

SECTARIANISM

ANALYZED, DEFINED AND EXPOSED

A TRACT

FOR

HOME READING

BY

APOSTOLIC DISCIPLES

SECOND EDITION

PUBLISHED BY

DANIEL SOMMER

Price 10 cts. a copy, 75 cts. a dozen

Religious Sectism Defined Analyzed and Exposed

CHAPTER I. Definition of Sectism

What is the meaning of the word *sect*? It is a word used in the Common Version of the Bible as a translation of the Greek word *hairesis*, which means "a choice or option; hence, a sect, faction; by implication, discord, contention." In its verb form the word *hairetia* means, "to take for one's self, choose, to choose by vote." Is the word *heresy* or *sect* used in a favorable sense in the Bible? No. Judging from the standpoint of an established religion there are no justifiable sects or heresies. Taking the gospel and the Church of Christ as standards of judging it is evident that all sects and heresies are wrong. What ideas are always present in heresies and sects? The word *heresy* specially refers to the doctrine or notion which is adopted by choice, while the word *sect* specially refers to the result of the heresy being adopted. *Heresy* is the theory while *sect* is the practical result or outworking of the theory when adopted. Option, choice, vote—these three words mention the beginning and progress necessary in the formation of all heresies and sects which have marked the deviations from the gospel in all generations since the gospel began to be preached.

What is the effect of a religious heresy when it ripens into a vote? After the spirit of choice has ripened into a vote, whether overtly or covertly made, then the conclusion is sooner or later reached by those doing the voting, that every truth of

importance is found within the compass of the ideas or notions which they have adopted. This is especially true when a system of religion has been adopted. Then the conclusion is nearly always reached that the adopted system" is the standard of measuring. As a result the eyes and ears of those adopting such a system are closed against additional truth; honest investigation is ended with them, they feel themselves encased within the limits of what has been already adopted, and thus are the victims of one of the worst ailments which ever afflicted the human family—Sectism.

As sectism is the result of a heresy being formulated, and enforced, and as the Greek word for heresy means choice or option, what is the opposite of sectism. It is expressed by the one word *authority*. A heresy could never have been conceived; , nor a sect formed among professed Christians if they had all confined themselves to what is given by divine authority. Reverence for divine authority and whole-hearted submission thereto will make heresies and sects impossible. Sectism is choicism or *optionism* and is the opposite of *autkorityism*.

ANALYSIS OF SECTISM.

What caused the first doctrinal disturbance in the church, when first established? *Hobbyism*. Certain Jews who believed in Christ made a hobby of circumcision, and began to ride it among the churches of. Christ established among Gentiles. As they went forth on their mission of mischief they made this exclusive or hobbyish speech; "Except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Acts 16:1.

What is hobbyism? It is undue emphasis of any notion or idea, and the hobbyist is one who is victimized by such emphasis. The idea that takes possession of him may be wholly, wrong, or it may be a perverted truth, or simply; a truth unduly magnified. Perhaps the best definition of a hobbyist ever given outside of an insane asylum comes from the pen of that great preacher of the gospel, Benjamin Franklin, and is as follows:

We are asked to define what we mean by one-idealism, and explain how the universe is made up of atoms. With this request

we cheerfully comply. It is to be carried away with one idea. The idea may be a good one, or it may not; but one-idea-ism is giving an idea undue importance. A man addicted to one-idea-ism can no more cover it than a leopard can change his spots. If he attempts to pray he will commence with something else as a stepping stone, regularly paving the way, and unmistakably making his way to his favorite idea. When it is put forth and he is delivered of it he is relieved for the time being, especially if he finds that it annoys some one. If you call on him for an exhortation, a sermon, or if he writes, he may wind round and round, trace back and forward, but it will, in spite of himself, in all his efforts to conceal it, be manifest to all, that he takes no interest in all he is saying, only as it subserves his purpose. In paving the way to the one idea the center around which the whole man revolves, and to which his entire existence is subservient. If that one idea is not dragged in, the man, is not relieved, his burden is still upon his Soul, and he is in travail waiting to be relieved.

Did an insane man ever describe a hobbyist? " Yes, as the following incident will show: Several persons visited an insane asylum, and found an inmate riding a stick as children sometimes do. Upon being asked what he was doing the insane man responded that he was "riding a hobby." Thereupon he was asked If he would not rather have 'a horse.' "Oh, no," he promptly answered, "You see I could get down from 'a horse,' but I can't get down from my hobby." This answer of an insane man strikingly describes a hobbyist. He is one who has been victimized by unduly considering some favorite idea, which may be wholly erroneous, or a misapplication of 'truth, or a truth unduly magnified or extended.

When is a truth unduly magnified or extended? Whenever it is lifted above other truth equally important, or is considered to the exclusion of other truth which should be considered.

Was that the procedure by which certain Jews at Jerusalem made a hobby of circumcision? Yes, circumcision was a fleshly mark, and a national mark for Jews, and those who wished to be of the Jewish nation, but it was never intended to be urged on the Gentile nations. Therefore when Gentile sinners were converted to Christ it was wrong for Jewish believers to urge them to be circumcised.

If a Jew be converted to Christ would it be wrong for him, to circumcise his children? No, it would not be wrong as may be gathered from the fact that the apostle Paul circumcised Timothy who was only a half Jew. Acts 16:1-3. Paul would not have done that if Jews had no right to circumcision after the gospel was introduced.

