

The Baptist Examiner

A nation-wide, independent paper, standing foursquare for the distinguishing doctrines of Baptists, and shunning not to declare all the counsel of God.

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20).

Vol. 2, No. 10

ASHLAND, KY., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1932

Whole No. 26

Seventh Day Adventism Examined

By THE EDITOR

A devotee of Seventh Day Adventism down in Bristol, Tenn., wants to know if we can prove that the Seventh Day Adventist "church" is not the true church. Yes, neighbor, we can prove that quite easily. Seventh Day Adventism does not represent the true church of Christ for at least four excellent reasons, which are as follows:

1. **Jesus founded his own church while on earth and promised it perpetuity; but Seventh Day Adventism was not founded until about 1832-49, and was founded by William Miller and his deluded followers.** That Seventh Day Adventism was founded by William Miller we have the testimony of no less an authority than Elder White himself, one of the principal early leaders and husband of the prophetess. Elder White said: "**We hold that the great movement upon the Second Advent question, which commenced with the writings and public lectures of William Miller, has been, in its leading features, in fulfillment of prophecy**" (Life of Miller, page 6). A thing "commenced" must be different from anything in existence, for "commence" means "**to give origin to; begin; initiate.**" And Miller did not re-commence the church of Christ, because Christ declared that his church should never go out of existence when he said, "**the gates of hell shall not prevail against it**" (Matt. 16:18). If it went out of existence for one moment, contrary to the declaration of Christ, the gates of hell prevailed against it. Therefore, Miller began something different from the church of Christ.

2. **Christ founded his church to preach his gospel; but Seventh Day Advent churches preach Satan's gospel instead.** The gospel of Christ is the story of his death, burial, and resurrection (1 Cor. 15:1-4), which is "**the power of God unto salvation to ever one that believeth**" (Rom. 1:16). Satan's gospel is the teaching of salvation by works either in whole or in part, for both amount to the same since works and grace won't mix (Rom. 11:6). Adventists teach that believers are under the law of God given through Moses, and that our salvation depends upon our keeping this law. They teach that the keeping of the Sabbath is the seal of Rev. 7:1-4, without which they believe none will be taken up with Christ when he comes.

3. **The church of Christ as represented in the New Testament taught that Christ bore our sins in his own body on the cross, and that he, having entered the heavenly temple, with his own blood made for us a complete atonement, thus of himself obtaining the actual forgiveness, remission, redemption, removal, cancelling and cleansing of our sins; but Seventh Day Adventists teach that Christ did not bear our sins on the cross and that he has not yet obtained the cancelling of our sins, but that Satan will finally bear our sins away as the scape goat and that thus they will be cancelled.** For the teaching of Scripture on this matter see 1 Pet. 2:24; Heb. 9:28; Heb. 6:19, 20; 9:12, 24-26; Eph. 4:32; Col. 2:13; 1 John 2:12; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Matt. 26:28; Rom. 3:25; Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 1:18, 19; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Heb. 9:12; John 1:29; Acts 3:19; Col. 2:14; 1 John 1:7. Instead of teaching that Christ bore our sins on the cross and that we have now through his blood a complete redemption and atonement, Adventists teach that Christ only re-

moved our sins to the heavenly sanctuary, and that he is now only cleansing the sanctuary and investigating our sins preparatory to his coming forth and binding our sins on the devil, whom they believe to be represented by the scape goat on the Old Testament day of atonement, and who, having received our sins, is to be annihilated. This is the well known teaching of Mrs. E. G. White, the "inspired prophetess" of Seventh Day Adventism.

4. **Christ is the head of his church (Eph. 1:22; Col. 1:18), but Mrs. E. G. White is the head of Seventh Day Adventism.** They regard her as having been inspired of God to explain the teachings of the Bible. They profess to take the Bible as their authority, but they view it only, as it is seen through the writings of Mrs. White. Therefore, they look to Mrs. White and not to Christ as their head. This accounts for their glaring, absurd, fallacious teachings; and these teachings prove that Mrs. White and not Christ is the head of Seventh Day Adventism, for no sane, normal person would believe them if he studied the words of Christ for himself under the leadership of the Holy Spirit.

Our questioner also wants to know if we can prove that the saved go to heaven and the lost to hell immediately after death. We can prove that the saved at death go to be with Christ and that the lost in hades are in conscious fiery torment. We find our authority for the first proposition in 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil 1:23. Luke 16:23 is ample proof of the second proposition. Of course, our questioner, in harmony with delusion with which he is afflicted, will say that this is only a parable; as though, if that were true, we would be permitted to believe that the passage represents conditions otherwise than they are. The notion that the story of the rich man and Lazarus is a parable is an arbitrary assumption. There is not a hint that this is a parable, and the fact that one of the characters is named is opposed to the idea that it is a parable. But suppose it is a parable. Would Christ have represented conditions after death otherwise than they are? Would it not have been a piece of deception for him to try to influence his auditors with a story not according to facts?

Our deluded neighbor furthermore desires to know our reasons for changing the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first. We haven't changed it. Not being a Jew and not being under the Old Testament law, we do not keep the Old Testament, Jewish Sabbath. Instead we, in harmony with New Testament churches (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1, 2), solemnize the Lord's Day (Rev. 1:10). We keep a different day and for different purposes. The Old Testament Sabbath celebrated the completion of creation and the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. The Lord's Day is in honor of the new creation and celebrates the victory of Christ over death, hell and the grave, by which victory we are delivered from the power of sin. The Old Testament Sabbath was never enjoined upon any except the Jews. It was a sign between God and the children of Israel (Ex. 31:17). The Sabbath command was not moral, but ceremonial. Priests in the temple broke it and were blameless (Matt. 12:5). This could not be true if the

