

FOREWORD 1

WRONGLY DERIDING CHRISTIAN BRETHERN 4
 A REPLY TO DR. H. A. IRONSIDE “WRONGLY DIVIDING THE WORD OF TRUTH”

“PUERILE AND CHILDISH DIATRIBES” 29
 A REPLY TO DR. H. A. IRONSIDE WATER BAPTISM AND THE SCRIPTURES

WHEN IS A FINE PIECE OF EXEGESIS A VAGARY? 39
 A REPLY TO DR. JAMES M. GRAY “WATER BAPTISM AND THE SIGNS GIFTS” MOODY MONTHLY EDITORIAL, JUNE 1935

FOREWORD

Dear Readers:

In the interest of fair play, as well as for the sake of defending the Truth of God I make this appeal.

In this booklet are printed two messages, the first entitled, “Wrongly Deriding Christian Brethren”, an open letter to Dr. Harry A. Ironside, Pastor of the Moody Church, the other an open letter to Dr. James M. Gray, Editor of the Moody Monthly, entitled “When Is a Fine Piece of Exegesis a Vagary?” The first letter is my third reply to Dr. Ironside’s recent publication, “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth”, a reprint of a series of messages published during the past few months in “Serving and Waiting.” The letter to Dr. Gray is in reply to his editorial in this month’s issue of the Moody Monthly.

Most of you know that the storm is raging, because I do not agree with these brethren concerning the place of water baptism in the program of the Church. Under date of March 27, 1933 Dr. Gray wrote me that I was to be commended for standing for my conviction concerning water baptism. May I explain to the readers that I did not bring this subject to open controversy. As pastor of North Shore Church for the past twelve years I have never baptized any one. I did not believe that water baptism was compatible with the message of grace or had any place in the dispensation of the mystery when I accepted the call. For nine years I never preached nine sermons on water baptism. I taught it to the people of this assembly in Bible classes. We have had more than 2500 sinners walk down the aisles to accept Christ since I have been here and I will guarantee to any one that more than 2000 of them had been baptized with water. We have never made water baptism a basis of fellowship with any Christian. The majority of our Conference speakers have been immersionists. When I came to this pastorate we were supporting one missionary; now we have ten. Five of these ten believe in water baptism.

I agree 100 per cent with both Dr. Ironside and Dr. Gray on all of the Christian fundamentals; in the verbal inspiration of the Bible; the eternal Deity of the Lord Jesus

Christ; salvation by grace alone on the basis of faith in the sacrificial, redemptive work of the Lord Jesus Christ; that the moment a sinner repents and receives the Lord Jesus Christ he is immediately baptized into the death, burial and resurrection of the Saviour without any water baptism, and without that baptism he is seated with Christ in the heavenlies as a member of His Body. I believe in the same separated life of holiness that they believe in.

We differ as to the religious program for members of the Body of Christ. If water baptism is not required for membership in Christ's Church—as both of these brethren teach—then why is it necessary for membership in man's church? The answer is “Not the Scriptures”, but “the tradition of the elders.” I have been trying to find some Scriptural exegesis for the selection or rejection of the commandments, gifts, teachings and orders of the Four Gospels, the Book of Acts and I Corinthians. I cannot see what right any Christian has to promiscuously, capriciously and arbitrarily go from Matthew to II Timothy and select or reject what he pleases and include it in a denominational creed without any intelligent Scriptural principle.

May I say that these two Doctors and Mr. Norman Camp are responsible for this open controversy concerning water baptism. Dr. Gray started it with an article in Moody Monthly in 1933, in which article he condemned the teaching of those who did not agree with the baptizers, but his Scriptural refutation was almost as weak as this month's article. Then Mr. Camp and Dr. Ironside, against the advice of some of their good friends, insisted on an open discussion of the subject in the Moody Memorial Church, in one of the sessions of the Illinois Fundamental Ministers Association. Mr. Camp acknowledged that the resolution was directed against me; and he and Dr. Ironside tried in every way to keep me from an opportunity of defense. Those who attended the meeting know something of the injustice: and I have some information concerning the prearranged agreement that has not been made public.

May I say that I can show to any one interested more than 150 commandments, gifts, messages, miracles, signs, etc. which were in the program of Jesus of Nazareth and the Church of the Acts period that neither of these Doctors practice. Neither do they agree among themselves. Dr. Gray says that the Great Commission is not for this age; but that the Lord's Prayer is. Dr. Ironside says that the Great Commission is for this age but that the Lord's Prayer is not.

Both of these learned and gifted Bible teachers, spiritual leaders of America, will acknowledge that they do not exercise any of the sign gifts of I Corinthians 12:8 to 11, except as all Christian preachers are prophets. They do not know of any Christian who does practice any of these gifts, except the counterfeits practiced by deluded religious people. Instead of offering some Scriptural corrective for the counterfeit practice and delusion, they condemn the servant of the Lord who presents the only intelligent Scriptural remedy for the disease that is troubling Fundamentalism on all sides. They say that the remedy is worse than the disease. Why? Because there is no Scriptural explanation to account for the absence of the genuine gifts of the “Acts” Church that will not rule out any and all of the different 20 theories concerning water baptism as taught and practiced by the 200 divisions and subdivisions of the Body of Christ, which Body is instructed to keep the unity of the Spirit on the basis of one baptism. Ephesians 4:3 to 6. What is the matter, when all Grace preachers are agreed concerning the great fundamentals, but are so ungraciously divided on water baptism? Has Satan used any one thing more successfully to divide members of the Body of Christ?

Now, we suggest that you read Dr. Ironside's book, “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth”, and Dr. Gray's editorial, “Water Baptism and the Sign Gifts,” If you are familiar with

the writings of these brethren, these last messages may cause you to exclaim, “how have the mighty fallen”; for it must be admitted that these two men are looked up to as few spiritual leaders of this generation. How many young preachers there are who are kept from being Bereans because their eyes are upon these outstanding champions of the faith!

Undoubtedly Dr. Ironside’s book will shock you, because of the methods he has used. And you will be dumbfounded at the weakness of Dr. Gray’s article, in which he does not deny that Pentecostalism and similar movements are leading people into a Satanic delusion. He commends the effort of any brother to offer a corrective, but closes by acknowledging that the corrective must be found in Dr. Warfield’s church history. To think of admitting that there is no corrective in the Scriptures for that which is unscriptural!

Dr. Ironside’s, book is filled with misrepresentations, false charges against spiritual men of God, exaggerations, sarcasm and a number of plain contradictions of statements that he has made in his other printed messages. It is unbelievable that such a highly esteemed brother, such a noble servant of the Lord, would resort to such uncharitable, unjust and ungracious attacks upon men of like precious faith, and especially upon one of the most spiritual men of God who ever lived in any generation, Dr. E. W. Bullinger, a beloved brother who has departed to be with Christ, a brother who was highly praised by Dr. James M. Gray in the Moody Monthly in 1933, although Dr. Gray did not agree with all of Dr. Bullinger’s teachings.

Only once before can we recall that Dr. Ironside resorted to such abuse against his brethren and the tactics of Rome in an endeavor to intimidate Christians and keep them from going on from childhood to manhood in the Scriptures, as he is now doing, by the cry of “Bullingerism”. In his words which we quote, you will see that he accused other men of the very course he now pursues. In February 1926, concerning the Plymouth Brethren, Dr. Ironside wrote: “The Brethren have been largely engaged in kicking each other, in trying to get earnest Christians out of systems, in forbidding their people to listen to preachers who preach the truth in different denominations, in rejecting fellowship with other believers, in lofty and ridiculous claims to be The CHURCH without the ability to tell the inquirer which one of the twenty or more fighting factions among themselves occupies the true Church crowd.”

I cannot help but believe that Dr. Ironside is going to acknowledge that he wrote the messages of “Wrongly Dividing” in the energy of the flesh, and will repent; asking his brethren to forgive him; and we know that they will freely do so. If there is any way in which he can be persuaded to meet in an open meeting some of his so-called “ultra dispensationalist” brethren, whom he has vilified and maligned, we will convince you of his false charges.

Because Dr. E. W. Bullinger, like many other Bible students, could never reconcile Romans 16:25 and 26 with Ephesians 3:3 to 11, he suggested that Romans 16:25 and 26 were added as a postscript. He quoted some evidence to support this although he never was able to definitely prove it. Dr. Ironside has branded as “higher critics” those who suggest such an attempt to reconcile these seeming contradictions. In John Darby’s writings his Synopsis (Romans), the sixteenth chapter, he declares these two verses to be a postscript.

We sincerely trust also that a meeting can be arranged, with a number of Christian brethren present, that there might be the opportunity to present to those who are concerned some facts not yet made known about the cancellation of our broadcast contract with the Moody Bible Institute. Dr. James M. Gray put me on the air after a thorough, diligent, careful study of my doctrinal position on water baptism and the Body of Christ. Then he put me off the air at the urge

of men with whom he does not agree any more than I do. As to the weakness of his present editorial, would ask our readers to carefully read my open letter to Dr. Gray in this book.

During the Bible Conference at North Shore Church, to be held June 17th to the 21st, we shall openly discuss Dr. Ironside's book and Dr. Gray's editorial. We sincerely trust that we can urge both of these brethren to be present and they shall receive, the most courteous and gracious respectful hearing and consideration. This is an invitation to you to be present. If these two brethren have other engagements that will prevent their presence at the time suggested, we shall be very happy to meet them at their own appointed times.

Trusting that our readers, after prayerful consideration, will see the justice and necessity of this foreword and these open letters for the advancement of truth, and for the defense of Christian brethren who have been wrongly derided, I remain:

Most cordially yours in the matchless grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.
J. C. O'HAIR

WRONGLY DERIDING CHRISTIAN BRETHREN

Chicago, Ill., May 20, 1935

Dr. Harry A. Ironside, Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Doctor Ironside:

I have just finished reading your new book, "Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth," the reprint of your "Serving and Waiting" articles, concerning ultra-dispensationalism.

Your book makes me think of childhood; childhood literally and childhood spiritually. You undoubtedly enjoyed the same games that other boys enjoyed, and you will remember how we delighted to build with our blocks to see how high we could make the building just to have the joy of knocking it down. In your messages you have invented or imagined some differences that do not exist between you and your ultra-dispensationalist brethren. Some of the extreme views you mention are held by some brother here and there who has withdrawn fellowship from all except his little circle. Some of the dispensational differences which you mention in your book actually exist and to these we shall presently refer. Your acquaintances know the ultra-dispensationalist brethren that you are after, and you should have told them that these brethren are just as much against Universal Reconciliation as you are and that they agree with you one hundred percent on all the Christian fundamentals. I do not know one of them who believes in soul sleeping. I do not know one of them who would rob any Christian of one word that the Lord Jesus spoke while He was on earth, that is intended for the members of the Body of Christ. Every one of them, with whom I am acquainted, would apply to the spiritual life of every member of the Body of Christ virtually every instruction of the Lord Jesus Christ that you apply, and some of them would even hesitate to take away from them the Lord's prayer, as you have done. Why blame Bullingerism for the teaching of Universal Reconciliation any more than you do for Russellism, which teaches very much the same doctrine? There is nothing in Dr. Bullinger's teachings that would lead a man to any such doctrine, or to careless living, as you falsely charge.

Pardon me, if I misjudge you, but I do not believe that the Holy Spirit had anything to do with your messages. And this for two reasons; first, because the Holy Spirit never leads a

Christian to exaggerations or misrepresentations and He never leads any one to the misapplication of the Holy Scriptures; and, second, because the Holy Spirit never leads a believer to manifest the spirit that you have manifested in your messages. I believe that you have written in the energy of the flesh, and if you wrote after sundown, you disobeyed Ephesians 4:26 and 27. "Be ye angry and sin not: let not the sun go down on your wrath." I have quoted 26, and now you read 27 and it may cause you to fall upon your knees and repent of your sin and to write a letter of apology to your brethren who love the Lord Jesus Christ and His precious Word just as much as you do, and who would lay down their lives or suffer any other loss before they would teach one thing contrary to His truth. All of these brethren have for years put your dispensationalism to the test and have found it faulty, full of inconsistencies, and altogether unsatisfactory for the understanding and reconciling of the Scriptures.

Perhaps you have heard of the man who in anger called his neighbor about every name he could call him, and then added, "But understand me, I don't mean to insult you." In your church paper you said you wrote with malice toward none. Who could believe that after reading your messages? On the last page of your book you said that you had not desired to belittle any of your brethren. You called them "unspiritual theorists," "Bullinger and his ilk," "ecclesiastical hobby riders," "heretics," and what not. Still you would not think of belittling them. You did not even show ordinary respect toward a beloved brother in the Lord, who, although he was always a thorn in the flesh to the Plymouth Brethren, was one of the noblest and most spiritual Christians since the days of the apostles, a brother who could have done for you what Aquila and Priscilla did for Apollos. If you are unwilling to call him "Brother Bullinger", you might have used the "Doctor", as no man was ever more entitled to that degree. I see you use it concerning yourself. You speak of the "astute Bullinger". What would your friends think if after your death some Christian should write of you as "the infallible Ironside?" I have read your books and the books of Dr. Bullinger, and have the perfect Scriptural right to disagree with both of you on some of your teachings, which I do; but, beloved brother, he has no more blunders in his writings than you have.

I see that you claim to have been a student and a teacher of the Word for nearly 40 years. Surely then you know that the greatest gift is "love". Surely you must believe that the Lord can do more for any believer in 40 years in the manifestation of that gift than your book indicates has been done for you. As a spiritual leader, really are you not ashamed of yourself? If not, you ought to be. Those who know you best know that the thing you are defending is the tank of water and that you merely bring in the other side issues to prejudice and confuse the readers.

You prove that the Body of Christ of the "Acts" period is the Body of Christ in Ephesians by the use of I Corinthians 12:26.

"Whether one member suffers, all the members suffer with it."

Theory is one thing; practice is another. If you are conscientious and sincere in your contention, what do you think the Lord will require at your hand for bringing suffering to your fellow-members? You certainly did not spare them. But we obey Ephesians 4:32, and for Christ's sake forgive you. Perhaps some one has misinformed you, if indeed you have written upon information; for I am sure that the testimony of every believer, who has been delivered from the error of your dispensationalism, and advanced to what you call "ultra-dispensationalism", is that it has brought him into a happier spiritual state and made him to love the risen Lord as never before. Personally I have never known one of them to be guilty of the charge you make on page 19: "They look down from their fancied heights of superior

Scriptural understanding with a certain contempt upon godly men and women.” I believe that you know in your heart this is not true. You are either imagining many things or inventing them. You claim that you believe that Matthew 18:15 to 18 is the Divine method of settling differences. Have you tried it?

It is deplorable that there must be fights among the soldiers of the Lord, but let’s have them fair. Why is it that the brethren who are opposed to the interpretation of the ultra-dispensationalist resort to false charges against brethren instead of to the Scriptures which are profitable for correction? It is because their Scriptural attempts are as futile as yours are. To carry your point you malign your brethren with false charges; but you fear to meet them with an open Bible as you have been invited to do.

NOBLE BEREANS

We are not boasting when we sometimes refer to ourselves as “Bereans”. You are familiar with Acts 17:11: “These were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so.” That’s our test, brother. As a teacher of the Word, you should be one hundred per cent in favor of it.

Pray tell me, if Paul was giving out the Mystery of Ephesians and Colossians when he was at Berea, how could the Bereans have searched the Scriptures to see whether these things were true, when you admit that this Mystery was not in those Scriptures that the Bereans were searching. Therefore Paul was not preaching the Mystery in Berea; for the Mystery has to do with the unsearchable (untraceable) riches of Christ. This is the important issue which we shall discuss with you in this message, and try to convince others, if we fail with you, that your “puerile diatribe” (thanks for the name); is a splendid example of your subject “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth.”

On the last two lines of Page 24, after you have stated that the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 is water baptism, you add, “But this is simply interpretation, and all might not agree as to it.” Why did you not say this concerning some thirty or forty other statements you made in your book? Can’t you see that Christian brethren can have honest differences? Get over your wrath. An intelligent student of the Word of God cannot agree with your plain contradictions of the Scriptures, even if you endeavor to force him to do so by ridiculing his teaching, defaming his character, and trying to discredit his testimony.

You could do much more for the cause of Christ and for the understanding of the Word of God among Bible students, if you would get victory over your prejudice pride and bitterness and gather in a prayerful spirit of meekness with a company of brethren. Can you not see that you are the one who is guilty of the attitude which you charge to your brethren? We will meet you at any time you indicate with as many witnesses as you desire.

I quote from page 41, “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth”

“Was this Mystery made known by other servants besides the apostle Paul? It was. The apostle John makes it known in His account of our Lord’s ministry as given in the tenth chapter of his Gospel. OTHER SHEEP I HAVE WHICH ARE NOT OF THIS FOLD. THEM ALSO I MUST BRING, AND THERE SHALL BE ONE FLOCK AND ONE SHEPHERD.” This is perhaps the earliest intimation of the mystery that we have. It shows us that John, as an

apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, had received the revelation of the mystery even before the apostle Paul did.”

“Then what of the apostle Peter? We dare to say this same Mystery was made known to him on the housetop of Simon’s residence in Joppa, when he had the vision of the descending sheet from Heaven.”

“The greatest of all the New Testament prophets is Luke himself, and in his book of Acts, the mystery is plainly made known.”

And from page 42:

“Unto me (Paul), who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ: and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ Ephesians 3:8 and 9.

And from page 25:

According to God, the new dispensation, that in which we now live, the dispensation of the grace of God, otherwise called the dispensation of the mystery, began the moment the Spirit descended at Pentecost.” “

And from page 44:

“He (Paul) had been a minister of the Gospel. That Gospel has been preached in all the creation which is under heaven. He had also been made a minister of the mystery which hath been hidden from ages and generations.”

Now you and I have a splendid starting point because we are thoroughly agreed that the mystery was not the subject of prophecy; that is, that Israel’s Old Testament prophets did not write concerning the “dispensation of the mystery.” Even the most superficial student of the Word of God must agree with us on this point, if that student believes the plain words of Paul in Ephesians 3:5, 8 and 9 and Colossians 1:24 to 28.