But was not circumcision a part of the law given through Moses, and is not Christ the end of the law to every one who believes? Circumcision, like faith, was in existence before the law (Rom. 4th chapter,) and though circumcision was enforced by the law, yet it was before the law and did not; end with the law. But it is a national mark for the Jews as a peculiar people, whom God still intends to preserve and keep separated from all other nations. Jer. 30:11.

What is the strongest evidence in the New Testament." that the Jews who urged circumcision on Gentile , Christians had made a hobby of that institution? It is found in Gal. 6:12, 13, where it is stated that the purpose of those Jews was to make a fair show in the flesh, and to avoid persecution on account of the cross of Christ, and to glory in the flesh of Gentile Christians, but not because they themselves kept the law, nor because they were genuine Christians. Paul divested; them of their pretentious, and exposed their true character, to the public view.

Are all hobbyists mere pretenders? No, some of them are good people in many respects, but they are generally, if not always, afflicted with some serious defect, either by; nature or education, and in order to compensate for that defect, or overbalance it in some way they urge themselves to an opposite extreme. This is Illustrated in the case of one who is a hypocrite assuming extreme piety, or in the case of one specially lacking in reverence assuming extreme humility, or of one who is naturally of an exclusive disposition making a hobby of denouncing the narrowness of the sects. Hobbyism is always unduly exclusive, and religious hobbyism is the first step of error in the direction of sectism. It is likewise the last step of error which is abandoned in the return from religious sectism

to the gospel of Christ. The religious hobbyist generally becomes such by looking at a passage of scripture very much as a dog looks at his dinner. He forgets the past and ignores the future, so that he will often bite the hand which furnished him the dinner if that hand should attempt to make any change therein, or make any addition thereto. Thus it is that a hobbyist often acts the part of an enemy to his best friend. His favorite theory becomes his absorbing theme. He is like Solomon's sluggard, and thus is "wiser in his own conceit than seven men who can render a reason Prov. 26:16. He says, that he *knows* that he is right because he is *with* the scripture, and *on* the scripture. There is no use to tell him that every scripture may be fraught with evil results when pressed beyond its divinely intended application. He *knows* he is right, and *cannot* be wrong because he is "with the word of God." But the truth is that he is only with an undue *extension*, or a *perversion* or *misapplication* of the word of God. Such is *hobbyism*—the first step away from the truth in its simplicity, purity, and fulness, and the last step taken on the return to the position where truth in its perfection is found. Hobbyism is the first degree in "the mystery of iniquity," which "mystery" is found in its perfection in the Roman Catholic Church. Hobbyism was the first wedge of doctrinal division driven into the primitive body of believers whereby "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" was threatened, and hobbyism is the last wedge that the devil attempts to drive so as to destroy the oneness and peace of the church when all other errorism has been abandoned.

CHAPTER II.

What is the second step taken in passing from the gospel, as established by the apostles of Christ at Jerusalem, to the apostasy as established at Rome? *Innovationism*. Illustrations of this are found in Acts 21st chapter, and in 1 Cor. 11th chapter. The church which consisted of converted Jews at Jerusalem failed to grasp the full bearing of that statement which says,

Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes." Rom. 10:4. Therefore certain Jewish rites were borrowed from Judaism by that Church. This was the beginning of innovationism among converted Jews. Then the church at Corinth, which consisted of converted heathen, failed to grasp the full bearing of that statement which, says, "And ye are complete in him who is the head of all principality and power." Col. 2:10. Therefore the church at Corinth was disposed to borrow a heathenish feast and connect it with the gospel. This was the beginning of innovationism among converted Gentiles.

What is the meaning of the word *innovation*? It means the introduction of something new, strange, or foreign. Religious innovations are practices that are thrust upon the established order of things, and are not in harmony therewith. innovations in themselves may be right or they may be wrong. The fact that they are innovations does not prove their real character.

How then is their real character to be determined? Simply by considering the established order of things. If that order be *right* and *complete* then all innovations thereon or thereupon are *wrong*. For instance, God's divine power has given unto Christians "all things that pertain to life and godliness," (2 Pet. 1:3) and inspired scripture is given "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17). Now, as this is true it is evident that whatever is introduced by human arrangement into the worship or work divinely required of Christians is an *innovation*, and is therefore *wrong*. But if the divine arrangement for worship and work, for "life and godliness," were imperfect or incomplete then an innovation might be right, as it might tend to supply what is lacking in an imperfect or incomplete order of things.

What is the difference between *hobbyism* and *innovationism*? It is partly expressed by the Latin words *ab intra*—meaning "from within," and the words *ab extra*—meaning "from without." The difference is further expressed by the Greek word

theoria—meaning "theory," and *practice*—meaning "practice." In other words *Hobbyism* begins with an *internal theory* which may establish itself in an *external practice* while innovationism begins with an external practice which may result in establishing an *internal theory*. This discrimination being true it is evident that hobbyism has the first chance to work doctrinal mischief in a church which is perfect in doctrine, while innovationism has the first chance to corrupt the practice of a church that is perfect in worship and work. Hobbyism, when developed, contends for *unscriptural strictness* in the church, while innovationism, when developed, pleads for *unscriptural liberty*. The former is more exclusive than the scriptures authorize, while the latter is less exclusive than the scriptures require. They are both the offspring of irreverence for the completeness and integrity of the Sacred Text, and thus have their foundation in the weakness rather than in the strength of those with whom they originate and by whom they are urged. May not an innovation be used as a hobby? Yes, and that is frequently done. When doctrines or ideas not mentioned in the gospel are introduced, and then are so magnified as to be exclusive of truth, they are both *innovations* and *hobbies*. This is the real character of the leading hobbies which in modern times have been used to disturb the churches of Christ.