command were moral in nature. The weekly Sabbath was merely one of the "feasts" of the Jews (Lev. 23). Its inclusion in the decalogue gives it special emphasis, but that fact no more binds it upon New Testament believers than if it were not so included; for we are not under the ten commandments (Heb. 12:18-28 with Deut. 4:12, 13). We are under the jurisdiction of mount Zion instead of Mt. Sinai; Jesus instead of Moses; the new covenant instead of the old. Jesus never enjoined the keeping of the Sabbath on his followers, and his command was that they teach his commandments (Matt. 28:20). The church of Christ, therefore, has no commission either express or implied to teach Old Testament Sabbath keeping. No apostle ever enjoined Sabbath keeping on the churches. Like other feasts of the Jews it was a shadow of things to come (Col. 2:16, 17). It typified the rest that believers have through faith in Christ (Heb. 4:1-10). Since Seventh Day Adventists have not ceased from their own works (Heb. 4:10; Rom. 4:5), but are depending on their works for salvation, therefore they know nothing of the rest of faith; and it is fitting that they should be still observing the type just as orthodox Jews still observe the passover, not knowing that the type has given away to the antetype. Christ blotted out the Sabbath commandment for believers, nailing it to the tree (Col. 2:14). It was against us; it was a yoke we were unable to bear (Acts 15:10). Its hard, unyielding requirements made it unadaptable to varying conditions and circumstances. Were it in force, it would hamper and hinder us in our service toward God. "Sabbath-keepers" make only a hypocritical pretension. We have never known a one of them to really keep the Sabbath. They prepare food usually with fire. Both the preparation and the kindling of the fire were forbidden (Ex. 16:23; 35:3). They go out of their dwelling on the Sabbath, which was forbidden (Ex. 16:29); and instead of spending the day in rest, they usually spend it in promulgating their Satanic doctrines. There is absolutely no more reason for saying that these restrictions have been abolished than there is for saying that the Sabbath commandment as a whole has been abolished. The Sabbath and all the laws relating thereto stand and fall together.

In keeping the Lord's Day voluntarily as a privilege in obedience to the example of New Testament churches, we are following the example of our Father in his rest from secular labor after six days of work. In keeping the Lord's Day, we do not follow the letter of the law (not being under the law); but the spirit of the law written in our hearts (2 Cor. 3:6; Heb. 8:10). The secret of the proper observance of the Lord's Day is not in objective rules and regulations, but in being in the Spirit on the Lord's Day (Rev. 1:10). This is the liberty we have in Christ, and we are commanded to stand fast in it (Gal. 5:1).

But, if we were still under the law, there is not a single syllable of it that would require us to keep Saturday as the Sabbath. The law required simply one rest day after six days of work (Ex. 20:9-11). The Jewish Encyclopedia says: **"The phraseology of the commandment does not fix the six days; the definite article before 'seventh' implies merely that the day referred to is that following any group of six consecutive days."**

The folly of the Adventists' supposition that Saturday is the day that coincides numerically with the seventh day of the week of creation is matched only by their other vagaries. Did God keep the American Saturday or did he keep the Asiatic Saturday? And has time come down to us in uninterrupted seven-day periods of one hundred and sixty-eight hours each? How about the extended day of Josh. 10:13, was it counted as one of the regular days in the week? If so, then the succession of twenty-four-hour day periods was broken, and Adventists today cannot be keeping the right period. And if not, then, since this extended day was thirty-six hours long—the sun remaining up twenty-four hours—the limits of the day would have to be changed and Adventists should begin the Sabbath at sunrise instead of at sunset! But the Sabbath of creation's week and the Sabbath of Israel began at sunset (Lev. 23:32;

Neh. 13:19). Which horn of the dilemma will you take, Mr. Adventist? Either one of them will prick the insides out of your sabbatarianism.

Then let the Adventist take note of the fact that Israel reckoned time from the time that God gave them directions about their exodus from Egypt (Ex. 12). And their Sabbaths were doubtless reckoned from that or from the time that God began to give them manna (Ex. 16:22).

And perhaps some Adventist will be kind enough to tell us what Adventist missionaries do when they go to China. Do they set up a day, as is the custom, when they cross the International Date Line? If not, when they get to China their Sabbath period is between our Saturday morning and Sunday morning; and they keep a part of the hated American Sunday! But worse still, this would make their Sabbath period fall between the Chinese Saturday evening and Sunday evening; and they will be rated by Chinese Seventh Dayists as pagan sun-worshippers! But if they do follow the custom and set up a day, when they get to China their Sabbath period will begin with our Friday morning and end with our Saturday morning, and they will be found working at the time when American Seventh Dayists are abstaining from work under the pain of eternal death. Can a thing be morally right on one side of the world that is morally wrong on the other side? Do missionaries keep the Chinese Saturday, and teach the Chinese so? If so, why? If they can change their Sabbath period to conform to Chinese days, why cannot Seventh Dayists in America change their Sabbath period to conform to the American "legal Sabbath?" Is the number of the day an objection? Suppose we change the first to the seventh, would that alter the moral nature of the day? Is it because Sunday is named after the sun that this change cannot be made? If so, do they not know that Saturday was named after the Roman god, Saturn? Or is the change refused because they say Sunday was the day when pagans worshipped the sun? If so, they make an assertion that is opposed to facts. The pagans had no special weekly day of worship. Will they say that it is because Constantine or some Roman pope changed the day of rest and worship? If so, they show their ignorance for Sunday was observed long before Constantine and before there was a pope. Its observance began in New Testament times (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2) and was continued by the followers of Christ.

So, Mr. Adventist, when it comes to the question of the proper time for observing your Sabbath in different parts of the world, you are in a mess any way you turn. The reason for this is that God gave the Sabbath to one nation and one nation only. Your insistence on all nations observing it puts you face to face with a dilemma with several very sharp prongs on each horn. We specialize in made-to-measure dilemmas for all errorists.

We challenge any and all Seventh Day Adventists to reply to what we have said. Our neighbor desires also that we take a shot at the Adventists' theory of soul sleeping. This we will gladly do, the Lord willing, in our next issue. And we promise to make it look like the hole in a doughnut with all the cake taken from around it.

"Let us follow only God's Word and we will have no Christ-Mass, nor Easter, nor Children's, nor Mother's, nor Father and Son, nor any other day devised by men, whether heathen, Catholic, Universalist or what not; but we will seek to observe every day in the fear and service of God, as His word teaches and His Spirit leads."—Pastor W. C. Pierce, Catlettsburg, Ky.