The Scriptures did foresee that God would justify the heathen by faith, even when the Gospel was preached to Abraham 430 years before the Old Covenant was established; for Galatians 3:8 so declares. This justification made Gentiles seed of Abraham and children of Abraham. Galatians 3:7, 9 and 29. Therefore, the mystery among the Gentiles was not becoming seed of Abraham. The Lord on earth declared that many would come from the east and the west and sit down in the kingdom of heaven with Abraham. Matthew 8:10 to 12.

The Scriptures did prophesy that God would take out from the Gentiles a people for His name. For this is the language of Acts 15:14 to 17, quoted from Amos 9:11 to 15: “how God for the first time did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His Name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written. “AFTER THIS I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David.” What meaning is there for us in the words “AFTER THIS?” If the Body of Christ is spoken of in verse 14, concerning the outgathering of Gentiles, it was the subject of prophecy; and the sons of men in other ages did speak of the mystery. If verse 16, and not 14, is the subject of prophecy, then the prophets knew that the Body would be chosen before the tabernacle of David would be rebuilt. By either interpretation Peter contradicts Paul’s statements in Ephesians and Colossians.

I think you and I are agreed that the One New Man of Ephesians 2:15 is included in the mystery which Paul declares that he received by revelation from Christ. We are also agreed that the New Man was purposed in Christ Jesus before God had any prophets or before He made any promises to Abraham, even before the foundation of the world. According to your arguments the One New Man of Ephesians 2:15 can be Scripturally called “The New

Covenant (Testament) Church”, “The Church of God”; “The Body of Christ.” You say the members of this Church can be called today “The Seed of Abraham” and “The Children of Abraham (spiritually)”. Then surely there can be nothing unscriptural about calling the Body of Christ, “The Abrahamic Covenant Church.” If we have Scriptural right to call members of the Body of Christ spiritual children of Abraham, why object to calling the Body of Christ, ““Spiritual Israel”, in the light of Romans 11:11 to 28?

Honestly brother, do you not believe that there is as much Scriptural authority for calling the Body of Christ, “Spiritual Israel”, as there is for calling that Body, “The One Flock of John 10:16?” Does not the One Flock speak of Israel? Is not that One Flock the subject of prophecy? Does not God speak of Israel as His flock thirteen times in the 34th chapter of Ezekiel? Does not God say in Ezekiel 37:24, “they shall all have one Shepherd?” “And I will make them one nation; and one King shall be king to them all.” Ezekiel 37:22. How about Jeremiah 31:10, “He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd does his flock?” “He shall feed His flock like a Shepherd.” Isaiah 40:11.

Now, surely you teach that Jesus Christ is to be the Shepherd-King of Israel in the coming Kingdom age when Israel shall be in their land under Christ their King and Messiah. You also teach that Jesus Christ came to this earth to be the Shepherd King of Israel, and because they would not receive Him as King, their House was left desolate; and on the day of Pentecost the dispensation of grace, the dispensation of the mystery, began; and then and there the Body of Christ began historically with the advent of the Holy Spirit about 50 days after the death and resurrection of Christ. You must acknowledge that the Lord Jesus had a flock when He was on earth; for He said, “Fear not little flock; it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.” Luke 12:32. Was not the flock of Luke 12:32 the same as the flock of John 10:16?

If so, and if the flock of John 10:16 was the mystery, so also was the flock of Luke 12:32.

According to your arguments The Body of Christ is One Flock and Christ is the Shepherd. You must also believe that the Nation Israel is to be the One Flock and Christ the Shepherd. So there is a “Body” Flock and a “Kingdom” Flock, two separate flocks. Then if someone speaks of a “Body” Church and a “Kingdom” Church, why such vigorous protest?

You say that Luke plainly made known the mystery in the Book of Acts. On page 40, the last line, you say, “the mystery is that during the present age all distinctions between believing Jews and believing Gentiles is done away in Christ.” On page 39 you say, “the distinction between Jew and Gentile was abolished in the cross, not after Paul’s imprisonment in Rome.” And yet you say on page 41, in reference to Peter’s vision on the housetop some seven years after the cross, “This was to him the intimation that in Christ the distinction between Jew and Gentile was HENCEFORTH to be done away.” Now, which was it, HENCEFORTH from the cross or HENCEFORTH from Peter’s vision? There are seven years difference. All during those seven years Peter was filled with the Holy Spirit. Why did he not know that the dispensation of grace and the dispensation of the mystery began at Pentecost?

In Acts 26:22 and 23 Luke declared that the gospel light that was being shown to Jews and Gentiles, by the suffering and resurrection of Christ, was according to prophecy. The salvation of Jews and Gentiles in the Book of Acts, therefore, was the fulfillment of the Old Testament Scriptures, and could not have been the mystery which was not made known to other generations. That mystery that was hid in God. Surely anything that was known by Moses and all the prophets and made known in the writings, centuries before Christ was born, could not be the mystery which Christ revealed to Paul years after his death and resurrection;

for that mystery was wholly unknown to Moses and all the prophets. Thus we know that the offer that was extended to Israel, by the mouth of Peter, in Acts 3:19 to 26, which was spoken of by Moses, Samuel and all of Israel's prophets, was not the mystery of Ephesians and Colossians. That Gentiles were to be saved and made to rejoice with Israel was no mystery. Romans 15:10. That was told by a number of Israel's prophets. Therefore, the mystery must be something that is still a mystery to you.

Again may we ask you the question, If Paul in His Acts ministry was proclaiming the mystery that was not in the Old Testament Scriptures, how was it that the Bereans searched the Scriptures to check up on him?" They certainly couldn't find in the Scriptures that which was a secret hid in God when those Scriptures were written. Ephesians 3:8 and 9.

In Acts 17:2 Paul's message was an argument from the Scriptures. Could Paul have convinced those Jews from the Scriptures that Christ was to be the Saviour of both Jews and Gentiles? Certainly. Could he have convinced them from the Scriptures that God was making a New Man, seated in the upper-heavenlies, blessed with all spiritual blessings, chosen in Christ before Abraham was and before Adam was? Certainly not. Because that could not be found in the Scriptures and Paul would not have been foolish enough to reason out of the Scriptures concerning that which was not made known to the sons of men in other ages.

By reading Acts 15:14 to 17 any student of the Word of God should know that what Peter received in the vision of sheets was not the mystery unknown to the prophets, because the prophets foretold the very thing that Simeon declared. Peter's vision was necessary to tell him to begin his ministry to the Gentiles which was foretold by Amos and other prophets. But that Gentiles should be joint-heirs in a joint-Body was not made known to Amos and other sons of men in other ages. Ephesians 3:5. If the Bible is right, you must be wrong. I prefer the Bible to your statements.

You expressed such a beautiful thought in your Lectures on Colossians, page 27:

Doctrinal correctness will never atone for lack of brotherly love. It is far more to God that His people walk in love toward one another than they contend valiantly for set forms of truth however Scriptural." If it is far more to God that His children walk in love than that they contend valiantly, what about the comparison when they contend, but not valiantly?

Now your expression is beautiful on paper, but it would be more beautiful in practice. Let's agree to practice it; what do you say? Let's be good Christian friends and love each other in spite of our differences, and hereby agree not to resort to unfair and ungracious personal attacks in defending our dispensational views. Permit me to bring to your remembrance your words on page 61 in your Colossians; "If I set at naught any fellow-believer, I am to that extent failing to keep this unity."

CHILDHOOD DOCTRINE

"FOR EVERY ONE THAT USETH MILK IS UNSKILLFUL IN THE WORD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS; FOR HE IS A BABE. BUT STRONG MEAT BELONGETH TO THEM THAT ARE OF FULL AGE, EVEN THOSE WHO BY REASON OF USE HAVE THEIR SENSES EXERCISED TO DISCERN BOTH GOOD AND EVIL."

"THEREFORE, LET US GO ON TO PERFECTION." Hebrews 5:13 to 6:1.

"THAT WE HENCEFORTH BE NO MORE CHILDREN." Ephesians 4:14.

“WHEN I WAS A CHILD I SPAKE AS A CHILD; I UNDERSTOOD AS A CHILD; I THOUGHT AS A CHILD; BUT WHEN I BECAME A MAN, I PUT AWAY CHILDISH THINGS.”

It does seem to me, dear brother, that you desire to put a premium on ignorance concerning the deeper and higher truths in God’s Book. You acknowledge that there is a real advance in truth from the second chapter of Acts to the second chapter of Ephesians. On page 8 of your “Colossians” you say that Colossians has to do with Christ as Head of the Body, known no longer after the flesh. This is indicated by the “henceforth” in Paul’s statement in II Corinthians 5:16. But if some other student of the Word of God sees the difference between the whole counsel of God in Acts 20:27 and the eternal purpose of God in Christ in Ephesians 3:11, you call him names. Is it not possible that that which you designate “ultra-dispensationalism” is “strong meat” and perhaps, you are unable to take it?

So many have suggested to me that you cannot afford to change your position because you have written so many books setting forth your interpretations and theories that you must continue to condemn all contrary opinions in defense of your printed messages, and yet in this message you contradict the statements in some of your most recent books.

By brethren who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and in truth your interpretations have been weighed in the balances and have been found wanting and unsatisfactory. You seem to be bothered very little about the seeming contradictions in the Bible, which are more than seeming contradictions, if your interpretations are correct. Of course, you can lead those who are not “Bereans” and who look upon you as a big Bible teacher, but be careful, brother, that you do not lead them astray. To me, it is difficult to understand how a man of your ability, intelligence and long experience in Bible teaching cannot see how you make the Bible contradict itself.

These brethren, whom you ungraciously refer to as men of the Bullinger “ilk”, are diligently studying the Bible to see if there is not a Scriptural answer to the ever-increasing Pentecostal and Healing delusions which are proving such a menace to Fundamentalism. This is one reason why we have urged you to meet with a group of brethren, who belong to the same Body of Christ to which you belong, who love the same Christ and the same Bible that you love, and see if we cannot get together in the spirit of love and fairness rather than resort to such ungracious and unjust methods as you employ. And you know, dear brother, that you care for little else than water baptism in all of this controversy. It is your defense of your own peculiar views concerning that religious ceremony that makes you so bitter.

You will admit that no Bible teacher is infallible and not one of them has reached finality as to the interpretation of the glorious truths in Colossians, Philippians and Ephesians. Let us not go backward. Let us go forward.

You teach in the Dallas Seminary and enjoy fellowship with the president of that seminary. He wrote an article in the monthly magazine, “Revelation” concerning the Mystery or Body, and in that article he said it was not unto John and Peter that the revelation of the Body was given; but it was given specially and specifically to the apostle Paul. Is he an “unspiritual theorist” because he disagrees with your statement that John knew it before Christ died and Peter received it in his housetop vision?

INSTRUCTION GIVEN BY THE LORD IN THE GOSPELS

On page 22 of your book, “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth”, in the first long paragraph you are discussing the messages and miracles of Peter and Paul. Then you begin

paragraph 2 with the question, “What then is the conclusion?” and thus you answer the question: “It is wrongly dividing the Word of truth to seek to rob Christians of the precious instruction given by our Lord Jesus in the Four Gospels, though fully recognizing their dispensational place.”

Now, in the first place, what has the conclusion of the second paragraph to do with the argument of the first paragraph? Paul’s imprisonment and miracles were not during the years covered by the Four Gospels. And surely you are not here suggesting that you believe that the Church of Christ should today duplicate the divers miracles performed by Christ and His apostles. All of your ultradispensationalist brethren believe just what you believe concerning the miracles of the Four Gospels. You say that you fully recognize the dispensational place of the Four Gospels. If you had stated in your message what you recognized to be the dispensational place of the Four Gospels, your readers would have learned that you believe virtually the same as we believe. Can you name one precious instruction of the Four Gospels of which we have robbed Christians that you have not taken away from them? Remember the Lord’s words against pretense. Have you robbed Christians of that most precious instruction of the Lord Jesus, “the Lord’s Our Father prayer?”

The Lord gave precious instructions to his disciples in Matthew 10:5 to 8; “Preach the Kingdom of heaven at hand; heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons ... Provide neither gold, nor silver nor scrip for your journey; neither two coats; neither shoes.” Do you preach Matthew 5:5, that the meek members of the Body of Christ will inherit the earth? Do you obey Luke 10:4 to 9? Can you accomplish what the Twelve accomplished according to Luke 9:6? Do you obey the precious instructions of the Lord Jesus recorded in Luke 12:33: “Sell that ye have, and give alms, provide yourselves bags which wax not old”? Do you tell Christians to obey Matthew 8:4? Do you leave your gift before the altar and go to be reconciled to your brother? Matthew 5:24. If you follow this precious instruction of the Lord in the Four Gospels, get busy, brother. Do you anoint yourself when you fast? Do you obey Matthew 5:40 to 42, “give to him that asketh thee and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away?” Do you take any thought for the morrow? Do you preach the Parables of the Kingdoms, other than the seven, as belonging to the Dispensation of Grace? Are you going to be with the Twelve Apostles when they shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel? Matthew 19:28. Are you going to drink of the fruit of the vine in the Father’s kingdom? Are you preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, “he that endureth unto the end the same shall be saved? Are you preaching “strive to enter in at the straight gate”?

I can prove to any intelligent group of Christians that you exclude from the program of the church of which you are pastor more than fifty of the precious instructions given by the Lord Jesus in the Four Gospels. Then this question of Romans 2:21, “Thou, therefore, which teachest another, teachest not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?” Have you not robbed Christians of just as much as we have, if teaching them to test the things that differ is robbery? Let’s be honest, sincere and gracious in our dealings with one another.

Did not the Lord Jesus distinctly say, when He was on earth, “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel?” He said to the Twelve, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles.” Matthew 10:5 and Matthew 15:24. Several years after He went back to heaven He said to Paul, “I will send you far hence to the Gentiles.” Acts 22:21. If the Lord, while on earth, did not open the door of faith unto the Gentiles, and if He tells us that this was done some years later (Acts 14:27), should we not do what you suggest, fully recognize not only the

dispensational place of the Four Gospels, but the dispensational place of the early chapters of Acts?

I believe that you would glorify the Lord and please the Holy Spirit, if you would write a confession of your sin against your brethren. They have no desire to be proud, stubborn or disagreeable. They all long for fellowship with Grace preachers and Bible teachers who are called Fundamentalists, but rather than sacrifice their God-given convictions, they are willing to forego that joy. They boycott no such brother because he immerses or sprinkles; and if you do not know it, I have proof to convince you that this agitation about water baptism was started by the baptizers and not by those who believe that the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5, which is for the Body of Christ, has nothing to do with water. If you are so sure that you have the true Scriptural interpretation concerning water baptism and that that interpretation is so clearly taught in the Bible, why is it that you go to such limits to belittle and discredit your brethren in your determination to keep Christians from hearing the objections to your interpretations? This is simply a repetition of church history. I am willing that the people whom I serve as pastor shall hear your views. Will you give me a chance before your people?

As I have said to you before, our differences as to water baptism, the gifts of the Holy Spirit and the Dispensation of the Grace of God and the Dispensation of the Mystery, are because we do not agree as to when the Nation Israel was set aside. Some one said to me the other day, "I don't care when the Dispensation of the Mystery began; I don't care when the Body of Christ began historically; I don't care when the dispensation of Grace began. That Dispensation is here now; and I am in the Body and I got into that Body just like you did, and it is my business to get others in. So let's quit quarreling about it." That sounds commendable, but how about our task of selecting a program for the present-day Church? How much of the Kingdom program of the Four Gospels is for us? How much of the "Acts" Church program is for us? In order that we might answer this Scripturally, we must go on from "childhood" doctrine to "manhood" truth.

As we do this, let's agree to do our best to obey the Golden Rule in our discussion, if that precious instruction is for this dispensation.

SIGNS AND GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT

It is more than difficult for any one to read your statements concerning signs and miracles and determine just what you believe. Perhaps many of us would be wiser, in the judgment of men, if we were as vague in expressing our convictions. You claim that the signs of Mark 16:17 and 18 were only to follow the apostles. You say on page 220, "the signs accompanied preaching the Gospel," and yet you make the following four statements:

"More than that, if we can place the least reliance upon early church history, the same signs frequently followed other servants of Christ, as they went forth in obedience to this commission, and this long after the imprisonment of the Apostle Paul."

"It is not true that a definite limit is placed in Scripture upon the manifestation of sign gifts, and that such gifts have never appeared since the day of the apostles."

"The statement has also been made that all miracles ceased with Paul's imprisonment, that there were no miracles afterward. What superb ignorance of church history is here indicated."

"However, it is perfectly plain that the nearer we get to the close of the Acts, the less we have of signs and wonders."

From these statements we would judge that you are contradicting your statement as to signs for the apostles only.

Such vague teaching concerning signs, healing and other miracles coming from our outstanding Bible teachers, upon whom so many Christians depend for the correct teaching of the Word of God, and which leaves such uncertainty in the minds and hearts of these Christians as to the signs and gifts of the early church, is deplorable. If the miracles not only extended this side of the close of the “Acts” period, but into the church after the death of the apostles, what right have we to exclude the miracles, signs, visions and gifts of the “Acts” period from our church programs today? What right have we to Scripturally teach that they are exceptional rather than general?

There can be only one of two genuine reasons for the absence of signs and miracles in the Body of Christ today. The explanation is either “unbelief” or “undispensational”. According to your arguments, the “undispensational” is eliminated. It must therefore be “unbelief”. If this be true, the Pentecostalists and others, who have the courage to disregard church creeds and the tradition of the elders and the Fundamentalists’ doctrinal platforms, and strive diligently for the recovery of the “Acts” signs, visions and ceremonies and the gifts of I Corinthians 12:8 to 11, are to be commended, and the rest of us should join with them in humble confession of our unbelief.

Why do you say without any explanation, “This to be expected” concerning the “less in the way of signs we have as we get near to the close of Acts,” if the close of Acts marked no change in the program of the Lord’s Church? A reader must come to the conclusion, after examining several of your statements, that I Corinthians gives us God’s order and program for today. But in your own heart you know you would not tolerate Christians in your church organization if they were trying to exercise the gifts of miracles, or tongues, or discerning of spirits, or healing. If we cannot give the dispensational explanation for the absence of these signs in the Church, we should not condemn those who are trying to practice them, or refuse to meet the issue squarely. Surely no intelligent teacher will try to satisfy an eager soul by ignoring a discussion of I Corinthians 12:8 to 11; dismissing the inquirer with the statement that they are still here but very exceptional. This is trifling with the question. Far better say, I don’t know anything about it.