In what special and mischievous work do hobbyists and innovationists unite? They are united in the mischievous work of trying to capture the churches of Christ. Those which they cannot capture as a whole they seem to delight in dividing, and they are likewise united in trying to break down the influence of those friends of the truth who stand opposed to the ends they have in view. At this juncture they, become brethren and each will endorse the other's sayings against those who expose their favorite ism. Of the time when Christ was on trial it is recorded, "And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together; for before they were at enmity between themselves " Luke 23:12. On this principle hobbyists and innovators, operate together, and here they find common ground for warfare against the truth. They are like Calvinists

and Universalists. The former are Narrower than the gospel, and the latter are broader than the gospel; yet both will unite in trying to overthrow the true preacher of the gospel. In their opposition to the truth in *its* fulness and strictness they are brethren. Thus it is with hobbyists and Innovationists.

Which of the two classes of errorists is the more dangerous to churches of Christ That depends on the condition of the church in any locality. The word "loyalty" is the watchword of hobbyists, and they make very frequent use thereof, while the word "liberty" is the watchword of innovationists and is unduly used by them. The former word gives admission to confidence in certain congregations, while the latter word gives admission to confidence in others. Where the plea of "loyalty" succeeds, the plea of "liberty" would fail, and where the plea of "liberty" succeeds, the plea of "loyalty" would fail..

What must be the end of hobbyism and innovationism The Savior said, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," Matt. 15:13. As plants it is, evident that both hobbyism and innovationism have come forth from irreverence for the strictness and completeness of the Sacred Text, but the former is nourished by self-righteousness while the latter is nourished by love of popularity. As neither of them was planted by the heavenly Father they are both destined to be "rooted up." Whatever of either ism is too stubborn to yield when the sword of the Spirit is handled against it by men will at last yield when the Lord shall take unto himself his great power. (Rev. 11:17.) Then, if not before, all who will have wrought divisions and offenses contrary to the gospel (Rom. 16:37, 18), will be convinced of their errors, will abandon their speculations, and will understand that they shall be rewarded according to their works. Then the cry of "loyalty," on the one hand, will not cover unscriptural narrowness, and theory of "liberty," on the other band, will not cover unscriptural broadness. Both hobbyism and innovationism will then be treated as they deserve, and those found guilty of advocating them in this life will then be convinced of their mistake.

CHAPTER III.

In view of the weaknesses in mankind what is the most natural result of hobbyism and innovationism? Sectism or *sectarianism* This is the third step necessary to be taken in passing from Jerusalem to Rome, and is the third degree in the out-workings of the "mystery of iniquity." Of what does religious sectarianism consist? Judging from a gospel point of view it consists of heresies which are formed by uniting the unscriptural exclusiveness of hobbyism with the unscriptural liberty of innovationism. In other words, sectarianism, from a gospel point of view consists of departures from, the truth as it is revealed in the New Testament. Those departures are shaped into articles of religion, then united with certain features of divine truth, all assumed to be of divine authority, and all enforced by human authority. Have we an illustration in the New Testament of enforcing error by human authority? Yes, it is found in the apostle John's second letter. Therein mention is made of a character who was guilty of prating against that apostle with malicious words, refusing to receive the brethren, forbidding others to receive them, and casting them out of the church for no other reason, it seems, than that they did not obey him.

What shall we say to those who deny that sectarianism is the natural result of hobbyism and innovationism We should refer them to the doctrines of salvation by "grace only," "faith only," and "Spirit only" as illustrations of unduly emphasizing scripture teaching, and thus of *hobbyism*. Then we should refer to practices which were borrowed from Judaism and Paganism in the progress of the passage from Jerusalem to Rome, and refer to practices which were borrowed from the Catholic Church by Protestant reformers in the sixteenth century as illustrations of sectarianism being partly composed of innovationism. What then are the component parts of religious sectarianism?

They consist of *hobbyism* and *innovationism*. Nothing can be more evident when the analysis is clearly made than that *hobbyism* and *innovationism* are the chief factors of *sectarianism*.

The divine truth found in sectarian systems without perversion is no part of sectarianism.

Is religious sectarianism a blessing or a curse to mankind?" It is a curse just as far as it perverts truth or enforces error. Are all persons who live in sectarian churches equally under the influence of sectism? No. There are probably some in all the sects who, in mind and heart, are converted to Christ, and who so reverence his word that they will bow to its teachings just in proportion as they become acquainted therewith. All such are in mind and heart not sectarians, though outwardly living in connection with sectarianism. Just as people can outwardly live in connection with the Church of Christ without being Christians so it is true that persons can outwardly live in connection with sectarian churches without being sectarians. "For they are not all Israel who are of Israel," (Rom. 9:6), and so they are not all sectarians who are of sectarian churches. What shall we say of those preachers who denounce all persons who happen to hold membership in a sectarian denomination with a sentence of sweeping impeachment, as though they were all equally under the influence of sectism? We should say that they are probably more sectarian than some whom they denounce. Their manner shows that they are unscripturally exclusive, and this is one of the elements of sectarianism. Should we acknowledge any of those to be Christians who are Identified with sectarian churches and wear sectarian names? No, not in the full and scripture sense of the word *Christians*. In mind and heart some of them are doubtless converted to Christ, but they cannot keep the ordinances fully, nor be altogether in harmony with the gospel while they hold membership among sectarians and wear sectarian names. None of the denominations are wholly right and none of them are wholly wrong. We should admit the truth and condemn the error in each, and should admit that many among the denominations are better than their sectarian creeds. Sectarianism is bad enough, and preachers of Christ should not stain their spirits with sin by misrepresenting what is found in sectarian systems.