"Please send me ten copies of the last issue (March 1st) of the Baptist Examiner I don't think I have ever before seen quite as much sound teaching on the doctrine of election in one little paper as is found in this issue of the Examiner."—Elder C. G. Sego, Tennessee Ridge, Tenn.

WHY THE WASHING OF FEET IS NOT A CHURCH ORDINANCE

By THE EDITOR

In an article some time ago we gave ten points of difference between Baptists and Roman Catholics. We stated the fact that Baptists recognize only two church ordinances. One of our readers wrote us immediately and asked why we did not include the washing of feet as a church ordinance along with baptism and the Lord's supper. We now undertake to show why the washing of feet is not now and never has been a scriptural church ordinance.

1. **We wish to say first of all that there is nothing in the command of Christ to indicate that the washing of feet is a church ordinance.** Christ commanded the apostles to follow his example in the washing of one another's feet (John 13:14, 15,) but there is nothing in this command to hint that this was to be done in church capacity. This command is purely an individual matter. It had to do with the duty of the host or hostess toward the guest.

2. **Christ performed and commanded an act of service, but the washing of one another's feet today is no longer an act of service.** All those who are even remotely acquainted with the customs of the times when Jesus walked this earth know that people in that day wore loose sandals. This made the very frequent washing of feet necessary both for the sake of comfort and cleanliness. One of the first duties of the host or hostess when a guest arrived was to at least provide water for the washing of the feet, because it would be very uncomfortable and unsightly to sit with the dust and sand that had collected on the feet and in the sandals as the guest had walked along way. Christ commanded his followers to go farther than merely provide the water; he commanded them to actually wash each other's feet. They were thus to perform an act of lowly service. But because of the change in footwear the washing of one another's feet today (except in cases of sickness, death, or some emergency) is no longer an act of service; it is nothing but a piece of needless, meaningless formality. It would be taken as an insult (and rightly so) today for one to offer to wash a guest's feet, for such would imply that the guest was very neglectful of bodily cleanliness. To insist that the command of Christ is still in force literally when there is no longer need for the act is to miss the true meaning of his command. It is to exalt the letter at the expense of the spirit. To follow the spirit of Christ's command let us perform real acts of service for one another.

3. **Nowhere in the New Testament epistles is the washing of feet mentioned as a church ordinance.** We have ample instructions in these epistles about baptism and the Lord's supper, but not a word about the washing of feet as a church ordinance. This is as certain proof that New Testament churches did not practice the washing of feet in church capacity as a corresponding silence is proof that they did not recognize a pope, nor adore images, nor pray to Mary, nor confess their sins to a priest, nor practice extreme unction.

4. **New Testament believers practiced the washing of feet as an individual matter in the home.** Proof of this is found in 1 Tim. 5:10. This verse gives some of the qualifications of widows that were to be enrolled as worthy of receiving material assistance from the church. Each one of these widows must **"have washed the saints' feet."** Now if the church at Ephesus (which was the one to which Timothy was ministering at the time of receiving this letter) had been practicing the washing of feet in church capacity, each member of the church could have fulfilled this qualification; and its mention among the qualifications of widows that were deserving would, therefore, have been needless and meaningless. The mention of the washing of feet in this connection shows conclusively how New Testament believers regarded Christ's command. They regarded it as an individual matter belonging especially to the home. It was on the par with rearing children, lodging

strangers, relieving the afflicted, etc.

5. **Our washing of one another's feet does not symbolize any spiritual truth.** Therefore the washing of feet is wholly unlike baptism and the Lord's Supper and deserves no place as a church ordinance. There was a beautiful meaning attached to the washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus. It pointed to the maintaining of our fellowship with Christ in spite of the recurrent defilement of sin, or the restoration of that fellowship when it (our fellowship with Christ; not our legal standing in him) has been broken by temporary spiritual declension, which Christ accomplishes by bringing us to repentance and confession through the work of the Holy Spirit. John 13:8-10 strikingly conveys this beautiful and gracious meaning. In these verses there are two Greek words used to convey the idea of cleansing—"nipto" and "louo." The latter has reference to the bathing of the whole body, while the former has reference to the washing of parts of the body, such as the hands and feet. When Jesus said to Peter (v. 8): **"If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me,"** he used **"nipto"**. And when he said (v. 10): **"He that is WASHED needeth not save to WASH his feet,"** he used both words—"louo" in the first case and **"nipto"** in the second. In these two quotations Jesus clearly points out the meaning of his washing of the disciples' feet. In the first quotation Jesus could have reference to nothing else other than spiritual cleansing, for he did not literally wash the feet of many who had part with him then and he has not literally washed the feet of any of the living who now have part with him. Then in the second quotation Jesus discriminates the kind of cleansing he has reference to in the first quotation. When Peter was informed of the importance of spiritual washing of the feet, he misunderstood Christ's meaning and impulsively asked for a complete bath. Jesus then told him that he needed not a complete bath, but only the washing of his feet. The complete bath (indicated by **"louo"**) typified the **"washing of regeneration"** (Titus 3:5), wherein there is a **"washing of water by the word"** (Eph. 5:26). While the washing of the feet (indicated by **"nipto"**) typified the maintenance and restoration of our fellowship as already pointed out. See 1 John 1:7, 9. When Christ said to Peter: **"What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter,"** we believe he meant that the washing of Peter's feet had special and particular reference to Peter's restoration after his fall. We have the record of this restoration in John 21:15-17. This was the deep spiritual meaning of the washing of the disciples' feet by Christ. But the washing of one another's feet cannot have this meaning. The washing of feet by Christ typified the continual cleansing which we receive from Christ. Christ said: **"If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me."** It is Christ that washes all of us and not we that wash one another. Therefore, the washing of one another's feet can have no spiritual significance.