If the gifts of 1 Corinthians 12:8 to 11 are for the Church today, they are for the members of Christ’s Body everywhere, and not merely for missionaries way off in northwest China or the heart of Africa. Christ and his apostles and other disciples used clay, oil, aprons, handkerchiefs, and hands in healing the sick. These healings were not confined to saints. “They were healed every one.” Acts 5:16. Among the servants of the Lord there was none more faithful than Timothy, to whom Paul wrote, “take a little wine for thine oft sicknesses.” I Timothy 5:23. This is quite significant coming from that Apostle by whose hands so many had been miraculously healed.

Now let us not cover up; let us be honest. Should we try to perpetuate or duplicate the miracles of Christ and His disciples and of those servants of the Lord whom you say continued with the miracles after the death of the apostles? You condemn those who are not willing to accept all of the instructions of the pre-prison Epistles of Paul as belonging to the Dispensation of the Mystery. Certainly the child of God who rejects some of the program of the transitional “Acts” period as not for members of the Body of Christ today, and gives a Scriptural reason for so doing, is not worthy of condemnation from another child of God who utterly ignores that program of signs, miracles, gifts and ceremonies and makes no effort to

put into practice any of it except two ordinances that he arbitrarily selects to the exclusion of every other sign, gift and ceremony.

You have repeatedly said in your preaching and teaching that the signs of Mark 16:17 and 18 were not to follow any believers except the apostles, and still you condemn those who believe that the signs and gifts of the “Acts” period, including the miracles and healings and tongues of I Corinthians 12, ceased when God’s judgment fell upon Israel after the “Acts” period.

Why not encourage Christians to seek the gifts and advise them to receive instructions from those who claim they have the gifts because they have more faith than you and I have? The gifts of I Corinthians 12:8 to 11 either belong to the program of the Church today or they do not. Is it the mark of intelligence to give the Lord’s Supper and baptism such an important place in the assembly today on the authority of I Corinthians 10 and 11 and utterly ignore the gifts of chapter 12 which are far more precious to many of God’s saints than are the two ordinances which are so precious to you? You make no attempt to exercise the gifts of I Corinthians 12, neither do you instruct your hearers to make the attempt.

DID PAUL RECEIVE THE MYSTERY AT HIS CONVERSION?

Concerning proof that Paul received the revelation of the mystery at the time he was converted, as recorded in the ninth chapter of Acts; you say, on page 33 and 34:

“These unspiritual theorists invariably overlook something that completely destroys their unscriptural hypotheses.

When then did Paul get this revelation of the truth of the one Body? He tells us he had been preaching it throughout the world among all nations. The answer clearly is, he received it at the time of his conversion, when he cried in amazement, “Who art Thou Lord?” and the glorified Saviour answered, “I am Jesus Whom thou persecutest.” This was the revelation of the Mystery. In that announcement our Lord declared that every Christian on the earth is so indissolubly linked up with Him as the glorified Head in heaven, that everything done against one of them is felt by the Head. This is the mystery— members of His Body, of His flesh, and of His bones.”

“Now no one was ever added to the Lord in any other way than by baptism of the Holy Spirit. So that clearly we have the Body of Christ here in the Acts, although the term itself is not used.”

First let me say that your brethren are not unspiritual theorists with an unscriptural hypothesis. They have been redeemed by the same precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ that is your hope. They have been sealed unto the day of redemption by the same Holy Spirit that indwells you. They have by Divine baptism become members of the same Body that you are in. I do not know one of them who does not endeavor, as you do, to walk worthy of the heavenly vocation wherewith he is called, seeking those things which are above. And surely you will admit that the believer who yields himself to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in an earnest endeavor to obey Ephesians 4,5 and 6 and Colossians 3 and 4 and Romans 12 to 16, is truly seeking the path of separation.

They do not differ with you in any of those high and holy things; and so far as the precious instructions of the Lord are concerned, I am sure they are trying to obey every one of them intended for the members of the Body of Christ that you succeed in practicing. They all have a complete Bible, containing 66 Books, and believe in its verbal inspiration from Genesis

to Revelation. They have a few honest differences with you as to the dispensational divisions, but not as many as you pretend. They apply to the members of the Body of Christ every line of God's Word in the Old Testament Scriptures, the Four Gospels and Acts that can be applied in the light of II Timothy 2:15. As to "Inspirational differences", there are none. Virtually every one of them once agreed with your general dispensational teaching, but careful study of the Word of God has forced them to abandon their former position. Does that make them either unspiritual or theorists? They would not call you "unspiritual"; but they are satisfied that some of your teaching is theory.

Your attempt to prove that Saul of Tarsus received the revelation of the Mystery when the Lord said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" is most futile. The same Lord is to gather nations before the throne of His glory after the Body has been completed and taken to glory, and He will say to them: "Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me." Matthew 25:40. Will that prove that His brethren are members of His Body? How about the fulfillment of Zechariah 2:11 when in the coming kingdom age many nations shall be joined to the Lord?

What about the Scripture, "In all their affliction He was afflicted?" You say that no one was ever added to the Lord in any other way than by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Were not the branches of John 15:1 to 9 abiding in the Vine? Was not Israel Jehovah's wife? Were not the Persians of Esther 8:17 added to the Lord when they became Jews? "Thy Maker is thine husband." Isaiah 54:5, Isaiah 56:3. Kingdom subjects were joined to the Lord just as well as are Body members.

According to your arguments, Paul received the Mystery concerning the Body of Christ before he received the revelation concerning the Gospel of the uncircumcision in Arabia. Galatians 1:11 to 18.

Saul needed an extraordinary experience to convince him that Jesus was the Messiah, but when he began his ministry to convince Israelites of that fact he reasoned it out of the Old Testament Scriptures. According to Paul's testimony, that the risen Christ should show light unto Israel and the Gentiles, was the fulfillment of the writings of Moses and the prophets. Acts 26:22 and 23. This therefore was not the Mystery hid in God, hidden from ages and generations.

The Scriptures even foresaw the Gospel of the uncircumcision for the heathen. Galatians 3:8. So both Israel and the Gentiles could open the Old Testament Scriptures and test Paul's ministry of confirmation; "search the Scriptures daily and see if these things be true." But even the learned, consecrated Apollos, who was mighty in the Scriptures, could not have checked up on the truth of Ephesians and Colossians, because that truth was hid in God and no one could trace in the Scriptures "untraceable" riches of Christ which Paul mentions in Ephesians 3:8 and 9.

In the light of Matthew 12:16 to 21, and Matthew 21:38 to 43, we might say that it could be learned in the Old Testament Scriptures that mercy would be extended to Gentiles because of Israel's unbelief. Romans 11:30. But certainly not even the most profound spiritual student of the Word of God could learn by diligently studying every line from the first of Genesis to the last of Malachi that the time would come when God would make a New Man, independent of the covenants which He made with Israel, and that God would reveal the fact that this New Man was chosen in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world and identified with the risen Lord far above principalities and powers, seated in the heavenlies

with Him, and blessed in Him with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies. These glorious truths were not made known to the sons of men in other ages.

This new revelation, which was not the confirmation of the promises to the fathers, and which Paul could not prove by the Scriptures, must have had much to do with the fact recorded in II Timothy 1:15, "All they in Asia are turned away from me."

According to your teaching, the New Testament Church began historically on the day of Pentecost. And of course you believe that all of the house of Israel shall know the Lord, under the terms of this New Covenant. Jeremiah 31:31 to 34, Hebrews 8:7 to 11. According to your teaching the "One New Man", mentioned in connection with the "Dispensation of the Mystery", is the New Covenant Church. Israel under the Old Covenant was called a "church;" an "ekklesia". Acts 7:38. Certainly when God fulfills Romans 11:26 to 28 and Hebrews 8:11, and all Israel shall be saved, that will be the fulfillment of the New Covenant. According to prophecy, redeemed people shall then be joined to the Lord. Then surely saved Israel will be a New Covenant Church. That will be in the coming kingdom age. You therefore have in your program, two New Covenant Churches, this present New Covenant (Body) Church and the coming New Covenant (Kingdom) Church. With your interpretation there has been no suspension of the New Covenant since the day of Pentecost. No wonder we have not won for Premillennialism, thinking Covenant Christians.

If on the day of Pentecost the Church began in fulfillment of the New Covenant promised in Jeremiah 31:31 to 34, why call that New Covenant Church, which was prophesied, the Mystery not made known to Israel's prophets?

If the "One New Man" of Ephesians 2:15 was prophesied in Jeremiah 31:31 to 34, certainly the statement of Ephesians 3:1 to 11 seems contrary to fact. We should not be too hasty about condemning our Postmillenarian brethren, who support their teaching with Hebrews 8:7 to 11 and Hebrews 10:12 to 24 and Romans 11:15 to 22, if there has been no suspension of the New Covenant since the day of Pentecost. Certainly if the New Covenant did not begin until the death of Christ, it was only the Old Testament that was abolished with that death.

Your teaching must necessarily demand the suspension, with Christ's death, of the Davidic Covenant and that part of the Abrahamic Covenant that had to do with Israel's national redemption and peaceful possession of Canaan. But these Covenants are inseparably linked with the New Covenant, and you have just as many problems as have your so-called "ultra dispensationalists", who teach the suspension of all three Covenants at the close of the "Acts" period.

In the light of Colossians 1:25 to 27 and Ephesians 2:15 and Ephesians 3:8 and 9, it is difficult for me to believe that the One New Man, God's creation in Christ Jesus, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, is being made in fulfillment of any promise that God gave to the fathers by the prophets or of any Covenant that He made with Abraham, Israel or any one else.

I cannot definitely fix the time when the risen Lord revealed the mystery of Ephesians and Colossians to the Apostle Paul but I do know that there is no statement concerning the "Dispensation of the Mystery" during the "Acts" period. There must have been some reason, in the mind of God, why He withheld the writing of Ephesians 3:8 and 9 until after He pronounced His judgment upon the Nation Israel in Acts 28:25 to 28. I believe that there is a very definite turning-point with the close of the "Acts" period, whether or not we call it the close of the transitional period or the beginning of a new dispensation. Your ultra dispensationalist

brethren do not teach that the message of pure grace began with Paul's prison Epistles neither do they teach positively that the risen Lord had not revealed the mystery to him before he reached Rome. They do know that the "Dispensation of the Mystery" was not mentioned before that time, and they have learned by the study of Ephesians, Colossians and II Timothy glorious truths that are not to be found in any of Paul's pre-prison Epistles or in the oral ministry of the Twelve or Paul, recorded in Acts.

Even the beloved and gifted John Darby taught that Romans 16:25 and 26 was a postscript—(Synopsis—Romans). You call this higher criticism. Was John Darby a higher critic?

Your argument that the "Dispensation of the Mystery" began on the day of Pentecost, because the ordinances were taken out of the way by the work of Christ on the cross that He might make (of the twain One New Man is not proof of the fact. Those who were far off were not immediately made nigh by the blood of Christ. It was a gradual process and development of God's plan; no Gentiles at first; then to Israel first, Israel and Paul remaining under the law until the close of the "Acts" period; and then the radical change after Acts 28:25 to 28.

TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

I quote from Page 25, of your new book concerning the transitional period in the Book of Acts

"Personally, I have no objection to the term "transitional period", if it be understood that the transition was in the minds of men and not in the mind of God. According to God, the new dispensation of the grace of God, otherwise called the dispensation of the mystery, began the moment the Spirit descended at Pentecost. That moment the One Body came into existence, though at the beginning it was composed entirely of believers taken out from Jewish people."

In Colossians 1:27 Paul declared a mystery which did not begin at Pentecost; namely, the mystery among the Gentiles. In Ephesians 3:1 to 9 Paul wrote of the Mystery concerning the untraceable riches of Christ among the Gentiles which did not begin at Pentecost. Gentiles were not given the Gospel until some years after Pentecost.

It seems to me that there would be greater probability of agreement between the "dispensationalists" and the so-called "ultra dispensationalists", if we would take an unmoveable, definite stand together that, whatever the Mystery was, nothing concerning it can be quoted from the Old Testament Scriptures.

Certainly the Old Testament Scripture prophesied that Christ the Stone would be rejected by the builders and would then become the Head of the corner. Psalms 118:22; Matthew 21:42; Acts 4:1. Concerning the Rejected Stone I quote

Psalm 118:22 and 23:

"THE STONE WHICH THE BUILDERS REFUSED IS BECOME THE HEAD OF THE CORNER. THIS IS THE LORD'S DOING: IT IS MARVELOUS IN OUR EYES."

The Lord asked the question of Israel and received this answer:

Matthew 21:41 to 43:

"THEY SAY UNTO HIM, HE WILL MISERABLY DESTROY THOSE WICKED MEN, AND WILL LET OUT HIS VINEYARD UNTO OTHER

HUSBANDMEN, WHICH SHALL RENDER HIM THE FRUITS IN THEIR SEASON.”

“JESUS SAITH UNTO THEM, DID YE NEVER READ IN THE SCRIPTURES, THE STONE

WHICH THE BUILDERS REJECTED, THE SAME IS BECOME THE HEAD OF THE CORNER: THIS IS THE LORD’S DOING, AND IT IS MARVELOUS IN OUR EYES?”

“THEREFORE I SAY UNTO YOU, THE KINGDOM OF GOD SHALL BE TAKEN FROM YOU, AND GIVEN TO A NATION BRINGING FORTH THE FRUITS THEREOF.”

Acts 4:10 and 11:

“BE IT KNOWN UNTO YOU ALL, AND TO ALL THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL, THAT BY THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH, WHOM YE CRUCIFIED, WHOM GOD RAISED FROM THE DEAD, EVEN BY HIM DOTHS THIS MAN STAND HERE BEFORE YOU WHOLE.

“THIS IS THE STONE WHICH WAS SET AT NOUGHT OF YOU BUILDERS, WHICH IS BECOME THE HEAD OF THE CORNER.”

If the Lord was saying to Israel, in Matthew 21:41 to 43, that He was going to withdraw the offer of a literal earthly kingdom from Israel and give to the Gentiles a spiritual kingdom, the Body of Christ, we should not lose sight of the word, “therefore” in verse 43. The “therefore” refers to the quotation from Psalm 118:22. If in that Prophecy the Lord was saying Christ will be rejected as King by Israel and become the Head of a Gentile Church, then what Paul declares in Ephesians 3:3 to 9 is untrue; for he there declares that the relationship existing between Gentile members of the Body of Christ and the Head was not made known to the sons of men in other ages.

Even if we interpret Matthew 21:43 to mean that God would take away spiritual authority from Israel and give it unto Gentiles, He certainly did not do that until after the end of the “Acts” period. “To Israel He saith, All day long have I stretched forth My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people”. Romans 10:21. Israel was a disobedient and gainsaying people when they made that golden calf in the wilderness, about 1500 B. C. They were the same when they chose Jereboam and continually thereafter until the Ten Tribes were put away and then until the reign of Manasseh over Judah, until their Babylonian captivity. They were a disobedient and gainsaying people during the days of their Messiah on earth. But “All day long” was until God miserably destroyed those wicked men after the “Acts” period had closed. You and I differ as to the question “How long was All day long.”

All of the Twelve Apostles were Israelites. We would be safe in saying that the first 30,000 believers, after Pentecost, were Israelites. Paul was an Israelite. So were Mark, Barnabas, Silas and all of Paul’s first traveling companions. Paul was chosen to bring to completion the Word of God. Colossians 1:24 to 27. No Gentiles had authority to put hands on any one for any purpose during the “Acts” period, so far as we can prove by the Word. Spiritual authority was not taken away from Israel during the “Acts” period. The offer of salvation to individual Israelites was not taken away from them during that period, nor since. Therefore entrance into the kingdom of God has never been denied Israelites since Christ uttered the words of Matthew 21:43. But after the “Acts” period, especially after the destruc-

tion of Jerusalem, there was the fulfillment of Luke 21:20 to 24: Israel's house was left desolate and spiritual authority was placed in the hands of Gentiles.

I believe that the "Times of the Gentiles" politically or governmentally began with Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem about 606 B.C., and the "Times of the Gentiles" religiously or spiritually began after God's judgment upon Israel pronounced in Acts 28:25 to 28.

There is such a radical change in the program of the Church after the close of the "Acts" period that it might as well be considered a different Church or a different dispensation. The close of Acts certainly closed a "transitional" period, which was in the mind of the Lord as well as in the mind of the apostles, or it marked the beginning of a new dispensation. From my Bible study it is difficult for me to make the New Testament (Covenant) dispensation and the "Dispensation of the Mystery" one and the same: To my mind I Corinthians 9:20 to 22, Acts 20:16, Acts 21:20, Acts 23:4, Acts 23:6, Acts 24:6, in the light of Philippians 3:6 to 12, proves that Israel was before God as a nation until the quotation of those significant words from Isaiah 6:9 and 10 after Paul reached Rome. That marks either the end of a transition period or the beginning of new dispensation, with the revelation of truths theretofore unknown.

ISRAEL'S HOUSE LEFT DESOLATE

Doubtless you have endeavored to answer in your own mind, and to the satisfaction of many others, that question so frequently asked, "if the glory of Christ was to follow His sufferings, how could He have offered, in good faith, the kingdom to Israel before His death and resurrection?"

Many times I have gone carefully and prayerfully through the Four Gospels to see whether or not the Lord Jesus did definitely offer the kingdom to Israel. It seems to me that He did, that is, He did more than present Himself as King; although it was foreknown and foretold that the King would be rejected and that He would be delivered according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God and that the Nation would "do whatsoever God's hand and God's counsel determined before to be done." So the Saviour said, "the Son of man goeth as it was written of Him." Matthew 26:24.

What seems a rather difficult task is to reconcile the rebuke of the Lord in Luke 24:25 to 27, "O fools and slow of heart," with the messages of the Holy Spirit and Gabriel in Luke 1:27 to 32 and Luke 1:67 to 77. Any student of the Word of God, after reading the first chapter of Luke, must believe that Jesus Christ was born for Israel's national redemption; that He was born, not to be Head of the Church, which is His Body, but to take the throne of David; and to reign over the house of Jacob forever.