What were the first creeds that were formed after the gospel of Christ began to be preached? The first was called the Apostles Creed and the second was the Nicene Creed.” What purpose did those creeds serve at the time that they were adopted? They served the purpose of stereotyping the Conclusions then reached, and served to perpetuate or make permanent the errors therein stated, and they set an example in the direction of creed-making. In course of time they became the basis of religious persecution.

What shall we say of all human creeds in religion? They are unscriptural arrangements, are the offspring of Irreverence for the Sacred Text, are partly nourished into power by human conceit, and partly by human love of popularity. The conclusions they state are urged and enforced by human authority, more justly called human presumption. They give permanent form to erroneous conclusions, and make those conclusions more difficult of correction. They bind the minds and hearts of those under their influence by humanly arranged standards of measurement. Finally, they set an example which in being followed results in dividing and subdividing the professed followers of Christ, and which further results in holding them separated from each other. Creeds also teach their adherents to cherish the common falsehood which says that Christ intended his church to be divided into branches. Can the world be converted to Christ by means of sects or branch churches? No. The world generally cannot be led to believe on Christ and accept him as the Savior of mankind while those who profess to be his followers are divided into contending factions. According to John 17th chapter Christ prayed that all who would believe on him might be one, that "the world might believe on him, and that believers might be made perfect in him. Thus neither the conversion of the world for the perfection of believers can be accomplished while sectarianism prevails, and sectarian creeds remain in authority.

What shall then be said of religious sectarianism? It is unscriptural and anti-scriptural. It defeats the end which the gospel contemplates. From a gospel point of view it is with-

out a fragment of defense. Tet we must be careful not to permit our opposition to sectism to become so intense as to defeat the end we have in view. Therefore we should avoid wholesale denunciations and unmodified statements which imply that sectarianism is not even connected with anything that is good. In other words, let us be careful that we do not *make sectarians of ourselves* by unscriptural intenseness of opposition to sectism. Let us always remember that *hobbyism*—unscriptural exclusiveness—is the principle on which and by, which sectarian doctrines are conceived and formulated and afterwards reduced to practice. Let us likewise remember that *innovationism*—unscriptural liberty—is the principle on which and by which sectarian practices are adopted, and in course of time elevated to the dignity of doctrines. By the former principle sectarianism receives its *unscriptural narrowness*; by the latter principle it receives its *unscriptural broadness*.

CHAPTER IV.

When hobbyism, Innovationism, and sectarianism have all accomplished their mischievous mission, then what is the result? *Popism* or *Roman Catholicism*, which is the fourth and last step in passing from Jerusalem to Rome, end is the fourth and last degree of "the mystery of iniquity" which began to work in apostolic days. 2 These. 5:7.

How many prominent changes in church government were made in passing from the simple congregational form to the ecclesiasticism of Rome? *Four*—the diocesan, the metropolitan, the patriarchal, and the popish government. The first of these was a change from each congregation attending to its awn affairs to the transferring of the affairs of many congregations to a board of bishops. The second was the placing of the affairs of still a larger number of congregations into the management of the bishops in a central city. The third step gave certain bishops the title of patriarchs, and placed them over all the other bishops who directly controlled the churches. This was the last degree that the Greek portion of the church, per-

manently adopted in the mystery of iniquity BO far as change in church government was concerned. But the Latin portion of the church took a fourth degree in the mystery of iniquity by exalting one of the patriarchal bishops to be the pope, claiming that he was the representative of Christ on earth. When this was accomplished, and the civil government was used to enforce the doctrines of the pope, then the consummation was reached. The "man of sin" was then established, "the son of perdition" was then revealed. 2 These. 2:1-12.

Could popism or Roman Catholicism have been established if there had been no sectism?
No.

Could sectism have been established had there been no innovationism nor hobbyism?
No. Hobbyism and innovationism were consummated in sectism, and sectism was consummated in popism. Such were the steps necessary to pass from Jerusalem to Rome; and such were the degrees necessary to graduate in "the mystery of iniquity" which might otherwise be called "the university of religions error." The freshman class in that university learns hobbyism, the second or sophomore class learns innovationism, the junior class learns sectism, the senior class learns popism. Those who take the senior course fully and thus graduate in the "mystery of iniquity" are well drilled and deeply dyed Roman Catholics.

What classes of men can be mentioned as chief in taking the several courses of study belonging to the university now being considered? 1. Those who are striving for priestly orders in the Catholic Church. 2. Those who are striving for clerical orders in sectarian churches. 3. Those who are striving for the pastorate and other salaried offices in the Christian Church. Those who are striving to establish hobbies in the Church of Christ.

Which of these classes is now doing the Church of Christ the greatest mischief?
Hobbyists. The pulpits of the church are closed against the pope and his adherents. They are likewise closed against the archbishop of the Church of England and his subordinates, together with all other sectarian preachers where ever found. In most places they are also closed against all

innovators of the Christian Church. But the pulpits of the Church of Christ are generally open to the hobbyists who claim to be apostolic preachers. By reason of this fact hobbyists in the church of Christ have opportunities for doing the greatest damage to the cause of truth, and many of them are diligent in using the opportunities to work damage which their claim to be apostolic affords them.