But some one may say: **"Yes, but when we wash one another's feet we show our humility."** That brings to mind a pertinent story. A man came to his pastor and said: **"Pastor, I believe you are a good man, and you preach some excellent sermons; but it seems that you are lacking in humility."** The pastor said: **"Perhaps I am lacking in humility. In fact, I often feel that I am. But I suppose you are a very humble man."** The man replied: **"I sure am; and I take pains to show it, too."** Which of the twain was the humblest, the pastor who acknowledged his lack or the other who boasted and sought display? Moral: Supposed humility vainly displayed is a species of pride.

In closing we will sum up what we have said by saying that there is not one sound or scriptural reason for practicing the washing of feet as a church ordinance. It is nowhere mentioned as a church ordinance, and was not so practiced by New Testament churches. It is not such an act today as Christ performed. When engaged in by us it possesses no true spiritual significance. If it teaches anything, it teaches the untruth that we cleanse one another from sin. It does not show humility, but is a vain, useless, meaningless display that betokens pride rather than humility.

The Baptist Examiner

Published Semi-Monthly By The Editor
4758 Winchester Avenue
Ashland, Kentucky

T. P. SIMMONS.....Editor
C. D. COLE, Plant City, Fla.....
ROGER L. CLARK, Martin, Tenn.....
A. N. MORRIS, Doerun, Ga.....
W. M. WEBB, Texarkana, Ark., Tex.....
R. Y. BLALOCK, Caldwell, Idaho.....

Contributing
Editors

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

Domestic Subscriptions, per year in advance - - - - \$.50
Foreign Subscriptions, per year in advance - - - - \$.75

The paper will not be sent to any one beyond time paid for, except by special arrangement.

Entered as second-class matter Jan. 6, 1932, at the post office at Ashland, Ky., under the act of March 3, 1879.

A PRINCE IN ISRAEL IS FALLEN

The body of H. Boyce Taylor sleeps and his spirit has gone to be with the Lord Jesus Christ (Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23). He loved the Lord Jesus Christ and his truth with a supreme, sacrificial, and consuming devotion. He fought a good fight. He kept the faith. We should have liked to witness his entrance into the presence of God. The day of his entrance must have been a gala day in heaven. Surely there was a great multitude at the gates to receive him (Luke 16:9). We can fancy that the angelic choir sang its choicest anthem of welcome. For him to live was Christ and to die was gain (Phil. 1:21).

Perhaps no man in modern times has done so great a work for God and his truth as did Boyce Taylor. Eternity alone will reveal what he has meant to Baptists. How different things would have been without the ministry he rendered! Doubtless the writer would never have been contending as he is (though it be but weakly) for the once delivered faith had it not been that the Lord touched his life both directly and indirectly with the life of Boyce Taylor. We would like to know how many preachers there are who, in the plan of God, owe much of their doctrinal soundness to Brother Taylor. He is gone personally, but he still lives in the lives of others.

We are told that forty-eight years ago he was advised by doctors that he could not live long and that he ought to refrain from work. Did he heed the doctors' advice? No, it was not Boyce Taylor to do that! It was to heaven he looked for his orders. And he received no such word from the Great Physician. The life that he lived in the flesh he lived by the faith of the Son of God (Gal. 2:20). He could see no faith in turning from his labors so long as he had the strength to continue. He decided if he had only a little while to live that he would fill it as full as possible with labor for the Lord. So instead of quitting, he redoubled his efforts. And in the providence of God that little while lengthened into forty-eight years of intense labor that few men could have endured! He was physically immortal until he finished his work for the Lord.

The ranks of truth's army show a wide gap since his going. Only the omnipotent God can fill that gap. And we are glad to know that he will do that very thing. God buries the workers, but carries on the work.

We differed with Brother Taylor on some things; yet we agreed with him in the main. We revere his memory and praise the Lord that he lived.

Let all lovers of the truth's for which Boyce Taylor stood take new courage and rededicate their lives to God. The need

that confronts us is greater now than ever before. Let us not fail to come "to the help of the Lord against the mighty" (Judges 5:23).

INDORSEMENTS OF "THE EVILS OF SECRETISM"

Perhaps some that have not studied the lodge question and who read "The Evils of Secretism" for the first time when it appeared in a recent issue are wondering if the tract is authentic. Especially will such be made to wonder this if they discuss the matter with some lodge devotee that knows very little himself about the nature of Masonry and who does not mind to lie to shield his beloved lodge. Therefore we give below some indorsements from ex-masons, which indorsements were printed in the tract that formerly carried the discussion:

"So far as I know Masonry, and I have served either by election or appointment in every station in the Blue Lodge, 'The Evils of Secretism' by T. P. Simmons brings a very truthful accusation against it. I fail to see where any one can say he has unjustly accused the order.

"C. R. BARROW," Pastor,
Fredonia Baptist Church,
Fredonia, Ky.

"As an ex-Mason, and one that withdrew from the lodge for conscientious reasons, I am glad to give a word of indorsement to 'The Evils of Secretism.' To the best of my knowledge and belief, it is my candid opinion that every statement in the paper is true. I am enthusiastically backing the publication and circulation of the paper because I believe it to be a truthful, timely, and needed indictment of a growing evil. I wish to add a hearty amen to the entire paper, and I pray that God will give it a wide circulation to the end that the eyes of many may be opened to the glaring evils of secretism.

(Pastor) "L. M. WINSTEAD,"
Madisonville, Ky.

"The author of 'The Evils of Secretism' is personally known to me to be a Christian gentleman of the highest type. He would not, knowingly, misinterpret any man or creed to establish his own views. This is evident from the extensive study made of the subject under consideration.

"For many years I was an active member of the Blue Lodge of F & A. M., and served for a time as Master. Like many other honest and conscientious Masons, I gave little thought concerning the character and true significance of the teachings of the institution. However, my eyes were ultimately opened to the inconsistency that exists between the teachings of the Bible and those of Masonry. Seeing that a man could not be true both to Christ and to Masonry, I severed my connection with the latter. May the Holy Spirit open the understanding of that great host of Masons who desire to know and do the right, to see the truth as set forth in this work.

