation of the verse? Dr. Williams said they did. You quoted him as a scholar. If he is a scholar as you

claim, then certainly he knows what his punctuation marks mean. If you say he does not know, then you repudiate the scholarship of one of your scholars. If you, knew what those dashes meant and purposely left them out, why did you do it? Was it to deceive the people? Do you call this dealing honestly with the Word, as Paul said he did, II Cor. 4:2, or as many whom Paul said "Corrupt the Word?" II Cor. 2:17 Have you not read where it is said, "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse deceiving and being deceived." II Tim. 3:13. Did you apostatize when you purposely misrepresented Dr. Williams' translation, or were you just ignorant? I thought you had been to school and were wise enough, smart enough, intelligent enough, to know better. Is this the result of studying psychology?

Now, Mr. Harper, who is the man that misrepresents? In leaving out those dashes, you misrepresent Dr. Williams and try to make it appear that he is on your side. Are these the good works you expect to carry you to heaven?

Reader, here we have one of those wolves in sheep's clothing. Jesus said "Ye shall know them by their fruits." Matt. 7:15-16. Dr. Williams said by leaving out his punctuation marks Harper had twisted his translation. Do you think Mr. Harper was too ignorant to know that he was misrepresenting Dr. Williams when he did it? Harper claims to have a B. S. degree. Is he that ignorant? If he knew he was leaving out those dashes and knew it changed the meaning, then did he not do it to deceive? Is that the mark of a true servant of God, or of one of the false teachers in sheep's clothing?

Now, Mr. Harper, does not the word expression carry with it the meaning of declare? Dr. Williams' translation reads "And, as an expression of it, let every one of you be baptized in the name of Christ. If you will go to your dictionary you will find that to be one of its meanings. So, Dr. Williams, one of your scholars, your own witness, is against you.

I do not have Dr. Goodspeed's translation, but it is easy to see if Mr. Harper left out Dr. Goodspeed's punctuation marks as he did in the case of Dr. Williams he has also twisted his translation. A man who would do that once would not hesitate to do it over and over.

Now, he says Dr. Weymouth translates Acts 2:38: "Repent; replied Peter and be baptized, everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ FOR the remission of sins". This is practically the same as the King James' translation. But it does not say "For the purpose of obtaining the remission of sins." That is the point. Is baptism something one must have in order to obtain remission of sins?

It is the blood of Christ that washes us from sins. "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood." Rev. 1:5. Here we see that the blood of Christ washes us from sins.

Now, I issue a challenge to Mr. Harper or any Campbellite to bring the proof that we come in contact with the blood of Christ in the act of Baptism. He must prove that to sustain his point. I affirm that we reach the blood of Christ before baptism. We reach it through faith. "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, etc." Rom. 3:24-25. Here we see faith and not baptism brings us in contact with the blood of Christ.

"By whom also we have access (an entrance) into this grace wherein we stand". Rom. 5:2. We have found we are justified freely by His grace and we have access by faith into this grace. If Mr. Harper wants to say that faith here means the New Testament order of things, let him go back a few verses and read about how Abraham's belief (before Isaac was born) was imputed to him for righteousness. Was Abraham's belief a New Testament

order of things? See Rom. 4:19-22. Then it says this was not written for Abraham's sake only but for ours also to whom it shall be imputed "If we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." Rom. 4:23-24. So it simply has reference to us believing in God as Abraham believed in Him. Then follows the verses saying we are justified by faith and have access by faith into this grace. Rom. 5:1-2.

Now, if I am right in my argument, then I should find some verse that says the believer will receive remission of sins. Can I find it? I certainly can. "To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43.

Now we find in the Exodus of the children of Israel that they were sheltered by the blood of the Passover lamb three days before they were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and sea. Ex. Chapters 12-14. I Cor. 10:1-11. We are told in I Cor. 5:7 that Christ is our Passover. The blood of their Passover was before baptism. The blood of our Passover is before baptism. Now, Mr. Harper, come on with the proof that you come in contact with the blood of Christ in baptism. Let it be "For", "Unto", "In order to", etc., as you quote various men as saying. Do they say that "Baptism is in order that one might obtain forgiveness of sins? Dr. Williams whom you claimed to quote said baptism was separated from forgiveness of sins. He does not say you must be baptized in order to 'have forgiveness of sins.

MATTHEW 3:11 AND ACTS 2:38

John said "I indeed baptize you with water unto (eis) repentance", Matt. 3:11. Does that mean that they were to be baptized in order that they might repent, or as a declaration of their repentance? If you make it "In order to obtain repentance" then you have baptism preceding repentance. Then baptism must have been for the purpose of declaring their repentance. So Dr. Williams teaches in his translation. I can take your "For", "Unto", "In

order to" and meet you on your own ground and show that in no case is baptism "In order to obtain forgiveness" but everywhere and always it is a symbol or expression of repentance, remission of sins, etc.

Let the men say what they really said and do not put interpretations in their translations that are not there. Suppose that some do translate "Eis" in Acts 2:38 "In order to"; which do they mean is "In order to", "Repent" or "Be baptized"? Dr. Williams said he made forgiveness of sins dependent on "repent" and not "be baptized". If others translate it "In order to" do you know that they mean that baptism is "In order to obtain remission of sins"? Quit twisting the translations men make.