In what manner do hobbyists proceed in order to accomplish their ends? They are unable to mention their hobby before they reach the meeting house where they are to engage in a protracted meeting, or where they are to preach only a few discourses. Seldom or never do they remain at a place over Lord's day without making mention of their hobby. Some preachers have several, and they are liable to make mention of all those hobbies to several persons in any locality where they, may go to preach. According to the temperament of the hobbyist, and the intenseness with which he holds or rides his hobby, or hobbies, is he disposed to make mention thereof. Some of them will ask, "How do you stand on *sect baptism* down here?" while on their way from the station to the meeting house. Others will probably ask at the supper table on the first evening of their first visit to a home in any church, "How do you stand in regard to Christians voting and holding office?" Another class will probably ask on Lord's day morning, "What is the position of the church here in regard to the order of worship?" Still another class will inquire, "What attitude of prayer prevails with the church here." Then there are yet others who ask, "What do you think of the baptistery for immersing people?" Occasionally there is one who asks, "What kind of communion wine do you use here?" These questions are propounded by hobbyists in order to learn the situation, so that they may understand what they have before them, or in order to introduce their favorite themes.

Do hobbyists ever advocate their hobbies in the pulpit? Not often at first. Some of them seldom preach a sermon on their favorite themes. That might be unpopular. So they generally say but little concerning those themes in the pulpit, especially

at first, but they talk about them in private and perhaps circulate tracts, or papers in which those themes are discussed. Occasionally there is a hobbyist bold enough, especially when with a church that is weak, to urge his hobby the first day of his presence.

What is the result of such a procedure? Those members who are impressed favorably by the talk they hear, or reading they do, in favor of the hobbies advocated soon begin to talk about them to others, and in course of time there is division of sentiment in the church sufficient to work great damage.

Do any other preachers act after this manner in advocating their notions? "Yes. That is the very procedure adopted by Innovators when permitted to preach for churches of Christ. They do not inquire of the overseers who are satisfied with the Bible whether they regard it as right to advocate innovations, but endeavor to divide the church against those overseers. On the same principle do hobbyists proceed. They do not seek the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," but they seek to lead as many possible to accept their hobbies regardless of "unity" and "peace."

Do those who accept the hobbies advocated by certain, preachers become devoted to those preachers? Yes. The hobbyist whose theory they have accepted becomes very dear to them, and they are jealous for his welfare. They will permit him to review the position of any preacher who rejects his hobby without becoming offended. But they seem to lose self-control any preacher even proposes to reply to the hobbyist whose theory they have accepted.

What is the secret of such sensitiveness? It is all explained by the difference between truth and error. Truth is not such a delicate something that it cannot bear investigation, and those who hold the simple, pure, unadulterated truth are not sensitive because some one proposes to review the position they occupy. But it is far different with error, and with those who advocate error. With such it may be safely said that sensitivity is the rule, and willingness to investigate or have their position examined is the exception. "For every one that

doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." John 3:20, 21.

Do advocates of error ever talk about investigation and profess a willingness to have their positions examined? Yes, but they are seldom or never willing to affirm their full and real position, or to affirm any proposition which will permit their real position to be fully examined.

What class of errorists seem to be most lacking in courage when called on to discuss their real position? Hobbyists and Innovators who claim to be disciples of Christ when called on to affirm propositions covering their hobbyism and their innovationism. They are bold towards all others excepting those whom they know understand their real position.

Do they not sometimes seem bold toward even those who understand them? Yes, but it is the boldness of bluff and swagger. They sometimes recklessly charge on an opponent a position which he never held, and then because he will not affirm that position they will charge him with "backing out" and "backing down," though that opponent affirms every statement that he ever made on the question in controversy.

Do hobbyists and innovators among disciples follow after the things which make for peace on gospel principles. No. They seem to have no regard for peace unless the churches accept their theories and practices which they have not the courage to submit for investigation before a well-informed respondent.

What is the secret of such behavior on their part? Simply that they have become enthusiasts, if not fanatics, over theories and practices which they are painfully aware will not bear a scriptural investigation with a well-informed opponent. Therefore they avoid such an investigation whenever possible, and endeavor to advocate their peculiar views among those incapable of detecting and exposing their false reasoning.

How should those errorists feel who are guilty of such behavior? They should feel *ashamed to live* and be *afraid to die*.

Do errorists generally complain when called by their right

names? Yes, but, perhaps, none complain as much as do hobbyists. Sectarians will generally endure with some degree of composure to be called *sectarians*, and innovators do not very seriously object to being called *innovators*. But call a hobbyist by his right name, and he will at once complain. Thus the hobbyists are, perhaps, the most unreasonable sort of errorists. They will not fully affirm their real position, and will not acknowledge their right name.

CHAPTER V.

What is the limit of religious hobbyism? It is limited only by the limit of subjects upon which hobbies may be founded.

May hobbies be founded on a great variety of subjects? Yes, one or more hobbies may be founded on almost any subject. The leading doctrinal errors set forth in sectarian creeds are hobbies, which resulted from unduly magnifying certain Bible truths so as to make the conclusions reached exclusive of other truths equally important.

What are some of those leading doctrinal errors in sectarian creeds which resulted from hobbyism? The doctrines of salvation *by faith only*, of salvation *by grace only*, and of salvation *by Spirit only* will serve as illustrations. Salvation by faith is taught in the gospel; so is salvation by grace; and the same is true of salvation by the Spirit of God. But Martin Luther by dwelling on the doctrine of faith in the manner of the genuine hobbyist, settled upon the conclusion that mankind are saved *by faith only*. John Calvin, the father of Presbyterianism, by the same principle of procedure settled on the conclusion that mankind are saved *by grace only*. George Fox, the father of Quakerism, by the same method concluded that mankind are saved by the direct operation and guidance of the Holy Spirit without the Sacred Text, and thus settled upon the conclusion that salvation is by the *Spirit only*.