"So far as I am informed, 'The Evils of Secretism' maintains a strict regard for facts, and presents arguments that are unanswerable. Had I not previously severed my connection with Masonry, as an honest man and a follower of Christ I could do nothing else after studying this work of the author.

"Yours in His grace,
"E. E. SPICKARD," Pastor,
Livermore Baptist Church,
Livermore, Ky.

THE CHURCH THAT IS CHRIST'S BODY

Some time ago a devout woman wrote us in part as follows: "We agree in general with Baptist doctrine, but we cannot possibly concede the Baptist church to be the church. There is no schism in the church which is His body. Christ is head of an undivided body." We replied: "The local church is the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:27). And this local church of

which Paul spoke had divisions in it (1 Cor. 3:3). Christ has but one kind of church and body, and that is a local, independent organism. All believers constitute the kingdom of God, but not the church. [And if they did, the church would be far more divided than it is]. The church is an "ekklesia", an assembly. The "one body" of Eph. 4:4 is no more one universal body than the one baptism of verse 5 is one universal baptism. The one body is one kind of body, just as the one baptism is one kind of baptism. There is no such thing as "the Baptist church," unless you use the expression in the generic sense, as I am persuaded the term body is used in Eph. 4:4.

A LETTER TO JEWS

Dear Hebrew Friend:

Have you ever thought, "Why two Testaments?" Was not the Old Testament sufficient in itself? If not, why not?

The most startling thing is this,—the prophecy of the New Covenant is contained in the Old, over 500 years before it was sealed by the blood of its Testator, Jesus Christ. Jeremiah, a Jewish prophet, writing 606 B. C., said:

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the house of Israel, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of Egypt; which covenant THEY BREAK, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord." Jeremiah 31:31, 32.

A sinful people were unable to keep a holy law. The new covenant, therefore, must supply the power to keep its requirements. Reading on in Jeremiah (31:33, 34):

"This shall be the covenant that I will (at a future time) make with the house of Israel: I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Israel accepted the old covenant, saying: "All these things we will do," and failed miserably. Under the new covenant God said, "I will," and he provided a perfect sacrifice,—His Son, our Passover,—and placed His Spirit,—God, the Power,—in our hearts. And it is "to the Jew first." Under the new covenant, hopeless and helpless man is led to hope. His salvation is offered to him by God without any work or merit on his part. It is a free gift.

"By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" Ephesians 2:8.

'This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him.' Matthew 17:5.

Yours respectfully,

CHAS. WISENBERG,

2248 Westchester Ave.,

New York City.

(This and other similar letters can be obtained free from the above writer for mailing out to your Jewish acquaintances. A worthy piece of mission work.—Ed.)

THE OLD DOCTRINES

C. M. SHERROUSE, Biloxi, Miss.

In these days of sensationalism and boasted liberality of religious thought and belief we seldom hear the old gospel doctrines brought to the front. Is it because they are not applicable to our day and generation? Is it possible that we have so very greatly "advanced" in morality and righteousness that the doctrine of total depravity does not apply to us? Gen 6:5, 11, 12; Ps 10:2-12; Ps 14:1; Ps 53:1-3; Ish. 1-4; Jer. 17-9. How about the Bible teaching of condemnation; the necessity of repentance, faith, justification and regeneration? Why do we hear so little of church order, ordinances, rights, duties, obligations, and corrective discipline? We hear of the mercy of God and the goodness of God; but who preaches or writes of the justice of God, the wrath of God, and the vengeance of

God? Are not these attributes of God as much as the first named? Read Ezeikel 18:4-20; Jer. 51:6; Jude 6, 7; Mich. 5:15; Ish. 13:9-12; Nahum 1:2, 3; Luke 21:22; 2 Thess. 1:8; Rev. 6:16, 17. To be sure, we are taught that God is love, but it is also declared that, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Heb. 10:31. "For our God is a consuming fire." Heb. 12:29. "He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16:16. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment" (eternal death). Matt. 25:46. There seems to be, also, a strong disposition, by many, to overshadow gospel churches with organizations of human origin; societies of many and varied kinds. "All is not gold that glitters." Nor are all modern inventions and innovations that assume the name of Jesus scriptural. Go to the New Testament and get a photograph of the FIRST church and compare any or all man-made institutions that claim to be churches, or "branches" with the original model church established by our Saviour and Lord Jesus, the Son of God. Many could not be recognized as counterfeits; so very different are they from the model. Would to God that all our pastors and editors had the courage of the apostles and first disciples of Christ that they might fearlessly, yet lovingly, as did the apostle Paul, declare "all the counsel of God." Acts 20:27. There is great tendency to please the carnal mind and cater to the demands of the world, rather than to give people the whole truth in love, which is one of the greatest needs of our day. "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand." Ezek. 3:17, 18.

If your subscription has expired, we urge you to renew at once. You should appreciate the reduction in the price from one dollar to fifty cents. Your prompt renewal will help us in our effort to publish the truth. You will help us more if you will send one dollar and include another subscriber along with your renewal. It is a hard fight to publish a paper like the Baptist Examiner. We need the help of every lover of the truth.

THE TABERNACLE BAPTIST

AMARILLO, TEXAS

An independent Baptist Paper standing for the Great Doctrine of the Bible, the independence of local churches and the leadership of the Holy Spirit.

Devoted to Bible exposition, Sermons, Bible study and devotional life. Editorials on present day trends in church life and denominational matters.

Published semi-monthly at \$1.00 per year. Twelve pages to the issue. Carries an exposition of the International Sunday School Lessons.

Sample copy on application. SUBSCRIBE NOW.—Adv.

"Saved From the Shackles of Hell"

By REV. D. F. DESIST

A thrilling and gripping recital of his own conversion from Catholicism to Christianity. An exposure of Catholicism by one who broke out of its darkness into the light of Christ.

Price 75c. (A tithe goes to missions.)

Order Direct From

REV. D. F. DESIST, Station B., Clarksburg, W. Va. —Adv.