If we have a more sure Word of prophecy, we must believe that the Prince of Peace is to have the throne of David and that He will be Israel's Prince and Saviour, to give repentance and forgiveness of sins to Israel and that He will build again the tabernacle of David when He returns. Isaiah 9:6 and 7; Amos 9:11 to 15; Acts 5:30 and 31.

If you and I should agree that the kingdom was being offered to the Nation Israel up to Matthew 23:33 to 39, and was then taken from them, we would have to agree that during the earthly ministry of the Lord Jesus individual Israelites were being saved; many more than the 120 of the first chapter of Acts.

We have no record of any Gentiles having been saved while Christ was on earth. But how about the saved Israelites? Were they Old Testament saints or New Testament saints? Did those who lived until the day of Pentecost change from Old Testament saints to New Testament saints, when you say they became members of the Body of Christ or the New Testament Church? If any of the Israelites who were saved while Christ was on earth died before Pentecost, according to your teaching, they were not members of the Body of Christ and they were not members of the New Testament Church which did not begin until after their death. Was the thief on the cross baptized into the Body of Christ? Was Nicodemus born again? If so, was it without the Holy Spirit? If any died before Pentecost were they members of some Church of God? Was it the Old Testament Church? Will not all Israel be saved under the terms of the New Covenant, after God's purpose in this age of grace has been accomplished, "to make of the twain One New Man"? If so, will not saved Israel be a New Testament Church, if Israel, under the law, was an Old Testament Church, according to Acts 7:38?

These questions have direct bearing on the subject we are considering, namely, whether or not God could have postponed, and did postpone. His judgment from Matthew 23:38 to Acts 28:25 to 28, and at the same time could have been, and was, calling individual Israelite to membership in the New Testament Church of God.

I think Christians have been too hasty about appealing to some human school of interpretation for the meaning of the Word of God, and too frequently without giving such teaching the Berean test. In the mind, of the Bible student there are hundreds of questions that you make no attempt to answer and it seems you desire to discourage those who search the Scriptures for the answers, many of which must be there.

If the Nation was rejecting the King and kingdom while Christ was on earth, and at the same time individual Israelites were accepting Him as Saviour, why should it be thought a thing incredible that the same program was going on when the Holy Spirit offered the kingdom to Israel in Acts 3:14 to 26? You know that Mr. John Darby, Dr. James. M. Gray, Dr. A. C. Gaebelain, Dr. C. I. Scofield and many spiritual men of God, have taught that this kingdom offer was being extended to the Nation in Acts 3:19 to 21. But you say, "No such thing." I quote from your book, "Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth," page 30:

"In regard to the statement so frequently made that God was giving Israel a second chance throughout the book of Acts, it is evident that there is no foundation whatever for such a statement. Our Lord definitely declared the setting aside of Israel for this entire age, when He said, 'Your house is left unto you desolate. Ye shall not see Me again until ye say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord!' It was after that house was left desolate that the glorious proclamation at Pentecost was given through the power of the Holy Spirit, offering salvation by grace to any in Israel who repented."

"Not once in any of the sermons recorded of Peter and of Paul do we have a hint that the nation of Israel is still on trial, and that God is waiting for that nation to repent in this age."

"It is perfectly true that the Body as such is not mentioned in the book of Acts, and that for a very good reason."

"Your house is left unto you desolate." Why do you not quote with this judgment other Scriptures, such as Luke 21:20 and Matthew 22:7?

"When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

“But when the king heard thereof he was wroth; and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city.”

We are agreed that something most significant took place on the day of Pentecost. But we must also agree that more than 25 years after that day of wonders, Paul was eager to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Acts 20:16.

What did Paul find when he reached Jerusalem? Did he find Israel's house any more desolate than it was when Christ was on earth? While Christ was on earth Israel was making God's house a den of thieves. Were they doing any worse in the “Acts” period? Were not thousands upon thousands of Israelites saved during that period? Was not James, the Lord's brother, with believing and unbelieving Israelites, worshipping in the Jerusalem temple when Paul reached Jerusalem? Acts 21:18 to 28. Did not Israel, under Roman control, still maintain the religious right to try offenders of the law, according to Moses? Acts 24:6. Did not Paul apologize to the high priest as the servant of God in 60 A.D.? Acts 23:5. Were not the Twelve Apostles and Paul sanctioning covenant circumcision for Israel all through the “Acts” period?

There are hundreds of questions that any thinking student might ask in refutation of your arguments that Israel was set aside at Matthew 23:33 to 39, some time before the baptism of the Holy Spirit formed the Body, of Christ at the day of Pentecost.

Surely the ministry of the Twelve must have been the subject of prophecy. Acts 1:16 and 20. Surely Christ's resurrection, as proclaimed on the day of Pentecost, was in fulfillment of prophecy concerning His reign on David's throne. Acts 2:27 to 31. Surely the Holy Spirit came on that day in fulfillment of Joel's prophecy. Surely Christ was exalted from death to be Israel's Prince and Saviour. Acts 5:30 and 31. Surely this is the message of Paul, in 45 A.D., when he declared to Israel that Jesus was raised up, and raised up again, to be a Saviour to Israel and to give the sure mercies of David to Israel! Where did the Gentiles come in? After that salvation was sent to them to provoke Israel to jealousy? Romans 11:11 and 11:30.

On page 59 you say, “The Jew being already a member of a nation which, up to the cross, had been recognized as in covenant relationship with God.” I judge from your arguments that you believe that the Nation was protected and preserved by the Abrahamic Covenant up to Matthew 23:33 to 38, when the Lord called Israel “serpents” and a generation of vipers” and said, “your house is left unto you desolate.” Were they not called a “generation of vipers” in the beginning of the Lord's earthly ministry? Luke 3:7. Did Peter with the Eleven call Israel “a generation of vipers” or “serpents” on the day of Pentecost or thereafter? In Stephen's message they were called the betrayers and murderers of the Just One. Acts 7:52. But the Just One had prayed on the cross for their forgiveness; and God had exalted His Son with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. Acts 5:30 and 31. Because they refused this offer Stephen denounced them as “stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears.” Acts 7:51. But up to the time of Stephen's message they were not denounced by the Lord's apostles. They were spoken to in great mercy. I think we have lost the force of the “therefore” Acts 3:19. This suggests the two reason why God would send the King from on the condition of repentance; first, because they killed the Prince of Life through ignorance; and second, in doing so, they had fulfilled the foreordained purpose of God in putting to death His only begotten Son to provide salvation for sinners. Acts 3:17 and 18.

How you can read Acts 3:19 to 26 and see nothing in it but salvation by grace and membership in the Body of Christ for an individual Israelite, I cannot see. Because others do not agree with your dogmatism on this chapter, you get angry.

Peter was the mouthpiece of the Lord, filled with the Holy Spirit, when he proclaimed the Lord's message in the third chapter of Acts. Through Peter the Lord in tender mercy, addressed them as children of the Covenant." Acts 3:25. What the Lord was offering them was restitution (kingdom) promised by Samuel and other prophets. Acts 3:24 Samuel and the other prophet did not foretell the Body of Christ, and this you admit.

I see the Nation Israel protected by the Abrahamic Covenant in Acts as well as in the Four Gospels. "Ye are the children of the Covenant." The Lord called Gentiles, "dogs", in Matthew 15:26. You say the Lord was done with Israel when He called them "serpents" in Matthew 23:33. Then pray tell me, why the Lord, in Acts 3:26, said to Israel, "unto you first"? Why should the "serpents" come before "dogs"? Why was salvation withheld from Gentiles for several years thereafter?

You say that the Mystery was the Dispensation of Grace which began on the day of Pentecost and that all distinctions between Israel and the Gentiles were taken out of the way by the cross. Then why unto "serpents" first in Acts 3:26; Acts 13:46; Acts 18:6 and Romans 1:16? In Romans 11:30 we are told that Gentiles obtained mercy because of Israel's unbelief. In that same chapter we are told that some of the branches (Israel) were broken off that Gentiles might be grafted in; and that blindness was sent to them. According to your teaching, this blindness, unbelief, and breaking off, took place when the Lord, on earth, said, "your house is left unto you desolate." Then why did not the Lord immediately send salvation to the Gentiles to provoke Israel to jealousy? Your interpretation offers no explanation for the priority rights of Israel which you say on page 28 of "Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth", extended this side of Acts 28:25 to 28. You have no Scriptural explanation for the two orders in Acts, one for the believing Jews and another for the believing Gentiles. Acts 21:22 to 26; Acts 15:19.

According to your teaching, there is no sense to Acts 10:28, the fact that more than seven years after Pentecost it was not lawful for the Twelve to preach to Gentiles. You believe that Matthew 28:19 and 20 made it lawful. Then surely you must believe that the Twelve were stupid, disobedient, prejudiced servants and that they and Paul were out of the will of God in trying to please the Jews in the Book of Acts. How could they have been if they were filled with the Holy Spirit? Paul was triumphing in Christ when he became as one under the law to Israel. But any one who will compare I Corinthians 9:20 to 22 and Acts 23:1 to 7 with Philippians 3:6 to 12 should know that Paul ceased his two-fold position after the "Acts" period closed.

I could agree with you that the message of grace was proclaimed in the "Acts" period, but could never agree with you that the Lord would have ushered in the Dispensation of the Mystery at Pentecost and have kept His few selected, well-trained apostles in such ignorance. Did the infallible Holy Spirit lead them to say that what was happening and what was being offered to Israel was the fulfillment of promises made by prophets who were wholly ignorant of the Mystery?

You are mistaken in your charge that ultra dispensationalists do not recognize the significance of Acts 13:46 when Paul turned to Gentiles. Israel there sinned against the Holy Spirit, that sin which Christ said would not be forgiven, as was the sin against the Son of Man. They study that chapter with that wonderful eleventh chapter of Romans, which all admit is one of the outstanding dispensational chapters of the Bible, and they see in Paul's message at Antioch something that you do not seem to see, namely, a message to the Nation, corresponding somewhat to the message of the Twelve to Israel in Acts 2 and 3, and Stephen's message to Israel in Acts 7. How any student can follow Paul from Acts 13:22 through Acts

13:41 and say that he is even hinting at the Mystery, or giving the truth in connection with the dispensation of the grace of God, as told in Ephesians 3:1 to 9, I cannot see. Surely there is something more than a presentation of the Gospel of grace to individual Israelites there.

Jesus was raised up to be Israel's Saviour. Acts 13:23. Paul is not telling them that all distinctions between Jew and Gentile were broken down at the cross. He even says that Christ was raised up again that God might give to Israel the "sure mercies of David". Acts 13:34. What was the sure mercy of David promised to Israel? What did the sure mercy of David have to do with the Dispensation of the Grace of God committed to Paul? Is not the Nation protected and preserved by the Abrahamic Covenant in Acts 13?

All dispensationalists believe, that at some point in the past, God suspended His covenant dealings with Israel, that is, He postponed His blessings for the Nation guaranteed in the Abrahamic and Davidic and New Covenants concerning Canaan, the new heart, David's throne and the sure mercies of David that pertained to the kingdom. None of these promised blessings referred to the Body of Christ.

You teach that saved Jews and saved Gentiles were one when the first Gentile was saved; and all the children of Abraham in Christ. Were not the saved Gentiles in the "Acts" period, grafted in with the natural branches? Were the saved natural branches broken off? Certainly not during "Acts". Then, according to your teaching, the aliens of the commonwealth of Israel (who believed) became one with Israel. Then, had God suspended His covenant dealings with Israel up to Romans 11? Was not Abraham the father of all believers? Will he be in the Body with his children? Are you a child of Abraham and not an Israelite?

The so-called ultra dispensationalists believe that what you teach took place at Matthew 23:38, took place at Acts 28:25 to 28. Does this make them dotards, or any of the other awful things that you called them? You certainly never proved your contention.

I doubt very seriously if you would stand before an audience and refer to the late Dr. Scofield, as an "unspiritual theorist." What did he believe about Israel to the close of the "Acts" period? He endorsed, without reservation, these seven statements, as you well know:

"After repeated study of the Epistles written after Paul's arrival at Rome, I am convinced that in them is found a curative teaching for all of the present-day delusions and fanaticisms found among many of the most sincere saints in the Church."

"From Romans 9 to 11, it is evident that Israel was set aside nationally before the close of the Acts. That the Jew is in the forefront right down to the end of the Acts cannot be disproved."

"Jewish rites, vows and ceremonies were in vogue among the truly regenerated even down to the close of the Book of Acts period. But the Epistles unfold grace, and reveal light for the elimination from the Church of the last vestige of Judaism."

"The sign gifts of I Corinthians 12 were operative only during the Acts period." "There is no foundation in the Word of God for the prevailing -popular doctrine of "divine healing."

"A careful study of the Epistles, especially of the latest Epistles of Paul, which give the normal course of the Church during the present dispensation, would dismount all from their hobbies, eliminate the last vestige of Judaism from their lives."

"After this clear revelation of the mystery hid in God from all ages, removing the Jew from the position of superiority . . . which kept the Jew in the forefront right on to the close of the Book of Acts."

If you did not know it before, now you know that Dr. C. I. Scofield was almost an ultra dispensationalist. He was certainly coming into the light and departing from your uncertain and unsatisfactory dispensationalism which leaves Christians in the darkness as to the sign gifts and religious program of the "Acts" period. You teach that signs, visions, tongues, imposition of hands, and religious ceremonies belong to the dispensation of the Mystery because that dispensation began on the day of Pentecost and you teach that the same program was carried on by Paul until his death, with no truth revealed in his prison epistles that he had not been preaching.

Then surely, brother, it is your duty to bend every effort to recover for the church today the gifts of I Corinthians 12 and to sanction the order and program of "Acts" as the way Christians should behave in the House of God.

I see in the Four Gospels Israel sinning against the Son of man. I see, beginning with the "Acts" period the sin against the Son of man forgiven because of Christ's prayer on the cross; and that rejection of the Son of man by Israel was to carry out God's purpose to put Christ to death. Acts 3:17 and 18.

I see in the "Acts" period the Nation Israel rejecting the testimony of the Holy Spirit (the unpardonable sin) that God might have mercy on the Gentiles because of Israel's unbelief: Romans 11:11; Romans 11:19 and Romans 11:30.

It seems to me that many questions should come to your mind when you say that there was no transitional period during the "Acts" period so far as God was concerned. According to Matthew 22:7 and Matthew 21:41, it was God who was going to send judgment and destruction upon Israel and Jerusalem. Rome would have been as powerless to touch God's people as Pilate was to crucify God's Son, if it had not been the will of God. But that judgment and destruction did not fall during the "Acts" period. The Jews apparently never had more favor with Rome than during those thirty years. Rome interfered very little with Israel's persecution of Christians or with Israel's worship and religious ceremonies in and out of the temple.

The powers that be are ordained of God, and God saw to it that Rome protected Israel, Jerusalem and their temple for more than thirty-five years after Christ said to Israel, "your house is left unto you desolate." During those years the high-priests continued their temple services and religious leadership and no effort was made by any one to interfere. The Jews had access to the temple and strange enough the apostles preached daily in that temple, and all during the "Acts" period the Twelve and Paul were doing what the Lord in Matthew 16:20 forbade them to do: they were testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah.

It is interesting to note that in the Book of Acts eight strictly Israelitish words are used 276 times while the same eight words are used in the Synoptic Gospels only 252 times. I refer to these words, "Israel," "Jew," "Synagogue," "Temple", "Moses," "Law," "Jerusalem," "Fathers." You should admit that this is quite significant, because you are so sure that the kingdom was being offered to Israel in the Gospels and are so sure it was not in Acts.

We would judge by Acts 20:16 that Israel continued with their feasts in Jerusalem annually and with their daily sacrifices. They were crooked hypocrites and blind guides while Christ was on earth, worshipping God with their lips while their hearts were afar off. Were they any worse during the "Acts" period? You recall that it was the same ninth chapter of I Corinthians in which Paul assures us he was not warring at his own charges, that he tells us how he was becoming a Jew to the Jews. I am sure that the Lord directed Paul to do this during the "Acts" period because God was preserving and protecting His Nation and keeping them in their land. Why was it that the apostles remained in Jerusalem when the other Chris-

tians were driven out? Acts 8:1. This must have been the hand of God, otherwise the apostles would surely have been driven out.

Let us not forget that it was God who sent the blindness upon His own people in fulfillment of Isaiah 6:9 and 10 and certainly He would not have instructed Paul to become a Jew to the Jews if He had sent that blindness when the Lord spoke in Matthew 23:38.

According to your teaching, God's order is still "to the Jew first," and if no change took place with the quotation of Isaiah 6:9 and 10, at the close of the "Acts" period, have not converted Jews today the Scriptural right to act as one under the law to win Jews to Christ?

THE TWELVE AND PAUL

We have all observed that after the first chapter of Acts we find in that Book no record of the individual ministry of any of the Twelve except Peter and John and the Lord's brother, James. There is reference to "the apostles" and to "Peter with the Eleven." In Galatians 2:7 to 9, we learn that Peter, John and James were pillars of the church and that they agreed to go to the circumcision. Unto Peter was committed the gospel of the circumcision. If there is no difference between the gospel of Mark 16:15 and the gospel of the circumcision, surely there is a difference between that gospel and the gospel of the glory of the blessed God. Timothy 1:11. Whatever we call the gospel that Peter preached to Cornelius, I am sure you would not stand before a mixed audience of spiritual students of the Word and sinners and tell the sinners that their prayers and love for Israel and their benevolence had gone up before God as a memorial and that because they feared God with all their houses and prayed to God always, that because they worked righteousness, that because they were just and of good report, God would accept them. Neither would you demand the outward sign of tongues as evidence that they had by Holy Spirit baptism been made members of the Body of Christ.