What hobbies have done most mischief in the Church of Christ? The "design-of-baptism" hobby, the "special-divine order-of-worship" hobby, the "no-voting-nor-holding-office-in-

civil-affairs" hobby, the "attitude-of-prayer-and-thanksgiving" hobby, the "preaching-and-teaching" hobby, the "fermented-and-unfermented-wine" hobby, and the "running-water" hobby.

Does the New Testament use the expression "design of baptism," or "special order of worship," or speak of either "voting" or "holding office in civil affairs," or does it use the word "attitude" in regard to prayer and thanksgiving, or does it make a special distinction between preaching and teaching, or use the word "wine" when referring to the communion, or does the New Testament use the expression "running water" in connection with baptism? No, not one of these expressions nor distinctions is found in the New Testament.

Does that not imply that the ideas contained in those expressions are not found there? It certainly does, and hobbyists among disciples affirm that much in regard to other errors. They are prompt and positive in saying that the expressions "original sin," "Infant baptism," "getting religion," "Instantaneous conversion," "instantaneous sanctification," and "mourners' bench," are not in the New Testament. Then they say that as words and expressions are the signs of ideas it follows that when certain words and expressions are not found in the New Testament then the ideas or doctrines set forth in them are not in the New Testament. Hobbyists further say that if such doctrines or ideas be introduced into the worship or work, preaching or practice of the church they are *new things* and thus are *innovations*.

What then is a full statement of the real character of the hobbies which have disturbed the churches of Christ in modern times? They are both *innovations* and *hobbies*, or they are *innovating hobbies*. They are *innovations* because they are not found in the New Testament, and they are *hobbies* because they are so magnified as to exclude certain truths from receiving due share of attention. ,

What then is the character of those who disturb churches of Christ by their innovating hobbies? They are INNOVATING HOBBYISTS.

Does even this name fully state their rear character? It

does not. As their favorite conclusions are not authorized by the New Testament they reach those conclusions not by *divine 'authority*, but by *human choice*, and those conclusions when urged on the churches of Christ cause division of sentiment, strife of words, and result in factions in the body of Christ.

What then may those who choose to adopt such conclusions and urge them on the churches be justly called? This question is best answered by the correct definition of the word *heresy*. It is given thus: "*strictly*, a choice or option; *hence*, a sect, faction; *by implication*, discord, contention." According to this definition it is evident that *innovating hobbyists* are like *factionous heretics*. If their notions were in any measure divinely authorized they would in some measure be mentioned in the gospel.. As they are not found in the gospel they are certainly not of divine authority. Not being of divine authority they are adopted by human choice and thus have the character of heresies. As they cause contention, discord, and actions in churches where they are urged by their advocates it follows beyond question that they are not only *heresies*, but they are *factionous heresies*. Thus the character of those professed disciples of Christ who are advocating among the churches of Christ their unauthorized notions to the division of the body of Christ when fully stated is that of *innovating hobbyists and factionous heretics*.

What is the difference between *heresy* and *sect*. They are both expressed by the same Greek word, and thus a heretic and a sectarian are the same. The word *heresy* refers to the notion that is adopted by choice, and the word *sect* refers to the result or outworking of that notion.

Do heretics among disciples know themselves to be such characters? Probably not. They generally regard themselves as the best class of disciples, and some of them use the word "loyal" unto the weariness of those who hear them talk, or who read their writings.

Why do they not suspect themselves of error when they see the results of their work? Probably because their favorite theories SO deeply engross them that they are *blind to*

results. It seems impossible to persuade them to talk about the strife, contention, and division resulting from their hobbies. If by urging their hobbies or heresies they disturb an obedient believer so that he becomes unsettled, and by adopting the method of reasoning learned from hobbyists he becomes an infidel, yet hobbyists refuse to regard themselves as responsible for such results.

Could other hobbies be arranged besides those that are now disturbing churches of Christ? Yes, any preacher can shape a half dozen or more within an hour. For instance it would be easy to shape one on faith, one on repentance, one on confession, several on baptism, one on calling on the name of the Lord, and one on receiving the Holy Spirit.

How could a hobby be arranged on faith? Simply by reading John 20:80, 81, and Rom. 10:17, and dwelling thereon. The former passage teaches that faith comes by reading the divine testimony, and the latter teaches that faith comes by hearing that testimony repeated by some inspired preacher. In view of this it could easily be said that we cannot now hear inspired preachers, and thus we cannot become believers in the true sense unless we examine the divine testimony for ourselves. Having presented this much let the would-be hobbyist ask the question, How many persons have *read for themselves* the divinely given records of Christ's miracles before confessing faith in Christ? All who did not read those records *for themselves* and thereby become believers may well question the genuineness of their faith." Then let the would-be hobbyist begin to assert and denounce concerning the kind of faith that is produced by *hearsay* from *uninspired lips*, declaring that any heathen has as good reason for believing in big dumb Idols as those have for believing in Christ just because they *heard* of him from their uninspired fathers and mothers, or from some preacher, and that the Catholic has as good reason for believing the infallibility of the pope as *hearsay* believers have for their faith,—let this be done and not much time would be required to unsettle certain hearers, especially if *hearsay faith* was vigorously denounced, ridiculed and burlesqued, and *testi-*

mony faith was commended and eulogized.

How could a hobby be arranged on repentance? Simply by defining repentance according to the Greek text of the New Testament, and showing that many persons did not understand it that way, and then declaring that no man can obey God acceptably who don't understand what God says, nor what he means.