A LAYMAN'S DIGEST OF "THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM RECORD 1931" COMPARED WITH THE RECORD OF 1930:

I.—AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS IN GENERAL

	1930	1931	Increase or Decrease	Per- cent
1—Total Receipts of State Mission Board.....	\$434,506.82	\$368,356.60	—\$66,150.22	—15.2
2—Total Amount Contributed by Designating Churches.....	424,302.74	361,421.02	— 62,881.72	—14.8
3—Total Amount Designated by Designating Churches.....	98,659.69	71,923.13	— 26,736.56	—27
4—Total Amount Contributed by Non-designating or Budget Churches.....	10,204.08	6,935.58	— 3,268.50	—32
5—Largest Amount Contributed by Designating Church.....	22,546.47	21,564.86	— 981.61	— 4.6
6—Largest Amount Contributed by Non-designating or Budget Church.....	548.31	302.95	— 245.36	—44.7
7—Average Total Amount Given by Designating Church.....	522.38	422.32	— 100.16	—19.1
8—Average Total Amount Given by Non-designating Churches.....	34.24	27.52	— 6.72	—19.6
9—Average Total Amount Given by Designating Church to Budget.....	391.86	338.19	— 53.67	—13.6
10—Average Total Amount Given by Non-designating Churches to Budget.....	34.24	27.52	— 6.72	—19.6

II.—AS TO CHURCHES AND ASSOCIATIONS:

1—No. Churches Listed in Exhibit.....	1993	2012	+	19	
2—No. Churches Contributing Something.....	1129	1108	—	21	
3—No. Churches Contributing Nothing.....	864	904	+	40	
4—No. Churches Designating.....	831	856	+	25	
5—No. Churches not Designating Giving to Budget Only.....	298	252	—	46	—15.4
6—No. Churches Designating All.....	167	220	+	53	+24
7—No. Budget Churches Giving \$10.00 or Less.....	119	107	—	12	—10
8—No. Budget Churches Giving \$100.00 or More.....	20	11	—	9	—45
9—Percentage of Churches Giving Nothing.....	43 %	44 %	+		
10—Percentage of Churches Giving Something.....	57 %	66 %	+		
11—Percentage of Churches Giving to Budget Only.....	14.9%	12.5%	—		
12—Percentage of Churches Designating.....	41.6%	42 %	+		
13—No. of Entire Association Contributing Nothing.....	2	3	+	1	+50
14—No. of Entire Association Having Only One Contributing Church.....	4	5	+	1	+25
15—No. Associations With All Churches Contributing.....	2	0	—	2	—100
16—No. Associations With Only One Contributing Church.....	2	3	+	1	+50
17—No. Associations With Only Two Contributing Churches.....	8	5	—	3	—62.5
18—No. Churches Designating Half or More.....	119	133	+	14	+11.8

III.—AS TO RECEIPTS OF FUNDS:

1—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists to Foreign Missions.....	\$111,970.39	\$ 97,738.82	—\$14,231.57	— 8.7
2—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists to Home Missions.....	47,223.06	40,654.21	— 6,568.85	—13.9
3—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists to State Missions.....	100,980.12	93,197.94	— 7,782.18	— 7.7
4—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists via Budget to Southwide Education.....	22,819.95	20,439.54	— 2,380.41	—10.4
5—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists Special to Southwide Education.....	11,656.44	3,196.68	— 8,459.76	—72.5
6—Total Contributed by Kentucky Baptists to Southwide Education.....	34,476.39	23,636.22	—10,840.17	—31.4
7—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists via Budget to Education in Ky.....	45,131.33	38,882.61	— 6,248.72	—13.8
8—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists Special to Education in Kentucky.....	37,460.08	52,777.40	+ 15,317.32	+40.8
9—Total Contributed by Kentucky Baptists to Education in Kentucky.....	82,591.41	91,660.01	+ 9,068.60	+10.9
10—Contributed by Kentucky Baptists to Education (Special).....	6,024.89	4,261.56	— 1,763.33	—29.2
11—Grand Total contributed by Kentucky Baptists to All Education.....	123,092.69	119,557.79	— 3,534.90	— 2.8

IV.—MISCELLANEOUS NOTATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS:

- 1—The above figures, taken from printed exhibit in pamphlet form gotten out by the State Board for both years, the 1931 record also occurred in the Western Recorder under dates of February 4th and 11th.
- 2—Not all of record is included in this digest which can be extended along several lines very instructively.
- 3—Thirty-seven (37) Churches reported in 1931, not listed in 1930.
- 4—Eighteen (18) Churches reported in 1930, not listed in 1931.

EDITORIAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE FOREGOING

The foregoing digest was prepared and sent to us by an esteemed Louisville layman on his own initiative. It reveals some interesting information and should provide material for profitable study. We make the following observations on this digest:

1. Out of 1,108 churches that contributed something in 1931, 856 churches designated part or all of their contributions. This shows that the tendency to designate is very strong. And the number of churches designating in 1931 was 25 more than those designating in 1930. This shows that the tendency to designate is on the increase. This is a healthy indication. More and more churches are getting tired of machine domination.

2. It will be seen also that the designating churches are the largest givers. For whereas the designating churches rep-

resent 42 per cent of the total number, yet they gave approximately 99 per cent of the total contributions.

3. But whereas there was a decrease of 30 per cent in contributions for Foreign, Home, and State Missions so-called, there was a decrease of only about 3 per cent in gifts to all educational causes and an increase of about 11 per cent in gifts to education in Kentucky. This shows that there is more and more of a tendency to specialize on education. There seems to be a feeling that our schools must be supported regardless of what happens to missions. Then when we reflect that a good part of the amounts credited to missions is spent in exorbitant overhead expense, in W. M. U., and B. Y. P. U. work, in Sunday school and enlistment work that is more or less valueless in the scriptural progress of the churches, and in schools and hospitals on the foreign field, the former of which are proving a curse, we see that true, scriptural mission work is getting a very small part of the total gifts. Then

added to this consideration is the fact that few, if any, of the foreign missionaries are preaching the whole counsel of God. In another article we have already called attention to some of the looseness in the foreign mission work of the Southern Baptist Convention. Some years ago we had contact with a native Chinese that had been converted by missionaries of the Foreign Board. This Chinese seemed to have no doctrinal

backbone, and he spoke repeatedly of a union meeting that was held in one of the Foreign schools in China.