In presenting the Gospel of the Grace of God you might refer to the miracles of Jesus of Nazareth, as Peter did, and you might say, "To Him give all the prophets witness." Acts 10:43. For even Paul begins the Epistle to the Romans with reference to the Gospel of God which God promised in the Scriptures. But in telling them of the Gospel foretold in the Scriptures you would not be proclaiming the Mystery of Ephesians not mentioned in those Scriptures. You would tell the sinners that their good works had never gone up as a memorial before God; that good works should follow regeneration; that it was not by works of righteousness but according to God's mercy, all of grace, that they must be saved. Peter and James referred to Cornelius' salvation as saved by grace. Acts 15:11. But on page 57 of your book you say that during the reign of law, and during the years of Christ on earth, in fact, during all ages, sinners were ever justified by faith, which, of course, means by grace.

There has always been the element of grace in God's messages of deliverances. And surely when God fulfills the Abrahamic Covenant and the New Covenant by saving Israel and ushering in the millennium, there will be much grace mixed with judgment. But why do we speak of that coming period as the "kingdom age" in contradistinction to the present period which, we call the "dispensation of the grace of God"? Surely this period of Gentile favor must differ from the past dispensation of law, or the dispensation of the Son of man on earth, or the coming kingdom dispensation.

We know that Peter with the Eleven had the keys of the kingdom of heaven and we know that we do not preach to Gentiles today what Peter with the Eleven preached in Acts 2:22 to 38 or in Acts 3:14 to 26, or in Acts 5:26 to 32, or in Acts 10:34 to 46, "the Word which God sent unto the children of Israel." We know that we do not observe the gospel program of

Acts 8:5 to 15. We know that so far as there is any record in Acts that none of the Twelve preached outside of the land of the Jews; that the gospel of the circumcision was committed unto them, and that, aside from Peter's one message to the household of Cornelius, there is not one record of any of the Twelve having preached to Gentiles. I agree with you that the silences in the Scriptures are not always proof positive, but such a silence, in the light of Galatians 2:9, is more than significant, especially since the name of Peter is dropped from the "Acts" record after the door of faith was opened to the Gentiles (Acts 14:27) and the report was made at Jerusalem. Acts 15:6 to 19.

We are agreed that the Gospel which the Twelve and Paul preached during the "Acts" period was foretold in the Scriptures. We are agreed that the Dispensation of the Mystery was not foretold in the Scriptures. We are agreed that the keys of the kingdom and the Mark 16:15 gospel were committed unto Peter and that the dispensation of the grace of God for Gentiles was committed unto Paul. Ephesians 3:1 to 9.

It is difficult for me to reconcile your statements concerning the general Gentile ministry of the Twelve and the mystery concerning Gentiles in Ephesians and Colossians and make them agree with the Scriptures. If I cannot prove doctrines by the Word of God I refuse to be dogmatic on the authority of Polycarp, Jerome, Augustine, and other church fathers.

If your position is Scriptural, that the dispensation of grace and the "dispensation of the mystery" and the Body of Christ began on the day of Pentecost, and if, as you teach, Paul went right on under the great commission of Matthew 28:19 and 20 and Mark 16:15 to 18, with the gospel, program and ministry of the Twelve, then I want to ask the questions so frequently asked, "what need was there for such a unique conversion and calling of Paul, such a special commission, such special revelations?" Why did not Paul go right on under the authority of the Twelve, as did Stephen and Philip? Why did Paul speak of "my gospel" and speak of himself 1100 times in the first person pronoun? What is the meaning of the "contrariwise" of Galatians 2:7? According to your teaching, Galatians 2:9 has no meaning to me. Neither has Ephesians 3:1 to 9 and Colossians 1:24 to 28 and Galatians 1:11 to 18. From your teaching, I cannot see why one of the Twelve was not chosen to be the Apostle to the Gentiles. You object to a difference between the Gospel of the circumcision and the Gospel of the uncircumcision and you object to the statement that the Lord did not send the Twelve to evangelize Gentiles during the "Acts" period. But you must admit, in the light of Galatians 2:7 to 9, that there were two gospels and that if the Twelve evangelized Gentiles also they must have preached to them the "circumcision" Gospel which was committed to them. I refer only to the "Acts" period. Did the Twelve, during that period preach to Gentiles the Gospel of the glory of God mentioned in I Timothy 1:11?

You say on page 40, "It was his (Paul's) devotion to the revelation of the mystery, which is part of the dispensation of the grace of God, that resulted in his (Paul's) imprisonment." In Acts 26:6 Paul declared, as a prisoner, "I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers." In the same chapter, verses 22 and 23, he declares his message was foretold by all of Israel's prophets.

According to Acts 26:6 and Acts 26:22 and 23, therefore, Paul was a prisoner at first for preaching to Gentiles, not the mystery, but a message that Moses and the prophets had foretold. Romans 15:8 to 12. Galatians 3:8. According to Ephesians 6:19 and 20 and Colossians 4:3, Paul was later in bonds for the Mystery, a message and ministry about which Moses and the prophets never wrote.

If, as you declare, John knew the mystery before Christ died, and if Peter received the revelation of the mystery on the housetop, and if, during the “Acts” period they were proclaiming it to both Jews and Gentiles, why were they not prisoners of the Lord for the mystery? Were they compromisers and cowards like some of the brethren today who keep quiet for the sake of popularity and because of fear of persecutions and boycotts from brethren like you? We cannot believe this about Peter, James and John. But for some reason the Jews did not molest James when they said concerning Paul, “away with such a fellow; it is not fit that he should live.” Acts 22:22. Why did not the angry Jews try to kill James and Peter, if these apostles, were carrying on the same program as Paul was? Surely they must have had different ministries and messages.

The record is clear that the believing Jews of Jerusalem and elsewhere remained zealous concerning the law, with the full sanction of James and Paul. Acts 21:18 to 28. The record is also clear that the Twelve did not follow Paul in becoming as one without the law to them that were without the law. Therefore, it should be clear that the Lord did not send the Twelve to those who were not under the law. It should be clear, also, that with the Lord’s sanction the saved Israelites did not wholly abandon the law of Moses even 27 years after the death of Christ. Acts 21:28 to 25.

On page 28, “Wrongly Dividing”, you state that during the time of Paul’s liberty between his imprisonments, if he continued to preach, he observed the order to the Jew first and also to the Greek, or Gentile.”

To my mind the record is clear, that while Christ was on earth, God’s order was “only to the lost sheep of Israel”, “go not into the way of the Gentiles.” Matthew 15:24 and 10:5. During the years covered by the first nine chapters of Acts, God’s order was not to the Gentiles. Acts 11:18 and 19. Acts 10:28. To my mind it is absolutely imperative that the student of the Word study that Word as to whether the truth is before or after the fact stated in Acts 14:27, “the door of faith opened unto the Gentiles.” After that time God’s order was “to the Jew first, and also to the Greek”, until Acts 28:25 to 28. If as you teach, Israel had been set aside before Christ died, there would have been no reason why the Gospel of the grace of God should have been withheld from the Gentiles for more than seven years thereafter. I believe that we are agreed that the 5,000 believers of Acts 4:4 were Israelites and that many thousands of Israelites were saved before the message was given to Cornelius; and we are agreed that Acts 2:38 is not for us to give out to Gentiles as the Gospel of the grace of God. We should be agreed that the blindness of Romans 11:7 that God sent upon Israel was after the conversion of Paul. I have been taught by the Holy Spirit to place great emphasis on the judgment of the Lord pronounced by the mouth of Paul in Acts 28:25 to 28. This came to me in my own personal Bible study, without the slightest suggestion from any other man; and it will take something more than ridicule to take it away from me. Because you do not agree with what another believer has been taught, do not denounce him as a heretic. There is the possibility, if not the probability, that you are the one in error. To my mind it is most significant that the Lord Jesus, on earth, quoted at two different times the same verses from Isaiah 6:9 and 10 that Paul quoted in Acts 28:25 to 27. The Lord quoted them in Matthew 13:14 and 15, after He had uttered those words recorded in Matthew 12:16, 18 and 21 and again in John 12:40 and 41 after those significant words in John 12:39.

Matthew 12:16, 17 and 21:

“AND JESUS CHARGED THEM THAT THEY SHOULD NOT MAKE HIM KNOWN: THAT IT MIGHT BE FULFILLED WHICH WAS SPOKEN BY ISAIAH

THE PROPHET, . . . HE SHALL SHOW JUDGMENT TO THE GENTILES. . . . AND IN HIS NAME SHALL THE GENTILES TRUST.”

John 12:39:

“THEREFORE THEY COULD NOT BELIEVE, BECAUSE THAT ISAIAH SAID AGAIN: (ISAIAH 6:9 and 10).

Here is where we cry with Paul, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!” Romans 11:32.

These words were uttered after these words, in Romans 11:30, 31 and 32:

“FOR AS YE (Gentiles) IN TIMES PAST HAVE NOT BELIEVED GOD YET HAVE NOW OBTAINED MERCY THROUGH THEIR UNBELIEF: EVEN SO HAVE THESE ALSO NOW NOT BELIEVED, THAT THROUGH YOUR MERCY THEY ALSO MAY OBTAIN MERCY. FOR GOD HATH CONCLUDED THEM ALL IN UNBELIEF, THAT HE MIGHT HAVE MERCY UPON ALL.”

The prophecy of Isaiah had to be fulfilled: “Israel could not believe”: “they should not make Him known”: “judgment shall be shown to the Gentiles”; in His Name shall the Gentiles trust.” Therefore, blindness must come to Israel in fulfillment of Isaiah 6:9 and 10; and with that blindness salvation must be sent to the Gentiles. When the Lord quoted from Isaiah 6:9 and 10 He foretold that salvation would be sent to the Gentiles. When Paul quoted from Isaiah 6:9 and 10, in the year 62 A. D., he said, “Salvation is sent unto the Gentiles, and they will hear it.” Acts 28:28.

From that time on God’s judgment was upon Israel: He sent the blindness; and within a few years the army of Matthew 22:7 came and their city was burned up; the murderers were destroyed, and Luke 21:20 was fulfilled. Then their house was left desolate. After Acts 28:28 salvation was sent to the Gentiles in a somewhat different manner than ever before. Brother, compare Acts 10:34 to 46 with II Timothy 1:9 and 10. According to that grace and purpose of God which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began (II Timothy 1:9) Paul said, “Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.” (II Timothy 1:11).

To my mind it is inconceivable that God would send blindness upon Israel and then tell His servants to go to them first, whether their fall took place at Matthew 23:38 or Acts 28:25 to 28. I agree absolutely with Dr. Scofield that Israel lost their priority rights with the close of Acts. I agree with him that this is the only Scriptural answer to the “healing” delusions and to the “tongues” and “signs” Christians of today. In my humble judgment you are making a great mistake to abet present-day fanaticism by seeking to turn Christians away from God’s true corrective.

Whether or not I agree with the second of these two quotations from Sir Robert Anderson’s *Silence of God*, I certainly agree with the first:

“My contention is that the Acts, as a whole, is the record of a temporary and transitional dispensation in which blessing was again offered to the Jew and again rejected.”

“The right understanding of the Acts of the Apostles . . . a book which is primarily the record, not as commonly supposed, of the founding of the Christian Church, but of the apostasy of the favoured nation.”

Before you repeat your charge that a brother in the Lord is a hard-driven controversialist, you should examine your writings in the light of God’s Word and reserve

judgment upon others until you have cleared up the many mistakes you have made. Perhaps you are hard driven to support your own peculiar views concerning water baptism; for I repeat that I believe your last book was filled with ungracious attacks upon men of God because they do not agree with you that water baptism has any place in the dispensation of the mystery. You should know that no brother in the Lord would arbitrarily take such an unpopular position for any personal gain. Such a position means loss of Christian fellowship such as you advocated over the Radio, when you said, "When you meet a man who does not believe in water baptism for this age have absolutely no fellowship with him; shun him."

Why do you pretend in your book to have such holy respect for the precious instructions of the Lord, and then try to link up a man like Dr. Bullinger and other spiritual men of God with those who question the eternal Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ? You know full well that there is nothing in his teaching that would cause a man to doubt one moment that the Lord Jesus was both man and the Eternal God. You certainly were not obeying the precious instructions of the Lord in Matthew 7:12, commonly known as the Golden Rule. Even the world would call your method of attack unethical.

With Christian love and praying for the blessing of the Lord upon your life and ministry.

Yours in Him,
J. C. O'HAIR

"PUERILE AND CHILDISH DIATRIBES"

WATER BAPTISM AND THE SCRIPTURES

Chicago, Ill., May 20, 1935

Dr. Harry A. Ironside,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Doctor Ironside:

I have just finished reading your new book, "Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth," containing the several messages which were printed in "Serving and Waiting,"

In another letter I am writing to you concerning the "Dispensation of the Mystery" to which you refer in your book. But this letter is in regard to your remarks in chapter seven of your new book concerning "Water Baptism."

I have read with interest your reference to the arguments of those who do not agree with your "dispensationalism, which arguments you call "puerile and childish diatribes." Now, dear brother, let's keep sweet in this controversy and refrain from sarcasm, abusive language and ungracious derision. Cease to use the tactics of Rome and refrain from branding as heretics those who disagree with your application of II Timothy 2:15. Instead of boycotts, persecution and disfellowship, it would be better to arrange for a conference of many Christian

brethren and prayerfully and spiritually look into the Book and see why our dispensational differences. Brother, you have no authority to put any one out of the Body of Christ, but some of your arguments will influence ignorant brethren to condemn fellow-members of the Body. If you will be humble and fair and continue in brotherly love, this discussion can be used to the glory of the Lord and prove a great blessing in the lives of those Christians who desire to be Bereans, of those who will really look into the Word of God with unprejudiced minds and open and honest hearts. Remember, the invitation is still open to you to gather at any time that you may indicate, with a company of earnest, spiritual brethren, who would like to counsel with you and have your answers to the questions that are troubling them. Now, brother, cease from your pride and gather with us. It will do you good; and remember Ephesians 4:26 and 27

Also remember, that at any time, I shall be happy to meet with you, in the presence of any number of interested friends, to go through the Four Gospels with you to convince you, and them, that I accept for the Body of Christ in this dispensation virtually everything in the kingdom of heaven program that you accept. I would be inclined to agree with you that the Lord's prayer is not for this dispensation. However, it would be difficult for me to see that the Pearl of Great Price and the One Flock refer to the Body of Christ.

You have intimated in your chapter on water baptism that John's water baptism has no place in the dispensation of grace. You would not preach "baptism unto repentance for the remission of sins." Neither would you include in your program today the other messages, Jewish practices and kingdom signs of Matthew, Mark and Luke. Why did you not say in your book that members of the Body of Christ must have an intelligent Scriptural dispensational principle for the selection or rejection of the messages, signs and religious programs of the synoptic Gospels? I have prayerfully and diligently studied the Scriptures to find any God-given method of interpretation that would free the message of grace from signs and religion and that would not, by the same exegesis, free it from water baptism and I could not find it. I had two long talks with you and you gave me darkness instead of light; and now there is no light in your latest book. But you leave one with the impression that you think that you are final authority as to the meaning of God's Word.

In your "Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth", chapter seven, on page 57, you ridicule the claims of those who state that water baptism, before the death of Christ, was in any sense meritorious or had in itself any saving virtue. And of course you claim that water baptism, in the Book of Acts, played no part in the believer's salvation. On page 59 you state: "Christian baptism had its beginning in resurrection." On page 62 you say that water baptism "is simply the glad expression of a grateful heart recognizing its identity with Christ in death, burial and resurrection."

Before we search the Scriptures to see whether or not your interpretations are correct, I would like to ask you how you can enjoy Christian fellowship with believers who use a "spoonful" of water instead of a "tank full"? If your interpretation of the mode and signification of water baptism is Scriptural, is there any greater mockery than the Covenant sprinkling of Lutherans and Episcopalians, of the Reformed Denominations, of the Presbyterians, Methodists and many other groups of Christians with whom you have fellowship? Brother, are you consistent in having fellowship with Christians who practice such a mockery, if your burial baptism is Scriptural, while at the same time you are heartily in favor of disfellowshipping believers who are satisfied with Divine baptism alone? Can you not see how it is difficult for the so-called "Ultra-dispensationalists" to see that you are both sincere and consistent? But we know why you do not denounce these "sprinkling" saints.

There are too many of them; and it would hurt your popularity and the attendance at your Bible conferences. How can you be consistent and enjoy such fellowship with your Presbyterian brother in Philadelphia? We cannot help but wonder about these things. If your interpretation of water baptism is Scriptural, surely his is worse than ridiculous and absurd. If you must make water baptism an issue, you should not fellowship with a saint who teaches that a few drops of water on the head is the seal of the New Covenant when you say that Scriptural baptism is a burial, in water to express identity with Christ in death, burial and resurrection, and those who do not believe in water baptism are heretics. There must either be far less importance to water baptism, or far more, than you suggest in your book.

The day after I read your book I received a letter from a very earnest Christian, urging me to preach the full gospel, quoting the Scriptures to convince me that repentance and water baptism should be included with faith for the sinner's salvation. The letter was both the warning and the pleading of an earnest, conscientious, soul. What impressed me so forcibly about this letter was the fact that the Scriptures used by the writer to prove that water baptism is essential to salvation and must precede Holy Spirit baptism are Scriptures which you did not use in defense of your interpretation, and the Scriptures which you used in your book were not used in this letter.

Here are the Scriptures that were used by this solicitous Christian:

Mark 1:4 and 8:

“JOHN DID BAPTIZE IN THE WILDERNESS, AND PREACH THE BAPTISM OF REPENTANCE FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.”

“I INDEED HAVE BAPTIZED YOU WITH WATER: BUT HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU WITH THE HOLY GHOST.”

Mark 16:15 and 16:

“AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, GO YE INTO ALL THE WORLD AND PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE.

“HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED; BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED.”

Acts 2:38:

“THEN PETER SAID UNTO THEM: REPENT AND BE BAPTIZED EVERY ONE OF YOU IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, AND YE SHALL RECEIVE THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST.”

Acts 8:5, 12, and 15 to 17:

“THEN PHILIP WENT DOWN TO THE CITY OF SAMARIA AND PREACHED CHRIST UNTO THEM.”

“BUT WHEN THEY BELIEVED PHILIP PREACHING THE THINGS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST, THEY WERE BAPTIZED, BOTH MEN AND WOMEN.”

“WHO, WHEN THEY WERE COME DOWN, PRAYED FOR THEM, THAT THEY MIGHT RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST:”

“(FOR AS YET HE WAS FALLEN UPON NONE OF THEM: ONLY THEY WERE BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS.)”