How could a hobby be arranged on the confession? Simply by dwelling on the exact language of the Ethiopian eunuch's confession as found in Acts 8:37, and insisting that it is given to us for a model, and that all who have not confessed in the language of the eunuch have not confessed according to scripture. Then let the would-be hobbyist ridicule the ordinary method of confessing by saying "I do," or "yes," or "yes, sir," calling it "*short-style confession*," and those who favorite as "I do people," and how long would it require to disturb some persons about their confession? A half hour would be sufficient in many instances.

By what method could hobbies be arranged on baptism? Simply by dwelling with undue emphasis on the expression "in the name of Jesus Christ," and the expression "for the remission of sins," and the expression, "you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Then by taking Rom. 6:3, 4, and Gal. 8:27, and the expressions "baptized into Jesus Christ," and "baptized into his death," and "put on Christ" would serve as foundations for several hobbies. Then by taking Heb. 10:22 the expression "bodies washed with pure water" would serve as the foundation for another hobby, A tremendous speech could be made in favor of being baptized in "pure water" rather than in a mud hole, or duck pond, and many persons could be disturbed about their baptism by the influence of such a speech.

How could a hobby be arranged on the subject of calling on the name of the Lord? Simply by discoursing on Acts 22:16, and insisting that if it was necessary for Saul of Tarsus to call on the name of the Lord in connection with baptism it certainly is necessary for us to do the same, and that those who failed

to call on the name of the Lord in connection with their baptism may well question whether it was acceptable to the Lord, as they did not do all that was required of them.

By what method could a hobby be arranged on the subject of the Holy Spirit? By taking the promise, "and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," as found in Acts 2:38, and asking the question, "How many persons when baptized thought of this promise, and expected to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit?" and then declaring that to receive "the gift of the Holy Ghost" is a *design of baptism*. This would be a rich scripture for some hobbyish disposition.

Finally, a hobby might be arranged on the fact that the blood of Christ washes away sins, for it would be easy to declare that whoever was baptized into the death of Christ without understanding that the blood of Christ washes away sins, has not been validly baptized: Furthermore, it would be easy for any one possessed of a hobbyish disposition to insist that in order to be validly baptized the candidate must understand *how* baptism is for the remission of sins and *how* the blood of Christ washes away sins.

Would the hobbies thus arranged be on an equality with the hobbies that have actually been urged upon churches of Christ? No. They would be more reasonable and more dignified, as each of them would have a scripture form of expression as a basis, while the hobbies now being urged upon churches of Christ are chiefly if not wholly based on expressions not found in the Sacred Text. Even the re-baptism hobbyists base themselves on what they call "the design of baptism," and make most of their success by denouncing and ridiculing what they call "sect baptism." They begin with the expression "for the remission of sins," but they at once adopt the unscriptural expression "the design of baptism" as their basis. Thus it is that they *innovate the very form of expression* on which their, hobby is directly based, and use the expression "for the remission of sins" as a kind of proof text for their so-called "design of baptism." By this method they become *innovating hobbyists*. Then by reason of the results of their hobbyism and

the correct definition of the word "heresy" they may also be justly called *factionous heretics*.

CHAPTER VI.

Is the expression "design of baptism" more scriptural than the expressions "getting religion," or "original sin?" No, not one of these expressions nor any other to the same effect is found in the Sacred Test,

But may they not all be inferentially established? Yes, by the same method of reasoning, and one of them is just as easily established as either of the others. Words and expressions are the signs of ideas, and when any words or expressions ARE not found in the Bible it is evidence at first sight that the ideas contained in them are probably not in the Bible. This is good reasoning against the expression "original sin," and it is equally good against the expression "design of baptism."

As the expression "design of baptism" is not scriptural why was it ever introduced and adopted by disciples? Probably because sectarians went to the unscriptural extreme of pronouncing baptism a *non-essential*. In order to counteract that extreme disciples decided that baptism has a *design*, and that design is "remission of sins." But it needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted that the word *design* implies a *designer*, and thus if there be any *design* connected with baptism it refers to Christ's design in giving it as a command to be obeyed. Therefore whatever purpose or design Christ had in commanding believers to be baptized it all belongs to the *divine* side, and not to the *human* side of the great plan of salvation. This explains the expression "for the remission of sins" in Matt. 26:28. Christ said, "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." If the expression "for the remission of sins" in that sentence means purpose or *design* it certainly belongs to the *divine* side of redemption, and thus to *the designer*. But as man-kind have nothing to do with the design of the shedding of

Christ's blood they have nothing to do with the divine purpose or *design* in commanding us to be baptized. Understanding *the design* of anything belongs strictly to the *designer*, and not necessarily to some one else. '

But should we admit that the word "for" in Acts 2:38 means *design*? No. The Greek preposition *eis* which is translated by the word "for" in Acts 2:38 in all its primary or first shades of meaning conveys the idea of change and not of purpose or design. It is strictly expressive of *transition* or *change* from one place to another, or from one condition to another, or from one time to another.

What do Greek lexicons or dictionaries say about the, preposition *eis* which is used in Acts 2:38, in regard to its meanings or shades of meaning? A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament revised "by Thomas Sheldon Green, MA." defines *eis* thus: "into, to, as far as, to the extent of, until, before, in the presence of, in order to, for, with a view to, for the use or service of, in accordance with," Another which is in connection with the Greek text by Greenfield defines *eis* thus: "On, into, upon, in", among, to, towards, upon, near to, by, towards, against, to, even to, until to, for," etc. Groves gives as a definition of the word *eis*: in, into; to, unto, until; among, at, before, in presence of; at, on, upon; towards, against; as to, in respect of, concerning; through, by; for, for to, in order to, to the end that, so that. Liddell and Scott say that the chief signification of *eis* is *into*. According to these definitions it is evident that the idea of purpose or design is not among either primary nor even secondary meanings of the Greek preposition *eis*. That idea is not in the first shade of the meaning of that preposition in any Greek dictionary that we have ever seen, and very few give the idea of purpose even as a secondary meaning. Divine commands are generally, if not always, given in the primary meanings of words.