4. We suggest to some interested person that it would be very informing if we had a display showing just what was done with the money given for Foreign and Home Missions in the South and State Missions in Kentucky. We shall be glad to publish such a display if some person will prepare it.

Why Wine and Not Grape Juice in the Lord's Supper

By THE EDITOR

Nearly a year ago we in some way made reference to the use of wine instead of grape juice in the Lord's Supper, and one of our readers asked us for proof of our position. Since that time we have been giving the matter some further study preparatory to the writing of an article on it. Not long ago we were written to concerning this question, and we find that it is a very live question in a certain section of the country. We find a good deal of difference of opinion among Baptists on this question: some contending for the use of grape juice, others contending for the use of wine, and still others contending that it is immaterial as to which is used. Only one of these three groups can be right. And the one that is right ought to be joined by all. And, even though the question of itself were a trivial one, it would be worthwhile to discuss it for the sake of harmony and uniformity among Baptists; for differences that involve conscientious scruples always have a divisive and paralyzing effect, however small they may be. This question is not of the greatest importance; neither is it trivial. It is not a trivial thing to seek to know how to best "show forth the Lord's death till he come," and how to do it in complete harmony with scriptural practice. **"He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much"** (Luke 16:10).

We hold that wine should be used. We believe we came to this position through unprejudiced study. There was a time when we had never studied the question and paid no attention to the matter. Then we came to study it, and were inclined in favor of grape juice mostly, perhaps, through aversion to alcoholic drinks. Then later we were drawn over in favor of wine. But even after that, we came to wonder if grape juice did not match the unleavened bread better than wine. And it was not until this question was thoroughly settled in our mind that we became firmly established in our present position.

We have three reasons for holding that wine instead of grape juice should be used in the Lord's Supper. They are as follows:

1. **Christ used wine in the institution of the supper.** In order to ascertain this point we talked with one well-informed converted Jew and with one Jewish Rabbi. The former is Eld. Henry Singer, erstwhile Superintendent of the Hebrew Christian Mission of Detroit, Mich. When asked on this point, Mr. Singer replied that the Jews of Christ's day used fermented wine in the Passover. Mr. Singer has a tract on "The Jewish Passover and the Lord's Supper," and in this tract he says: **"Every Jew in the night of Passover must have four cups of red wine."** Reference to Prov. 23:31 will show what kind of wine "red" wine is. The other one consulted is "Rabbi" Abraham Feinstein of Huntington, W. Va. Mr. Feinstein, without hesitancy, said that the Jews of Jesus' day used fermented wine in the Passover. And when asked if there could be any doubt of this, he replied in the negative. We also wrote the American Board of Missions to the Jews of Brooklyn, N. Y., about this matter. Our letter was answered by J. Hoffman Cohn, General Secretary. He said: **"Every Jew knows that the Passover Supper must be celebrated by the drinking of real wine, and not unfermented grape juice. . . . You will find all this fully corroborated if you will consult the Jewish Encyclopedia,**

which is the most dependable and authoritative on all matters Jewish."

Now there is absolutely no satisfactory reason for assuming that Christ broke with Jewish usage on this point and used grape juice in the farewell Passover. Some arrive at this conclusion by reasoning in a circle. This deprives the conclusion of any force. Also the conclusion is false because the premise that all drinking of wine is essentially wrong is false. This is assumed in the face of the fact that Christ turned the water into wine at the wedding in Cana. The remark of the ruler of the feast proves that this was real wine and not just grape juice. This is assumed also in the face of the fact that just before his death Christ drank "vinegar" (Mark 15:36; Matt. 27:48; John 19:28-30), which, according to Thayer, Broadus, Hovey and W. N. Clarke (the latter three being writers in "An American Commentary on the New Testament") was the sour wine that the soldiers drank. Also we find Paul exhorting Timothy to take wine as a medicine (1 Tim. 5:23). And it was only the excessive use of wine that was forbidden to bishops and deacons (1 Tim. 3:3, 8; Titus 1:7). A. T. Robertson of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, of world-wide reputation as a scholar, said in a letter under the date of Sept. 14, 1927: **"I know of no reason in the world why the wine mentioned in the New Testament was not real wine. The Jews used it diluted with water (one-third wine, two-thirds water)."** J. W. Porter, editor of the American Baptist and also of quite a reputation as a scholar, being mentioned in "Who's Who" of America, takes the position that the wine at the marriage of Cana was fermented wine. He said, in a letter under the date of Sept. 17, 1927: **"In John 2:9, 10 the governor of the feast said: 'Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now'. Here the reference is clearly to the fact that after men had drunk freely of the good wine, they would not so easily detect the difference, owing to the effect of the wine. Grape juice does not stimulate, and would make no sense used in this connection."** Editor Porter said further: **"Dr. John A. Broadus, who is generally regarded as one of the world's greatest Greek scholars, takes the position that it was wine, and not grape juice. In fact no one, so far as my information extends, ever questioned the fact that it was wine until in recent years."** Peloubet's Bible Dictionary says: **"It has been disputed whether Hebrew wine was fermented; but the impression produced on the mind by a general review of the above notices is that the Hebrew words indicating wine refer to fermented, intoxicating wine."** Again: **"A great attempt has been made to prove the wine drunk at the Lord's Supper unfermented, by and for the sake of temperance workers of our day and nation. Such attempts are apt to do more harm than good, among those familiar with eastern customs today, or the history of those nations. But the apostle Paul has stated the case for total abstinence in Rom. 14 in such a way that does not need the treacherous aid of doubtful exegesis for its support."**

The writer is a prohibitionist; always has been and always will be. But he will not let the fact so prejudice him as to blind

him to scriptural facts and cause him to evade those facts. Prohibition does not need this in its defense. It is today a social necessity because of the abuse that has been made of alcoholic drinks. And had alcoholic drinks always been confined to wine, prohibition would probably never have been necessary. However, the writer is a total abstainer from all alcoholic drinks except for sacred or medicinal purposes.