ADAM CLARK

Mr. Harper gives Adam Clark's comments on Acts. 2:38. He quotes this man as saying, "For the remission or removal of sins -- (Harper could remember the dash here but forgot it when giving us Dr. Williams' translation) that is "In reference to the remission or removal, of sins." Receive the baptism in reference to the removal of sins? and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost, by whose agency alone the efficiency of the covenant is applied and by whose refining power the heart is purified. It was by being baptized in the name of Christ that men took upon themselves the profession of Christianity and it was in consequence of this that the disciples of Christ were called Christians."

Now Harper adds, "Here we have one of, if not the greatest Commentator on earth saying that, First, you receive baptism; second, you receive the Holy Spirit; third, The Spirit administers the blood of the covenant; fourth Then you are purified." A greater commentator, than Dr. Clark, Luke, the inspired writer of Acts tells us the House of Cornelius, received the Holy Spirit before baptism. Luke's order: Believed, Received Holy Spirit, then, baptized. Acts. 10:43-48.

HARPER A BLIND GUIDE

Mr. Harper's order, taken from Mr. Clark's comments puts baptism before the purification of the heart. The purification of the heart is an inward change. Baptism is an outward affair. So, like the Pharisees, Harper depends upon an outward work to bring an inward cleansing. "Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter that the outside of them may be clean also." Matt. 23:26. Campbellite righteousness is all outward. Depending on baptism, an outward work to make an inward change they become blind guides. Had Mr. Harper's heart been right he would not have tried to deceive by leaving out Dr. Williams' punctuation marks and twisting his translation.

THE ROMAN TOGA AND GAL. 3:27

There was a garment called the Toga, which the Romans "put on" and wore in public as an outward declaration of their position or circumstances in life. (See Webster's New International Dictionary, 1923 Edition, Page 2166. See also works on Roman Antiquities.) The "Toga Candida" was a white toga worn by those who were candidates for office. The "Toga Picta" was a toga adorned with golden stars, and was worn by a great general. From this comes our present day custom of army officers wearing bars and stars on their uniforms to indicate their rank. The "Toga Pulla" was a black toga. It was worn by those in mourning. From this came our present day expression "put on mourning". The "Toga Virilis" was the manly toga. It was worn by young men when they became free from their schoolmaster, pedagogue, tutor, or governor.

Now if we will study Gal. 3:24 to 4:5 in the light of the above Roman custom we can better understand what Paul meant when he spoke about "Putting on" Christ in baptism.

"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster. (R. V. Pedagogue) to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. ---- Now, I say, that the heir as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father." (Here Paul is referring to the Roman custom of putting young boys under the care of a tutor, or schoolmaster, until the time appointed of his father when he should be set free from that schoolmaster.) "Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world," (referring to the law) but when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 3:24-4:5.

When the young Roman reached the time in life when he was set free from his schoolmaster or tutor he publicly declared his freedom by "Putting on" the manly toga, and wearing it in public. So, when the Galatians had been made free from the law, through faith in Christ Jesus they "Put on" Christ in baptism as an outward declaration of their freedom. Baptism does not make us free, but declares our freedom. The manly toga the young Roman "Put on" did not make him free from his schoolmaster or tutor. It was a declaration of his freedom. When a woman "Puts on" black it does not make her a widow, but declares her to already be a widow. A general does not put on his uniform with stars to become a General, but to declare that he is a general. So we "Put on" Christ in baptism for the purpose of declaring our freedom which we already have in Christ. Always, everywhere it is the child of God who is to do the "Putting on". "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." The antecedent of the pronoun "You" in this verse is "Children of God" in the above verse. It was the saints of Rome (Rom. 1:7) whom Paul admonished to "Put on the Lord Jesus

Christ" in Rom. 13:14. It was the "Elect of God" whom Paul tells to "Put on" bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness and longsuffering. Col. 3:12. It was the Ephesian brethren whom Paul told to "Put on" the whole armor of God. Eph. 6:11.

As the Roman put on the various kinds of togas as an outward declaration of his circumstances, so God means for us to demonstrate our relationship to Him by "Putting on Christ" in baptism, to demonstrate ourselves as "the Elect of God" by "Putting on" a kindly disposition which becomes us as children of God.

If the Holy Spirit is the agency through which the blood is applied as Dr. Clark said, then Cornelius and his household received the blood before baptism, since they received the Holy Spirit before baptism.

So far as the writer knows this is a new exposition of this passage of scripture in Galatians. Last spring he ran across this word "Toga" in the dictionary. After this he went to the public library at Poplar Bluff, Mo., and read some books on Roman antiquities. At once it became evident that Paul had in mind the Roman custom of putting their young boys under the care of a servant, called the schoolmaster or tutor. This passage in Gal. 3:24 to 4:5 shows this to be the case. When he spoke to the Galatians about "Putting on" Christ by being baptized, it was evident that he had in mind the custom of the young Roman "Putting on" the manly toga to declare his freedom from his schoolmaster. Baptism is to the child of God, what the manly toga was to the young Roman. The law was the schoolmaster, baptism is our manly toga.

By: G. E. JONES.