“THEN LAID THEY HANDS ON THEM, AND THEY RECEIVED THE HOLY GHOST.”

Acts 19:5 and 6:

“WHEN THEY HEARD THIS, THEY WERE BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS.”

“AND WHEN PAUL HAD LAID HIS HANDS UPON THEM, THE HOLY SPIRIT CAME ON THEM; AND THEY SPAKE WITH TONGUES, AND PROPHESED.”

Has not this zealous, earnest Christian quoted sufficient Scriptures to prove that faith and water baptism are linked together in God’s requirements for salvation and to prove that water baptism must come before Holy Spirit baptism? You will agree with me that this writer is sincere, but sincerely wrong. Now I want to show you why I think the same thing about you.

Concerning water baptism, you and I are agreed on some points. I shall state these “agreements” before I mention our “disagreements.”

Now we are agreed that no matter how sinners were saved during any past dispensation, during this period of Gentile favor and dispensation of grace any and all believing sinners are saved by grace, through faith in the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, without religious endeavor, without works of any kind and without any kind of water baptism.

We are not only agreed one hundred per cent on this point, but also that every such believing sinner, saved by grace alone, is immediately sealed by the Holy Spirit, immediately puts on Christ and immediately becomes a member of the Body of Christ without water baptism. But now the question, my dear brother, how can we prove our position by the Scriptures quoted in the letter to which I have referred?

You have admitted in your oral and written statements that the very moment the sinner receives Christ as his own personal Saviour, and is saved, he immediately is identified, by Divine baptism, with Christ in His death, burial and resurrection, and is seated with Him in the heavenlies. All of this is accomplished without water baptism. Therefore, you admit that all sprinkled believers have been buried by baptism with Christ and have been raised to walk in newness of life. You have agreed with me that water baptism has positively nothing to do with becoming a member of that true Church, which is Christ’s Body, and that the believer will not forfeit his membership in that Body because of failure to be either immersed or sprinkled.

Summarizing; we are agreed that water baptism contributes nothing towards the sinner’s salvation, aids the believer in no way to become a member of the Body of Christ and is not God’s requirement for Holy Spirit baptism. You should be willing to admit that no group of believers, calling their group a Bible Church, has the right to demand for membership in their Church a religious ceremony which they say is not essential for membership in the Body of Christ.

I am persuaded that tradition, fear and religious superstition have much to do with the practice of water baptism in the denominations today. The attitude of many Christians in the matter is like the Catholics’ fear of giving up candlesticks and incense. If they would follow the Word of God instead of the tradition of Church fathers and the teachings of Church creeds, I believe they would see that the one baptism in God’s final message of grace is the Divine baptism and not the human baptism. To my mind it is difficult to believe, by diligently searching the Scriptures, that water baptism is for this age and that it must always follow Holy Spirit baptism, salvation and membership in the Body of Christ.

On page 59 you state that in the Book of Acts “there is a somewhat different presentation of this—the Jew being already a member of a nation, which up to the cross, had been recognized as in covenant relationship with God.” Your words, “up to the cross,” explain why you and I differ concerning the dispensational place of water baptism in Acts.

In Acts 2:36 the message concerned all the house of Israel. In Acts 3:25 Peter addressed Israel, “ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant.” The Nation is protected there by the Covenant just as much as they were when Jesus said, “I know ye are Abraham’s seed.” John 8:37. To my mind Acts 13:23 and 24 also 33 and 34 teach plainly that while Israel was in the land and the temple standing, the sure mercies of David were being offered to the Nation. This is not “puerile diatribe”; this is plain common sense. This was taught by Mr. John Darby, and he was no Bullingerite. And as you know, Dr. C. I. Scofield changed his mind as to Israel’s place to the end of the Book of Acts after his reference Bible was printed. Dr. Scofield was no Bullingerite.

If we should concede that you are right as to your claim that water baptism had one meaning before Israel was set aside and a new meaning thereafter, and also agree with you that Israel had been set aside when the Lord uttered the words recorded in Mark 16:14 to 18, we could not prove the claim by the Scriptures. In Mark 16:15 and 16 the order is not “he that believeth and is saved shall be baptized,” as you preach, but “he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,” as you do not preach.

And then the proposition which the Holy Spirit led Peter to make to Israel on the day of Pentecost is contrary to your explanation. John the Baptist had preached “baptism unto repentance for the remission of sins.” What did Peter preach in Acts 2:38?

Acts 2:38:

“THEN PETER SAID UNTO THEM, REPENT AND BE BAPTIZED EVERY ONE OF YOU IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, AND YE SHALL RECEIVE THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST.”

Now you say in your book, “Christian baptism began in resurrection”, and that Christian immersion was the Christian’s expression of his experience by the work of the Holy Spirit, baptized into the death and burial of Christ. How stupid, brother, do you want a man to be? How could these 3,000 Jews have gone into the water to give expression to an experience caused by Holy Spirit baptism when the plain command was that they were to be baptized with water for the remission of sins, in order that they might receive the Holy Spirit? Moreover, they would have said to the Twelve, “come on in with us and practice what you preach. You have never received Christian baptism which began in resurrection.” “You were baptized several years ago with Covenant baptism.”

After reading Luke 18:31 to 34; Matthew 16:21 to 24 and John 20:9, we should be thoroughly convinced that if the Twelve were identified by water baptism with Christ in death, burial and resurrection, they didn’t know anything about it. And thus we see that they never received what you call “Christian baptism,” which began in resurrection. Brother, you are trying to prove Scripture by interpretation and practice which you have had handed down to you. You claim that the Body is built upon the foundation of the Twelve; therefore it seems that their water baptism should be Christian baptism. But it did not begin in resurrection.

On the day of Pentecost, and for some years thereafter, the Twelve and Paul were doing what the Twelve were instructed not to do, by Christ. “tell no man that Jesus is Christ.” Matthew 16:20. Water baptism was in connection with this testimony. John the Baptist gave the meaning of water baptism, “That Christ might be manifest to Israel I am come baptizing with water.” John 1:31.

Christ’s command of Matthew 16:20 was rescinded by His prayer of Luke 23:34. The Father heard that prayer, prolonged His mercy and kingdom offer to Israel. Then in Acts 2:36, “Let all the house of Israel know that Jesus is Christ,” and water baptism followed.

Surely you would not say to an intelligent student of the Word of God that the 3000 on the day of Pentecost became members of the Body of Christ before they received water baptism? I think you can begin to see our difficulties, if you have not before.

Let us move on to Acts 8:5 to 17. What do we learn? Philip preached Christ and things pertaining to the kingdom, and the Holy Spirit worked through him miracles of healing and casting out of demons. The people repented and were baptized. Did Philip say to those believing Israelites, “now you have received the Holy Spirit and have become members of the Body of Christ in death, burial and resurrection, let your heart express it by going into this water.” Even a child can see the fallacy of such teaching. Some days after they were baptized with water they received the Holy Spirit. Acts 8:12 and Acts 8:16. So their water baptism was not the expression of the work accomplished by Holy Spirit baptism.

You said Christian baptism began in resurrection. Brother, be humble and confess that there is something wrong with your teaching. The Pentecostalists have the Scriptural order as given in Acts 2:38; Acts 8:5 to 16 and Acts 19:1 to 9.

We turn now to Acts 19:1 to 7, in which Scriptures we have the last record of the baptizing of any believer. I do not say that some were not baptized with water after this; but this order should be significant, for this was in 55 A.D., more than 20 years after that resurrection, with which you state Christian baptism began.

Some claim that Acts 19:5 should read, “having been baptized”; referring to something that had been done before Paul met them. But according to the common interpretation, here we have some disciples of John or Apollos, who thought they were disciples of Christ. They had had one water baptism and now Paul ministers to them. Did Paul say to them, “brethren, you have already been baptized by the Holy Spirit; you have become members of the Body of Christ; you have been identified with Christ in His death, burial and resurrection by Holy Spirit baptism, and having enjoyed these benefits of Holy Spirit baptism, you should express it by being immersed.”

No, brother, we have only to read the record to see that two water baptisms and imposition of hands preceded Holy Spirit baptism. The last order given us refutes all your arguments and you should apologize to your brethren for your ungracious condemnation. Their diatribes are not as childish as yours.

The reason why there was a change in the order in the case of Cornelius was because the Jews required a sign and at that time it was not lawful for the apostles to go to Gentiles. Acts 10:38. The words “doubting nothing” tell the story. Acts 10:20. Peter had to have Divine evidence before he would baptize the first Gentiles who came into fellowship with Israel. He had to explain his unlawful ministry to the other apostles and disciples. The order in Acts 19:1 to 7 was 14 years after the order in Acts 10:44 to 48.

In the case of Philip and the eunuch, the order is not stated; however it was belief and baptism. If there was any witness, it was to the desert. There is no verse in the Bible that supports the teaching that, water baptism is a witness to the world.

On page 60 you refer to Paul’s ministry at Corinth and to the Epistle which he wrote them four or five years after he preached there. He spent 18 months ministering in that city. Acts 18:11. The record is, “many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized.” Acts 18:8. They were both Jews and Greeks. Paul wrote in I Corinthians 12:13, that they were baptized in one Spirit into one body. You admit that that is the one important baptism, the one baptism essential to salvation. Some Bible teachers prove by Acts 2:38, Acts 8:5 to 16 and Acts 19:1 to 7, that Jews received water baptism before Holy Spirit baptism; and by Acts

10:42 to 47, that Gentiles received water baptism after Holy Spirit baptism. If such teaching is applied to Acts 18:8, concerning the baptism of both Jews and Greeks at Corinth, shall we say that the Corinthians who believed and were baptized received the Holy Spirit baptism before or after they received water baptism? Can you prove the order by the record in Acts 18:1 to 11?

When Paul was preaching the gospel to the Jews and Greeks in Corinth he was disobeying Matthew 16:20, for he was testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah. Acts 18:3. This the apostles were ordered not to do. But the order was rescinded by the prayer of the Lord, Luke 23:34, which authorized the continuation of water baptism. Paul did not know that the Corinthian saints were going to be carnal and proud. When Paul wrote to them several years later, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," he was referring to his general orders from the Lord, not to his ministry to the Corinthians only. In the so-called Great Commission the Eleven were ordered to preach and baptize. Paul was sent not to baptize, but to preach. If he was working under the Great Commission when he was preaching to the heathen the Grace of Christ's message, he certainly had a water baptism exemption.

You cannot prove by reading Acts 18:1 to 11 that the Corinthians were immersed in water as an expression of their identification with Christ in death, burial and resurrection. You do not know which baptism was first. Let's not force interpretations to support our views.

The reason why I refer to your interpretation of water baptism as a theory, is because you cannot prove your position by any Scripture. You simply imagine that the Scriptures support your view, but in chapter seven of your new book you no more prove your point than you do in your book, "What Saith the Scriptures About Water Baptism."

In Acts 18:8 it is quite certain we have the record of the Corinthians' water baptism. In I Corinthians 12:13 it is quite evident that we have the Corinthians' Holy Spirit baptism. If that Holy Spirit baptism was the fulfillment of Mark 1:8, then Christ did the baptizing in the Holy Spirit. In his marginal reference Dr. Scofield makes the Holy Spirit baptism of I Corinthians 12:13 and the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5 one and the same. This is the teaching of more than 95 per cent of Bible teachers. But on page 61 of your new book you say concerning the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5 that the words would have no meaning, if water baptism, as well as that of the Spirit, were not in view." And then you add, "let me try to make this plain." If you tried, you certainly failed. You said concerning the "one Spirit" of Ephesians 4:4; "now there can be no question that the Spirit is brought in here as forming the Body, and the Spirit forms the Body by what is called elsewhere the baptism of the Spirit." Pardon me, dear brother, but that is the trouble with you; you think, your dogmatism settles the question. But you are mistaken; there is a question in the minds of 98 per cent of all Christians, and in the minds of more than 75 percent of immersionists, as to the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5, for they are sure that it is not water baptism. Whether they call it Holy Spirit baptism or Death baptism, they are sure that it is a Divine baptism and not a human baptism. And your argument may not be a "puerile diatribe", but it is rather childish. Do not allow your pride to be wounded because some brother in the Lord challenges your interpretations of Scripture. God has given us minds and surely He wants every believer to receive the Word with all readiness of mind and then to search the Scriptures to see whether these things are true.

Now your contention is that the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5 is the same water baptism mentioned in Acts 2:38, Acts 8:12 and Acts 19:5. It is evident that in the second chapter of Acts, the eighth chapter and the nineteenth chapter believing sinners were not

baptized with water, as a witness to the world, that they had been baptized by the Holy Spirit into the Body of Christ, or because by receiving the one Spirit they had been identified with Christ in His death, burial and resurrection, for the reason that the water baptism, in all three chapters, preceded Holy Spirit baptism. This is quite an important observation, especially in the nineteenth chapter, inasmuch as, it was at Ephesus that Paul baptized with water certain disciples before they received the one Spirit (if there is water baptism in Acts 19:5); and it was to the Ephesians that Paul addressed his Epistle concerning the “one Spirit” and the “one baptism”. Ephesians 4:4 and 5.

Elsewhere in your book, “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth,” you state that Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, declared no new truth to the Ephesian saints; that he presented no different message of salvation than he had preached to them some seven years before he wrote to them. If Paul presented no new aspect of the Gospel of the Grace of God in his Epistle to the Ephesians, then the order of Acts 19:1 to 7 must be the order of Ephesians 4:4 and 5; water baptism before Holy Spirit baptism. You and I are thoroughly agreed that the truth of Ephesians is for members of the Body of Christ today; and we are thoroughly agreed that a believing sinner receives the one Spirit of Ephesians 4:4 without water baptism. But if that one Spirit of Ephesians 4:4 means Holy Spirit baptism into the Body of Christ, as you teach, and the “one baptism” means one water baptism, as you teach, then, according to Acts 19:1 to 7, our teaching is unscriptural. Moreover, if the “one baptism” is water baptism and if there is no new order in Ephesians, then the believer must be baptized with water to receive the Holy Spirit; and Ephesians 2:8 and 9 are not true.

Again, if the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 is water baptism and if water baptism must have the signification that you give to it, and if, as you intimate, that one water baptism is included in the sevenfold unity to be recognized in the endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit, you were far more consistent when you held your “Closed Brethren” position of exclusion than you are now. Certainly you cannot keep the unity of the Spirit with an unbaptized believer, though he is in the same Body with you. And it is useless to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit with a saved Presbyterian, a saved Lutheran, a saved Episcopalian, a saved Methodist, a saved Mennonite, a saved Dunkard, or with any other members of the Body of Christ who do not agree with you. Again I say that if you are sincere, you are not consistent.

The Holy Spirit has taught me that the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 is the one baptism of Romans 6:3 and Colossians 2:12. Whatever the one baptism of Romans 6:3 may be, water baptism could never do for any believing sinner today what that one baptism of Romans 6:3 did for those saved sinners. They were dead, buried, raised to walk in newness of life. Their old man had been crucified. I can never read water baptism into the sixth chapter of Romans without making that water efficacious and meritorious. I connect Romans 6:3 with Luke 12:50.

The simplest principle of Bible study is context study. To my mind it is a travesty on sound exegesis to read water into Colossians 2:12. But you must force it into that verse, as well as into Romans 6:4 and Galatians 3:27 and Ephesians 4:5 to support your theory.

We concede to the Baptists the right to make water baptism a door of entrance into the Baptist Church, but inasmuch as there is no Baptist Church in the Bible, we can neither prove nor disprove anything by their church-membership requirements. But we may be sure, from Acts 2:38, Acts 8, Acts 10, Acts 19, that there were two baptisms, at least, during the Acts period. And we know that there is one baptism for the Body of Christ in the Epistle to the Ephesians. And if you and I will agree with other Fundamentalists that that “one baptism” is

the Divine baptism by which we are identified with Christ, we can obey Ephesians 4:3, “endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit.” But this we cannot do, if we read water into Ephesians 4:5, because we would have to bring several million saved brethren to your interpretation and signification of the water. You state that “one spirit” of Ephesians 4:4 refers to Holy Spirit baptism and that the “one baptism” of Ephesians 4:5 speaks of water baptism; therefore you read into the chapter “two baptisms”. The Holy Spirit says “one baptism”. If the message of the nineteenth chapter of Acts in Ephesus is the same message written in the Epistle to the Ephesians, how about the order of Acts 19:1 to 7?

On page 62 of your new book you look back to the moment of your baptism in water as one of the most precious experiences that you have ever known. I am sure that you would not defend your “water baptism” teaching on the grounds of “good feelings”. You condemn this very thing in the testimonies of Pentecostals who look back upon the “good feelings” baptism and “tongues” experience as proof that their doctrinal position is Scriptural. You and I would not be guilty of magnifying experience above the Scriptures.

Perhaps you can explain why four earnest, spiritual, able Bible teachers, in one seminary, held four different views concerning water baptism, as you were one of the four. I refer to you, Dr. Gaebelein, Dr. Carroll and Dr. Winchester. You all have the same Holy Spirit. Is the Holy Spirit responsible for four different views among Christian brethren who labour together? From your dogmatism perhaps your answer is, “no, the other three are wrong, I am right.”

Dear brother, the time has come to change the tactics so long used by those who have been so bitter in the defense of their water baptism theories. Many Christians are thinking on this subject today and they want something more than sarcasm, intimidation, abuse, ridicule and human reasoning, or the tradition of the elders. There are more than 125,000,000 Catholics in the world who believe sincerely in holy water baptism to take care of original sin. They cannot prove it by Scriptures to our satisfaction. Among the Protestants no one denomination has remained more loyal to the Scriptures than the Lutherans. Recently I heard a Lutheran preacher say that the great majority of their members become Christians by accident, that is, presented as infants for baptism. They cannot prove it by the Scriptures. Thousands of the members of the Reformed and Christian Reformed Denominations are earnest and spiritual Christians. Many of these, if not most of them, enter their denominations by water baptism in childhood: These three denominations sprinkle. Some of your best friends; among whom are a number of most able Bible teachers living, believe in immersing infants; and they support their teaching with the use of I Corinthians 10:1 to 11. To you this is unscriptural nonsense, although you are very wise in your public utterances concerning them and free from the abusive sarcasm you use your “no water” brethren. You are familiar with the teachings of the Dunkards and Mennonites, especially those who refuse to have fellowship with other Christians who have not been immersed three times, and who refuse to sit at the Lord’s table with those who do not practice the washing of feet. Are they not sincere Christians? Do they not support their teachings, or earnestly endeavor to do so, with the Scriptures?