2. The church at Corinth used wine and received no correction from the Apostle Paul in this matter. We know that the church at Corinth used wine because through abuse of the supper some became drunk (1 Cor. 11:21). A Greek lexicon will show that the Greek word here means exactly what we commonly understand from the English term "drunken." Other cases of the use of the same Greek word (methuo) will be found in Matt. 24:49; Acts 2:15; 1 Thess. 5:7. Concerning the word in 1 Cor. 11:21 we read from "An American (Baptist) Commentary on the New Testament": **"The word itself means is drunk, and nothing softer. The passage is conclusive as to the wine used by them at the Lord's Supper."** Now the fact that under such circumstances the Apostle Paul did not prohibit the use of wine is a very strong argument indeed for the use of wine. Argument from silence is not always strong or even valid; but in this case it is strikingly both. Surely, if it had been improper to use wine in the Lord's Supper, the apostle would have said so, since some had done such an unseemly and vicious thing as to get drunk on the wine. It is said today by some that it ought not to be used because it puts a temptation before the weak. Was not Paul as much concerned for the weak as these are? We know from his writings that he was supremely concerned for the weak. Then he must have had some conscientious scruple that prevented his forbidding the use of wine! Marcus Dods says: **"Although the wine of Holy Communion had been so badly abused, Paul does not prohibit its use in the ordinance. His moderation and wisdom have not in this respect been universally followed. On infinitely less occasions alterations have been introduced into the administration of the ordinance with a view to preventing its abuse by reclaimed drunkards, and on still slighter pretext a more sweeping alteration was introduced many centuries ago by the Church of Rome."**

Now, in the face of Paul's failure to forbid the use of wine in the Lord's Supper in the light of the fact that some of the members of the church had actually gotten drunk at the time when the supper was supposed to be celebrated, what shall we say of those today who oppose the use of wine in the Lord's Supper through fear of injuring the weak? Their argument sounds very much like the argument against immersion for baptism on the ground that it is indecent.

3. The symbolism of the supper demands wine. On this point we find some very curious reasoning on the part of some in insisting on grape juice for this same reason. We find a Seventh Day Adventist paper thus contending. Also a Sunday school paper for young people published somewhere in the North. And this is the contention of one converted Jewish rabbi to whom we wrote. But that this contention is false and that grape juice does naturally contain leaven (a type of sin and evil) ought to be apparent to any one upon a moment's reflection. If grape juice did not contain leaven, it would not ferment. In answer to our query concerning this matter, Frederic J. Haskin, Director of Information Bureau at Washington, D. C., gave the following significant reply: **"The Bureau of Plant Industry of the U. S. Dept. of Agriculture says that grapes naturally contain a leavening agent and that this is present in the juice."** Does the Bureau of Plant Industry know what it is talking about? We invite proof to the contrary. Then comes the question as to what becomes of the leaven in the process of fermentation. In answer to this Mr. Haskin continues: **"The leaven is used up in the process of fermentation so that the finished product or wine does not contain any."** Therefore, we contend, that it takes fermented wine to match

unleavened bread, and that the former is as essential as the latter. The fruit of the vine that properly represents the sinless blood of Christ must not have any leaven in it. Therefore, wine should be used.

But some one asks if the use of wine in the Lord's Supper is not a violation of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Law. We answer that it is not; but if it were, we would be under obligation to obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29). But happily the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Law prohibit intoxicants only for "beverage purposes" and exempt wine used for "sacramental" purposes. But some one asks what is to be done about the pledge that many have made when young never to touch any intoxicants. We reply that scriptural consistency and the proper commemoration of the Lord's death should come before a pledge or anything else. It is better to break a pledge than to fail to properly keep this memorial. God does not hold any one responsible for the keeping of a pledge that hinders him in properly honoring Christ. Stick to your pledge in general, for it is a good one; but do not let it come between you and the proper observance of the memorial of Christ's death. To do so would be a sin.

GIVE GLORY IN THE CHURCH

B. F. VANCE, Bristol, Tenn.

Paul commanded that we give glory (manifestation of divine nature) to God "in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." (Eph. 3:21). The bride of Christ (2 Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:23-32) is the only church in which any one can give God glory. Two men in Bristol have pledged themselves to pay one hundred dollars to any one who will prove by the Bible that this church is not the perpetuated Bible Baptist church; the one that Jesus in Matt. 28:20 said that he would be with always to the end of the world.

The first communion service held in this Baptist church was in an upper room at night in a private house in Jerusalem. That was certainly restricted, local Baptist church communion—only the eleven charter members being present! A few Saturday nights ago our Bible Baptist church of Bristol, in an upper room in a private home, duplicated that first celebration of the Lord's Supper as nearly as possible—only charter members being present. There were no deacons. The minister officiated in all the service—the same as was carried out in the first.

I met two men this morning, who, when asked if they knew who the bride of Christ is, said "No." Isn't it a shame that she has been sat down on, crowded out, and kept in the background by these men-made, "gates of hell" churches, until very few would-be Baptists know her. I have been trying to introduce her to a waiting world; but it is a slow work. For if you are not clear in your articulation, you need not be surprised to hear some one say: "Truly glad to meet you Mrs. Campbell (Christian)." Let every true Bible Baptist pray the Lord for help in bringing this bride ("My dove, my undefiled . . . the only one of her mother"—Cant. 6:9) to the front and see that deserving people get acquainted with her! When Ham was here eight weeks he never once attempted to introduce her to his great crowds, but shouted: **"Join the church of your own choice!"**

Quite a number of our friends have sent us one or more subscriptions each besides their own. For this we thank them very heartily. Others have not. If you are in the latter class, how about showing this issue to your friends and asking them to subscribe for the paper? By getting subscriptions from your friends you can both help them and us. What do you say?

Extra copies of this issue for sale at two and one-half (2 1-2) cents per copy.