The Disciples, or Christians, are perhaps growing more rapidly in the South than any one denomination. They teach that “born of the water” means regeneration by water baptism. They teach that water baptism is essential to salvation and in support of it they can quote two verses of Scripture concerning baptism for every one that you quote against them. And in your article you very cleverly evade the Scriptures with which they support their teaching, such as Mark 16:15 to 17; Acts 2:38; Acts 8:5 to 12; Acts 19:5 to 7.

Perhaps the Pentecostalist movement is growing more rapidly than any other one sect in this country. Most of the members of this "church" teach that water baptism is a Scriptural requirement for Holy Spirit baptism. They prove their doctrine by the Scriptures, and their interpretation is confirmed by the emotional ecstasies which they experience when they obey the Lord's command and receive the two baptisms in the Scriptural order. Dear brother, they are unquestionably sincere; but you and I would agree that they are sincerely wrong. They believe that the signs and gifts of the "Acts" church should be here. How should we explain their absence, "unbelief" or "undispensational?" What do you say? Your faulty reasoning and exegesis of the Word of God offer to the Pentecostalists no intelligent Scriptural corrective. One of their leaders said to me, "either we are right in our interpretation, or you so-called ultra-dispensationalists are right; and not the men (and he mentioned your name) who teach that the Body of Christ began at Pentecost and that there was no change at the close of Acts as to water baptism and signs." He said, "it is either the water baptism with the signs; gifts of the Spirit, imposition of hands, visions and miracles of the "Acts" period, or no water with no signs and no gifts."

Is it not possible that the Lord is using these fanatical movements to bring the Fundamentalists to their senses? Is it not true that in hundreds of cities and towns of this country most of the zealous Christians who are emphasizing the fundamentals of the faith, are also emphasizing signs, tongues, gifts, healings, and secondblessing with their demand for water baptism? Can they not support their religious program with the Book of Acts that you use to prove water baptism for this age? What do we find in the second chapter of Acts, the eighth chapter of Acts and the nineteenth chapter of Acts? Why did you not deal with Acts 2:38; Acts 8:5 to 18; Acts 19:5 to 10? Do we not find in these Scriptures practically the same program that the average Pentecostalist assembly is trying to carry on, namely "the imposition of hands," "Holy Spirit baptism", "tongues", all after water baptism; and all associated with signs, healings and other miracles? I understand that you teach that the gifts of I Corinthians 12:8 to 10 were for all members of the Body.

Now, my dear brother, it takes little argument for a "Disciple teacher" to convince "Disciple members" that "Disciple water baptism" is the one correct Scriptural interpretation concerning that ceremony. The same is true concerning Catholics, Lutherans, Pentecostalists, Mormons, Adventists, Russellites, Dunkards; Mennonites and Baptists. They have their denominational prejudices, and no two of these groups are agreed concerning the "Scriptures and water baptism."

You are a very prejudiced teacher in the matter of water baptism. You are not willing to admit that you may be wrong. Would you admit for one moment that your argument is just as much a "puerile diatribe" as is the argument of any ultradispensationalist? Do you not feel ashamed for condemning a man of God who has gone to be with the Lord and who is not here to defend himself? Dr. E. W. Bullinger, even upon the testimony of some of your good friends, was one of the most spiritual men of God of any generation, a most able Bible teacher, and one of the most courageous and uncompromising messengers of the Grace of God that the world has known, redeemed by the precious blood of Christ. I do not agree with much of his teaching any more than I do with yours, but why not cease in your endeavor to intimidate young Christians with the cry of "Bullingerism?" One of your acquaintances said to me the other day, "I do not believe Dr. Ironside ever read Bullinger; for Bullinger never taught many of the doctrines with which he charges him." "He should be honest and quote from his writings; which he could never do." The principal difference between your dispensational

teaching and that of Dr. Bullinger is concerning the time when Israel was set aside and the place of the Great Commission. You say that Israel was set aside at Matthew 23:33 to 39, and Dr. Bullinger said at Acts 28:25 to 28. Undoubtedly you know, that Dr. C. I. Scofield changed his views before he died and taught that Israel was before God until Acts 28:25 to 28. John Darby also taught this. Mr. Darby, Dr. James M. Gray, Dr. A. C. Gaebelein, Dr. W. L. Pettingill, and many other able and spiritual men of God, have taught that the Body of Christ is not carrying on its program under the Great (Commission. But you would not risk your popularity by publicly condemning one of these brethren. Remember Galatians 1:10.

You have no difficulty whatever in getting those who believe in what you call "believers' baptism" by immersion to agree with you and scatter your literature, especially the Baptists, who must defend their unscriptural name. But if you will be humble and admit that there is a possibility that you are wrong, and accept the invitation that has been extended to you, to meet with a group of earnest, spiritual Bible students to talk this matter over, you will do much more for the cause of Christ than by using abusive language in condemnation of those who are Bereans and want the Word of God rightly divided.

The past few Sundays 28 sinners have accepted Christ in our services, more than 2,400 since I have been pastor here-and more than two-thirds of them had been baptized with water.

A baptism of love among Fundamentalists is much more needed and far more important than all the water baptisms.

If you receive that baptism and with it a change of heart, let's exchange pulpits some Sunday and prove our brotherly love and tolerant spirit.

I will send you shortly the letter concerning the Dispensation of the Mystery.

With Christian love and praying for the Lord's richest blessing upon your ministry and looking forward to that time when we shall appear together with our Lord in glory as poor unworthy sinners saved by God's Grace and the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Your brother in Him,
J. C. O'Hair

WHEN IS A FINE PIECE OF EXEGESIS A VAGARY?

WATER BAPTISM AND SIGN GIFTS

To the Editor of The Moody Monthly,

Dear Brother in the Lord:

This is a love letter to you concerning your message on page 460, this month's issue of your magazine, and it is written for the cause of Divine Truth. The article is "Water Baptism and Sign Gifts", and under the heading "how the movement began" you refer to the message I wrote you in answer to your 1933 issues containing the message "Dispensationalism Running Wild," and the full message in my book, Bullingerism, Pentecostalism and the Plymouth Brethren". It is for this reason that I take the liberty of printing my reply to this present article.

In addressing you I feel as though I should like to use some very strong adjectives to express my esteem and admiration for you; but in former communications I have expressed my very high regard and Christian love. I express again my personal appreciation of your faithfulness in the Christian ministry; and with many others I praise God for sparing your valuable life these many years. I can say from a sincere heart that you are one servant of the Lord whose Christian fellowship I have coveted. Rich will be your reward when the Lord's saints shall be gathered before him for His "well dones"

Mingled with my love and admiration for you there is much sympathy. Associated with an interdenominational Christian organization, as you are, your position is difficult and unenviable; and your problems are many. You and I are great admirers and lovers of the Apostle Paul. I have often wondered if he could have held such a position at the time he said, "all they which are in Asia have turned away from me." II Timothy 1:15. To retain the fellowship, patronage and support of Calvinistic Immersionists and Arminian Sprinklers, to please the Lord and at the same time to please Denominationalists, Antidenominationalists, and Undenominationalists, and to serve, without offense, those Christians who are zealous for Israel's law or religious program with signs, the Sabbaths, oil and second blessing, most assuredly a Christian leader must be more than an ordinary religious diplomat. In spite of your problems and many difficulties, you have apparently succeeded, and with whatever of that success the Lord has been pleased, no man praises the Lord more than I do.

I am sure you know well enough that interdenominational diplomacy forbids the full and free expression from the heart of some God-given convictions. And undoubtedly you agree with me, that in the case where the servant of the Lord is in the strait betwixt two desires or duties, the one to keep interdenominational peace and the other to obey Galatians 1:10, his duty is plain, from God's Word; and that is, to do the will of God by obeying Him rather than men. It is unscriptural to hold men's persons in admiration for advantage.

I must confess that I have neither your problem nor your temptation in the matter of seeking to please my denominational brethren. I have no desire to unnecessarily offend any child of God. Neither do I hesitate or refuse to speak forth plainly and dogmatically that which I believe God has taught me and wants others to know. One of the Institute's Radio preachers recently quoted John Darby's answer to a brother who asked him the question; "Mr. Darby, what do you hold concerning water baptism?" His reply, according to the Radio preacher, was, "I hold my tongue." There are times when no servant of the Lord can please the Lord by holding his tongue concerning God's truth. I think it is in this that you and I find some disagreement, in practice whether or not in theory. We shall await the day of His presence to see who is right. However, I am willing to confess that the outspoken servant of the Lord, who is true to his convictions, must forego the joy and benefit of fellowship with many brethren in this present life.

May I add that I withdraw fellowship from no brother in the Lord, who believes in the fundamentals of the faith, who preaches the grace of God for saints and sinners, because of his personal views concerning water baptism or because, like you, he has some vague, indefinite ideas about the "sign gifts" but never tries to exercise any one of them. Some months ago I wrote to the new President of the Institute inviting him to preach for us some Sunday, explaining to him that I would be happy to adjust any misunderstandings with the Institute because of these differences. He promised to consider the matter and let me hear from him; but as yet, not a line. He is welcome, as you are; for you know you said to me very graciously and heartily, "You and I disagree very little doctrinally."

Concerning the gifts of I Corinthians 12:8 to 11, first let me state them, for the benefit of those who read this letter: “the word of wisdom,” the “ word of knowledge,” “faith,” “the gifts of healing,” “prophecy,” “discerning of spirits,” “divers kinds of tongues,” “interpretation of tongues.”

One of the reasons why I know that these gifts are not for the present dispensation, that they are not intended by God for the Body of Christ, is because you have none of them, except as you forth tell God’s words as a prophet; and surely a spiritual, faithful servant of the Lord such as you would have one or more of these gifts, if they were for Body-members of today. I think you will admit that you do not know any one who has any of these gifts. However you and I are agreed that these “sign gifts” and the signs of Mark 16:16 and 17 are not absent because of disuse or unbelief. You quote Church History for the explanation of their cessation; I quote the Scriptures, that they ceased when Israel was set aside with the close of the “Acts” period.

“HOW THE MOVEMENT BEGAN.”

You have correctly stated some of the facts concerning the experience that caused me to begin the serious study of Water Baptism and Signs Gifts. I did this to satisfy my own soul and in an earnest effort to find an answer to the Pentecostal and Healing Movements which are playing havoc with Fundamentalism all over this country, and leaving in their trail deluded souls and religious fanatics.

Why do you very ungraciously add, “the seed fell into prepared soil?” That is not the manifestation of love. At the time I had the talk with the Pentecostalist preacher I was preaching and practicing immersion. I confess that I never could see what a tank of water had to do with the grace of God. I could not understand why water had to be heated and a servant of the Lord had to put on special clothes and put a believer under the water to add anything to the finished work of Christ. Grace preachers, who immerse, say it does not add anything; they say that the moment the sinner trusts in Christ he is eternally saved; he is immediately, by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, identified with Christ in death, burial, resurrection and is seated with Him in the heavenlies, without water. Then they begin with their “Buts”. But their “Buts” do not agree. There are some twenty or more of them. As one dear saint just wrote me, she wanted to teach water baptism, the International Sunday School lesson, the past Sunday. She took down her volumes and church papers and Bible monthlies for help; one from Dallas, another was Our Hope, another the Sunday School Times, another written by a leading Chicago Fundamentalist, the pastor of our leading Chicago Fundamentalist Church; and several others. And all of these teachers differed in their views. She was certainly able to teach her class to be exceedingly broadminded, flexible, and uncertain about the subject; for she also gave them my views.

WEAKNESS OF THE POSITION

In your article you referred to the weakness of our position, but, brother beloved, never in my life have I ever read any message coming from the mind and pen of a recognized, spiritual leader, as weak as your criticism and “Scripture-less” answer to our position, unless it was in the recent publication called “Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth,” containing several messages from the mind and pen of another Fundamentalist leader, who, judging from the carnal weapons employed and his unscriptural scheme of trying to identify spiritual orthodox brethren with men unsound in the faith, wrote under a state of excitement, anger and mental disturbance. I am

sending you a copy of my answer to him, which I hope you will read, inasmuch as it is an answer to your article.

How clear you are in your defense of other fundamental doctrines and glorious Bible truths! How vague, illogical and unconvincing your arguments are in this article! Your message shows either lack of knowledge and preparation, or a desperate attempt to win the approval and support of a group of Christians already prejudiced against fellow-members of the Body of Christ who are satisfied with Christ without signs, religion and ceremonies.

With real Bereans your article will help to stimulate and confirm the fast growing conviction, that our message cannot be Scripturally answered, and in desperation those who are pushed forward to make the attempt, must turn away from II Timothy 2:15 to church history or abuse, sarcasm and misrepresentation.

We intend to hold a Berean Bible Conference at North Shore Church, Sheridan Road and Wilson Avenue, from June 17th to 21st, this year. Hereby we most respectfully invite you to come and show us the error of our way with the Bible, without appeal to church history, in accordance with II Timothy 3:16. You will be granted the most respectful hearing, the most gracious, prayerful consideration. We ask the privilege of questioning you after you deliver your message.

If you are unwilling to do this, will you give me one hour before the faculty and student body of the Institute and give outsiders the opportunity of attendance? Don't be afraid of the truth. Let's get at our differences with the Word of God, and away from the tactics used by so many who have no Scriptural answer to the claim that water baptism has no place in this "signless" dispensation of grace.

In column 2, page 460, concerning your paragraph beginning with these words, "And Mr. Bishop goes further still", you thus conclude: "It leaves no basis whatever for the theory that water baptism and the sign gifts were only for the Jews, and that they ceased when the latter rejected the second offer of the kingdom." It seems to me that you are trying to leave with your readers the impression that Mr. Bishop did not believe that the "sign gifts" ceased when Israel was set aside, at the close of Acts. He most assuredly did believe it as did Dr. Scofield. We give the statement again from Mr. Bishop's book: "The sign gifts of I Corinthians 12 were operative only through the Book of the Acts period."

May I call your attention to a misrepresentation in your article which I believe to be unintentional on your part. I have never claimed, and I do not know any teacher of the Word of God who has ever claimed, that only Israelites received water baptism, or that the "sign gifts" were not found among the Gentiles. How could even a superficial student of the Word of God make such a statement, with the Book of Acts before him, and with the words found in I Corinthians 12:2, "ye know that ye were Gentiles?" This is the chapter in which the "sign gifts" are enumerated. And in the 13th verse the Word declares that both Jews and Gentiles were in the Body at Corinth. I trust that you will correct this misrepresentation in the next issue of the Moody Monthly. I do not understand why we cannot prove or disprove the "scripturalness" of our doctrines on the authority of the Word of God, without an appeal to church history and without resorting to any untrue accusations against a fellow-Christian. In practically every attempt to answer our position the critics have earnestly endeavored to prejudice and intimidate their followers rather than give light from the Word of God.

Another thing, you would leave the impression that those who teach that the kingdom was offered to Israel, in Acts 3:14 to 26, are teaching error; when this is your own teaching.

I want to again express my utter surprise that a spiritual man of God, a gifted Bible teacher, who has been a leader for nearly half a century, is willing to acknowledge that Pentecostalism is unscriptural, if not a satanic delusion, and yet you not only offer no Scriptural antidote, but you attack the one and only Scriptural answer to the delusion. Instead of offering the corrective for the heresy you make an appeal to church history to attack the Scriptural corrective of that heresy. Can you not see the weakness of such a procedure when it is admitted by all students of the Word of God and of Church history that the apostacy came before the middle of the second century; and therefore those today contending for the “sign gifts” and the program of the Book of Acts would say, “of course the signs ceased in the middle of the second century, because of the low spiritual state in the churches of that period?” It seems to me that we should either answer the fallacies of Pentecostalism and similar movements with the Scriptures or acknowledge there is no God-given answer, and wish them Godspeed.

What you call the new movement is not new today. It was new with the close of Acts and has been buried beneath ecclesiastical rubbish for centuries. It is our duty to recover the glorious truth concerning the dispensation of the mystery, found in Paul’s prison epistles, and there find the answer to every heresy that is troubling the Body of Christ today, and the antidote for every religious mixture that the enemy is using to frustrate the grace of God.

It is quite significant that among the carnal, divided Christians of Corinth all of the sign gifts were found, which is sufficient proof that the presence of signs is not the mark of spirituality or unusual faith. Many of them were babes and could take only milk. They were unspiritual in their dealings with one another; but all of the gifts were found there. And, furthermore, Paul declared that some of those sign gifts belonged to babyhood doctrine. I Corinthians 13:8 to 13.

In I Corinthians 14:18, Paul said, “I thank my God I speak with tongues more than ye all.”

In I Corinthians 1:17, Paul said, “For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.”

In verse 14, he said, “I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius.”

I wish you would give me an intelligent exegesis of Scriptures for the elimination from our present day church program of the sign gifts that will not eliminate the water baptism. Let’s not go to Dr. Warfield. Let’s stay with the Book. Is it consistent to prove water baptism by the tenth chapter of I Corinthians, the Lord’s Supper by the eleventh chapter, and prove nothing concerning the gifts by the twelfth chapter?

ISRAEL - SIGNS - WATER BAPTISM

You would lead your readers to believe that signs and water baptism are not associated with each other in the Word of God. Although your appeal is to church history, rather than to the Scriptures, you believe the signs disappeared in the second century and that the water baptism is for the Body of Christ in the twentieth century.

I have no appeal to church history except to show how churches departed from the Word of God. But I appeal to the Scriptures. Here are some simple, plain, significant Bible statements

“The Jews require a sign.” I Corinthians 1:22.

“Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know.” Acts 2:22.

“And I knew Him not: but that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.” John 1:31.

“And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.” Mark 1:5.

“And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon Him.” Mark 1:10.

“And He healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew Him.” Mark 1:34.

“But He answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” Matthew 15:24.

“And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

“And these signs shall follow them that believe: In My Name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues.”

“They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Mark 16:15 to 18.

“Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phenice and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the Word to none but the Jews only.” Acts 11:19.

“And when James, Peter, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship: that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.” Galatians 2:9.

“And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.”

“And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.”

“And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.”

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

“And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.” Acts 2:1 to 5.

“Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” Acts 2:36.

“Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Acts 2:38.

“And the people with one accord gave heed unto these things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did.”

“But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.” Acts 8:6 and 12.

“And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert.”

“And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.” Acts 8:26 and 38.

“For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God.”

“And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days.” Acts 10:46 and 48.

“And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken: and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one’s bands were loosed.”

“And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway.” Acts 16:26 and 33.

“When they heard this, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus.”

“And when Paul had laid his hands upon them. the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied.” Acts 19:5 and 6.

You should be willing to admit that it is rather significant that the Jewish words, “Israel”, “sabbath”, “synagogue”, “temple”, “Jew”, “law”, “Moses”, “fathers”, occur in the Acts 276 times, in the three Synoptic Gospels 252 times.

Is it not significant that we have the last Bible record of the practice of water baptism in Acts 19:5, with tongues and miracles following? And that in Acts 28:9 we have the last Bible record of miracles. Compare with Philippians 2:25 to 28; I Timothy 5:23; II Timothy 4:20. There is a Bible record of signs after the last record of water baptism; but the last record of water baptism is associated with signs. Acts 19:1 to 11. Another record of signs is found in I Corinthians 12:8 to 11.

Wherever there is the record of water baptism there is in the context either a sign or some Israelitish religious ceremony or observance.

EVIDENCE THAT RECOILS

Referring to your remarks under “Evidence that Recoils” you express sorrow that the revered Dr. Scofield should have become coupled with this “vagary”, and added, “quite without warrant”. Perhaps you may live long enough to express your sorrow for referring to the teaching of another servant of the Lord as a “vagary”. Let us see if it was quite without warrant. Let the readers judge.

Surely you have not become doubleminded But I am wondering how to reconcile this statement with a statement in your letter to me, under date of March 21, 1933. This is the statement: “YES, I AM READING AND WITH MUCH INTEREST, YOUR BOOKLET, “MUCH, LITTLE, NO WATER?” AND ALTHOUGH I DO NOT GO ALL THE WAY WITH YOU, I REGARD IT AS A FINE PIECE OF EXEGESIS. YOUR FAULT IS, IF YOU WILL FORGIVE ME, THAT YOU ARE TOO INTENSE.”

Do you not think, brother, that there is quite a difference between a “vagary” and a fine piece of exegesis? In my printed message entitled “Much, Little, No Water” I have set forth that which I still believe to be the Scriptural antidote for Pentecostalism and the healing delusions among people who are trusting in the precious blood of Christ for their redemption. You will recall a very pleasant visit, which I enjoyed with you in your office, when we had rather a lengthy discussion concerning the message set forth in my booklet to which I have just referred. You had the message marked with your pencil all the way through, and remarked that you were then going through it for the third time. You said to me, “That is a good message, and if you will go slowly I think you will win your brethren.” That conversation was at the time that you very graciously agreed to broadcast over WMBI the services of the North Shore Church of which I am pastor. You were thoroughly familiar with my views concerning water baptism and the Transitional Acts period when you put me on the air.

Under date of March 27th, 1933, you said in your letter:

“COMING NOW TO THE QUESTION OF YOUR TEACHING ABOUT BAPTISM, YOU ARE NOT TO BE CONDEMNED BUT CONTRARIWISE COMMENDED, IF YOU BELIEVE IT IS THE TRUTH. BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU SHOULD EXPECT OPPOSITION FROM THOSE WHO DO NOT AGREE WITH YOU AND YET WHOSE MOTIVE IS ENTITLED TO EQUAL RESPECT.”

Then you added that you were desirous that an open door among the fundamentalists should be granted for my message. It is rather difficult for me to understand why you stated in your letter that I ought to be commended for my stand and then in your oral ministry and written messages condemn me for my stand. Are you consistent? You know full well that your attempt to answer my position on water baptism was positively futile. Eliminating as you do, the Great Commission, you can not find where any one member of the Body of Christ is commanded to baptize a fellow believer also in that Body.

Coming now to your reference to Dr. C. I. Scofield, I can hardly understand why you should be more gracious in your attitude toward him than toward your other fellow-servants of the Lord.

In my booklet entitled “Bullingerism, Pentecostalism and the Plymouth Brethren”, I have stated facts. And inasmuch as the Moody Bible Institute has for years been responsible for the printing and distribution of the pamphlet written by A. E. Bishop, entitled “Tongues, Signs, and Visions Not God’s Order for Today”, I see no reason why I should keep quiet and receive condemnation and prosecution without offering my defense and producing all legitimate and valid evidence. Surely, there is nothing unjust about this. You admit that Dr. Scofield gives his unqualified endorsement to Mr. Bishop’s message. And in order to further the sales of the booklet the Colportage Association has printed his unreserved commendation on the first page. It has been because of Dr. Scaffold’s endorsement that so many have been sold. Therefore, the teaching of Mr. A. E. Bishop concerning the sign gifts, tongues and healing, was the teaching of Dr. C. I. Scofield, in the year 1920. On page 17 is found this statement

“THERE IS NO FOUNDATION IN THE WORD OF GOD FOR THE PREVAILING POPULAR DOCTRINE OF ‘DIVINE HEALING’.”

On page 19 is found this statement:

“A CAREFUL STUDY OF THE EPISTLES, ESPECIALLY OF THE LATEST EPISTLES OF PAUL, WHICH GIVE THE NORMAL COURSE OF THE CHURCH DURING THE PRESENT DISPENSATION, WOULD DISMOUNT ALL FROM THEIR HOBBIES, ELIMINATE THE LAST VESTIGE OF JUDAISM FROM THEIR LIVES.”

On page 5 is found this statement:

“AFTER REPEATED STUDY OF THE EPISTLES WRITTEN AFTER PAUL’S ARRIVAL AT ROME, I AM CONVINCED THAT IN THEM IS FOUND A CURATIVE TEACHING FOR ALL OF THE PRESENT-DAY DELUSIONS AND FANATICISMS FOUND AMONG MANY OF THE MOST SINCERE SAINTS IN THE CHURCH.”

On page 15 is found this statement:

“THE SIGN GIFTS OF I CORINTHIANS 12 WERE OPERATIVE ONLY DURING THE BOOK OF ACTS PERIOD.”

Now, my dear Editor, why do you express sorrow that Dr. Scofield’s name has been brought into this controversy? Who is responsible, if not the Moody Bible Institute? I believe it is of God for the advancement of truth. I can appreciate somewhat your problem, as you are teaching the Scofield Bible Course to your Institute classes. And you of course regret that Dr.

Scotfield has endorsed the teaching that you are condemning in your editorial. According to Dr. Scotfield, the sign gifts of I Corinthians 12 were operative only during the Book of Acts period. Moreover, you will notice in the first part of this "Bishop" booklet that the writer declares that those who do not agree with his teaching have been deceived by Satan.

This places you in rather an embarrassing predicament, inasmuch as one department in the Moody Bible Institute, which is sending out the printed Bible messages, is showing plainly that Dr. Scotfield taught as Divine truth what you teach, in this June edition of the Moody Institute Monthly, to be a vagary, concerning the sign gifts of the twelfth chapter of I Corinthians. How would it sound, dear brother, if you would write to the students of your Scotfield Correspondence Course that Dr. Scotfield taught a vagary concerning the "sign gifts"? Surely, one who is an uncompromising and honorable, consistent servant of the Lord should not discriminate by praising one Christian brother and condemning another one when they teach the same truth. This leads us to this question:

IS DR. WARFIELD'S BOOK THE ANTIDOTE?

According to your editorial, you do not deny that at least some forms of Pentecostalism can properly be termed Satanic delusions. And you suggest in your first paragraph that you could not object to any Scriptural remedy to deliver people from the delusion. You say the motive is commendable. After carefully reading your editorial from first to last I must come to this conclusion: you believe that Pentecostalism with its program of "tongues" and "counterfeit signs" is unscriptural, but that there is no Scriptural antidote, corrective or curative. However, you intimate that although this cannot be found in the Scriptures, it can be found in Dr. Warfield's book. Thus you admit that the Christian in error must go to church history to learn truth to correct his error.

You are thoroughly familiar with the claim of the Roman Catholic Church, in the latter of the marvels and miracles that have been wrought in the holy pools that have been visited by the Virgin Mary, and with the holy things that have been blessed by their other saints. Surely, as a teacher of the Word of God for all these many years, you would not ask a student of the Word of God to turn to church history for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness. If we have nothing but church history by which to show Pentecostalists the error of their way, my opinion is that we should by all means leave them alone, for church history is entirely too untrustworthy to be considered the highest court of appeal in this matter. Moreover, it seems to me that it is an indictment against God in giving us such incomplete truth in His inspired Word that we must have it supplemented by the traditions of elders and early church fathers. If some Christian who is troubled about "tongues", "signs" and "miraculous healing" comes to me for light, is it possible that I cannot give it to him out of the Bible, but must refer to Dr. Warfield and the Christians of the second century?

You speak of those upon whom the hands of the apostles had been laid and miracles continuing while they were alive. In I Timothy 4:14 and II Timothy 1:6 Paul refers to the hands that were laid on Timothy; but he certainly did not tell Timothy to exercise the "healing" or "miracle" gift of I Corinthians 12:8 and 9. He told him to take wine for his sickness. I Timothy 5:23. My explanation of this is Dr. Scotfield's explanation. "The sign gifts of I Corinthians 12 were operative only during the Book of Acts period." According to the teaching of Dr. Scotfield and many other doctors.

SIR ROBERT ANDERSON AND THE SIGN GIFTS

You will recall the fact that when I visited you in your office and talked with you about this matter, you showed me a large portrait of Sir Robert Anderson on your office wall. I remember how you asked me this question. You asked, "Did you ever meet that dear man of God?" Then you added, "He was one of the greatest of them all." We spoke of him as one of the outstanding Bible students of any age; one of God's gifted teachers. And right here, I would like to say that among all the servants of the Lord I have never held any in higher esteem than you and Sir Robert Anderson. I here quote several statements from Sir Robert Anderson's book, "The Silence of God". In my judgment he has the only Scriptural explanation of the absence of signs in the Church of Christ today. And so far as a human author is concerned, I do not know of a greater service the Colportage Association could do than to place a copy of "The Silence of God" in the hands of every thinking Christian in the land.

MY CONTENTION IS THAT THE ACTS, AS A WHOLE, IS THE RECORD OF A TEMPORARY AND TRANSITIONAL DISPENSATION IN WHICH BLESSING WAS AGAIN OFFERED TO THE JEW AND AGAIN REJECTED."

"AS INDICATED IN THESE PAGES, IT GIVES THE CLEW TO THE RIGHT UNDERSTANDING OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES—A BOOK WHICH IS PRIMARILY THE RECORD, NOT, AS COMMONLY SUPPOSED, OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. BUT OF THE APOSTASY OF THE FAVOURED NATION."

"IT HAS BEEN FURTHER ARGUED THAT, SO FAR AS THEIR EVIDENTIAL FORCE WAS CONCERNED, THE "CHRISTIAN MIRACLES" WERE FOR THAT FAVOURED PEOPLE 'OF WHOM, AS CONCERNING THE FLESH, CHRIST CAME.' AND IF THIS BE WELL FOUNDED WE SHALL BE PREPARED TO FIND THAT SO LONG AS THE KINGDOM WAS BEING PREACHED TO JEWS, MIRACLES ABOUNDED, BUT THAT WHEN THE GOSPEL APPEALED TO THE HEATHEN WORLD, MIRACLES LOST THEIR PROMINENCE, AND SOON ENTIRELY CEASED."

"THERE WERE NO MIRACLES SEEN BY FELIX, OR FESTUS, OR AGRIPPA; AND AS ALREADY NOTICED, WHEN PAUL STOOD BEFORE NERO THE ERA OF MIRACLES HAD CLOSED. THE MIRACLES OF ACTS 28:8 AND 9 ARE CHRONOLOGICALLY THE LAST ON RECORD, AND THE LATE EPISTLES ARE WHOLLY SILENT RESPECTING THEM."

"THE WORD OF GOD IS OUR GUIDE, AND NOT THE EXPERIENCE OF FELLOW-CHRISTIANS; AND WHEN THIS IS IGNORED THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES ARE DISASTROUS. THE ANNALS OF 'FAITH-HEALING', AS IT IS CALLED, ARE RICH IN CASES OF MIMETIC OR HYSTERICAL DISEASE, BUT ABOUT THE SPIRITUAL WRECKAGE DUE TO FAILURES INNUMERABLE THEY ARE SILENT."

"AN APPEAL TO 'THE CHRISTIAN MIRACLES', IT HAS BEEN URGED, SO FAR FROM SOLVING THE MYSTERY, SERVES ONLY TO INTENSIFY IT. THE PURPOSE OF THE MIRACLES, MOREOVER, WAS TO ACCREDIT THE MESSIAH TO ISRAEL, AND NOT, AS GENERALLY SUPPOSED, TO ACCREDIT CHRISTIANITY TO THE HEATHEN. AND THEREFORE, AS SCRIPTURE PLAINLY INDICATES, THEY CONTINUED SO LONG AS THE TESTIMONY WAS ADDRESSED TO THE JEW, BUT CEASED WHEN, THE JEW BEING SET ASIDE, THE GOSPEL WENT OUT TO THE GENTILE WORLD."

In your editorial you leave the impression that you disagree with those who teach that Israel the Nation was offered anew the Kingdom in Acts 3:14 to 26. I think in fairness to all you should have informed your readers that you hold this view yourself, for I quote from your Christian Workers' Commentary, page 347, your own words "LET THEM NOW REPENT THAT THE LORD MAY SEND THE MESSIAH WHO HATH BEEN APPOINTED FOR YOU. THE INFERENCE FROM ALL THIS TO THE END OF THE CHAPTER IS THAT, HAD THEY AS A NATION REPENTED THE MESSIAH WOULD HAVE RETURNED AT THAT TIME TO SET UP HIS KINGDOM IN ISRAEL."

And then I also quote from that same wonderful book of yours, page 313, your comment on the Great Commission:

"A THIRD MATTER OF IMPORTANCE IS THE 'GREAT COMMISSION' AS IT IS CALLED (MATTHEW 28:19 AND 20). NOTE THE WORD 'NAME' AS INDICATIVE OF THE TRINITY. IT IS NOT NAMES BUT 'NAME'. FATHER, SON AND HOLY SPIRIT IS THE FINAL NAME OF THE ONE TRUE GOD. THE CONJUNCTION IN ONE NAME OF THE THREE AFFIRMS EQUALITY AND ONENESS OF SUBSTANCE.' NOTE THE PECULIARITY OF THE TERMS. THIS IS THE KINGDOM COMMISSION, AS ANOTHER EXPRESSES IT, NOT THE CHRISTIAN COMMISSION. THE LATTER IS IN LUKE, DISTINCTIVELY THE GENTILE GOSPEL. BUT NOT HERE, WHICH IS DISTINCTIVELY THE JEWISH GOSPEL. AND THIS IS ALL THE MORE REMARKABLE BECAUSE IN LUKE, THE DISCIPLES ARE COMMANDED TO GO TO THE JEWS (Luke 24:47), WHILE HERE THEY ARE COMMANDED TO GO TO "ALL NATIONS'. IT POINTS TO THE CLOSE OF THE AGE WHEN THE COMMISSION WILL BE CARRIED OUT BY THE FAITHFUL REMNANT OF THE JEWS SO OFTEN SPOKEN ABOUT. IT HAS NOT YET BEEN CARRIED OUT. THE STORY OF THE ACTS IS NOT ITS FULFILLMENT. ITS ACCOMPLISHMENT HAS BEEN INTERRUPTED, BUT WILL BE TAKEN UP BEFORE THE LORD COMES TO DELIVER ISRAEL AT THE LAST."

One reason why I refer to this, is because I believe in honesty, sincerity and consistency among Christians. And I think you ought to explain to your readers what your belief concerning the Great Commission is. You have written it as above stated in your Christian Workers' Commentary and yet you recently printed in the Moody Monthly the message of W. M. Robertson of Vancouver condemning those who teach what you have written in your Christian Workers' Commentary. And also explain why the very same week the Moody Monthly, containing Dr. Robertson's article, was mailed out, your Radio preacher advised the hearers to buy the book, "Expositions of the Gospel of Matthew" by Dr. W. L. Pettingill. Dr. Pettingill agrees with you concerning the Great Commission, that it is not for the Body of Christ. Now, while I appreciate your impossible task and your unenviable position in trying to please the Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Covenant Christians and Interdenominational Fundamentalists, it none the less brings grief to my soul to witness such inconsistencies in the endeavor to get interdenominational peace at the expense of God's truth. This is where you and I disagree.

Surely it is useless to try to agree with a number of brethren who disagree among themselves concerning water baptism. Concerning the fundamentals, we have no difficulty in seeing alike. We all believe that Christ alone is sufficient and that God has some intelligent method of separating Christ from Judaism and religion.

You surely agree with me that no servant of the Lord has the Scriptural right to go from Matthew to II Timothy and capriciously, arbitrarily and promiscuously select such of the

programs of those different books as will fit into his religious program or denominational creed and reject the rest.

The Holy Spirit surely intended that II Timothy 2:15 should be applied to rid the message of grace of all religion and leave the believer an all-sufficient Christ. I have tried to apply the principle in the messages we have sent out near and far. More than 300,000 booklets have gone out.

You are correct; we are few but aggressive. How many stood with Paul when he stood for the mystery?

You must admit that our aggressive campaign for the truth has made believers study as never before, to see why they have not been taught in your Institute and in their churches to obey Ephesians 3:9.

Do you not believe that the controversy will fall out for the furtherance of the study of “Body” Truth? It is a good thing to provoke Christians to the Berean spirit of Bible study. We must all admit that our present-day program differs so radically from the Church program of the “Acts” period that the present Church might as well be considered a different Church. Shall our slogan be “Back to Pentecost” or “On to Paul’s Prison Epistles”?

With Christian love, yours for the Lord’s Truth,

J. C. O’HAIR