Still, as it sometimes has the meaning of design or purpose, the question arises, Has it not that meaning in Acts 2nd chapter and 38th verse? In answer to this question an illustration should be given. A teacher of Greek has a pupil

named John who is studying the New Testament. That teacher has often taught his pupil that the primary meaning of words must always be chosen in making a translation unless the sense of the sentence forbids. With this good rule well impressed he tells John to write on the black board all sentences of scripture in which *eis* is found in connection with the word *baptism*, but to leave the preposition *eis* untranslated. In obedience to his teacher John writes a part of Matt. 3:11, "I indeed baptize you with water *eis* repentance." Then he writes Matt. 28:19, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations baptizing them *eis* the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Next he writes Mark 1:4, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance *eis* remission of sins." Next he writes Luke 8:3, "And he came into all the country about Jordan preaching the Baptism of repentance *eis* remission of sins." Then John writes Acts 2:38, "Then Peter said unto them, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *eis* remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Then he writes Acts 19:5, "When they heard this they were baptized *eis* the name of the Lord Jesus." Next he writes Rom. 6:3, 4, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized *eis* Jesus Christ were baptized *eis* his death; therefore we are buried with Christ by baptism *eis* death." Then John writes 1 Cor. 10:2, "And were all baptized *eis* Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Finally Paul writes Gal. 3:27, "For as many of you as have been baptized *eis* Christ have put on Christ." The teacher then tells John to make a consistent translation of the preposition *eis* in all those passages of the Sacred Text. Remembering what his teacher has taught him about taking the primary meaning of a word whenever it will make sense John looks at his Greek dictionary and after assuring himself that *into* is one of the first and radical meanings of *eis*, and taking *into* as the meaning he translates every passage placed on the black board and makes good sense, and good strength in each instance. Matt. 3:11 he translates, "I indeed baptize you with [In] water into repentance;" Matt. 28:

19, "baptizing them *into* the name of the Father, etc.; Mark 1:4, "and preach the baptism of repentance *into* remission of sins;" Luke 3: S, "preaching the baptism of repentance *into* remission of sins;" Acts 2:88, "every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ into remission of sins;" Acts 19:5 "they were baptized *into* the name of the Lord Jesus; Rom. 6:3, 4, "were baptized *into* Jesus Christ were baptized *into* his death;" 1 Cor. 10:2, "and were all baptized *into* Moses;" Gal. 3:27, "baptized *into* Christ have put on Christ." The teacher then tells John to try the meaning *unto* as a translation of *eis*. He makes the attempt but gets into some trouble with Matt. 3:11, as the word *unto* in that passage is too weak. Then he gets into worse trouble in Matt. 28:19. In Rom. 6:3, 4 John is entirely unsatisfied, while in 1 Cor. 10:2, and Gal. 8:27 he feels that he has a weak translation. The teacher then tells John to try the translation *for* or in *order to*. John proceeds and is not satisfied with his success in Matt. 3:11, The Idea that John baptized people *for* or in *order to* repentance does not strike him favorably. With Mark 1:2, and Luke 3:3, he does better. But when he comes to Matt. 28:19 he is confused and says to his teacher that "something is wrong," as the command "baptizing them" *for* or in *order to* '(the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' is *nonsense*. To this the teacher agrees and John passes to Acts 2:88 and makes sense by using the words *for* or in *order to*. Then he passes to Rom. 6:3, 4, and by using *for* or in *order to* as the translation of *eis* he again makes *nonsense*. The idea of being "baptized" *for* "Jesus Christ" or in *order to* "Jesus Christ," and *for* or in *order to* "his death," and being "buried with him by baptism" *for* or in *order to* death—this is so absurd that John and his teacher both laugh. Then 1 Cor. 10:2 is considered, and the Idea that the Israelites were baptized *for* or in *order to* Moses provokes more laughter. Finally, John refers to Gal. 3:27, , and there shakes his head, saying, "The idea that Paul said that as many as had been baptized *for* or in *order to* Christ had 'put on Christ' does not sound to me like common sense to say nothing about divine inspiration." To this the teacher assents.

but tells John that *theological custom* requires that Acts 2:38 shall be translated by *for* or *in order to* as the meaning of *eis* in that passage. John answers by saying, "That makes me think just that much less of theological customs, for there is not a shadow of reason for ignoring the primary meaning of the word in this passage, nor for making an inconsistent translation which no man can defend." To this answer John's teacher makes no reply.

But what shall we say to those who inform us that in Matt. 26:28 the same form of expression is used as is found in Acts 2:38, and that in Matt. 26:28 the translation "for remission of sins" is certainly correct? We should tell them yes, but every form of expression as well as every word is known by the *company* or *connection* in which it is found, and this makes the difference between Matt. 26:28, and Acts 2:38. In the former passage the Savior was speaking of the shedding of his own blood as the meritorious or purchasing cause of remission of sins, while in the latter passage the apostle Peter was speaking of our obedience in the act of baptism which Rom. 6:3, 4, and Gal. 8:27 declare brings us *into Christ* by bringing us *into* the likeness of *his death*. Thus the former passage refers solely to the *divine* side of the plan of salvation, while the latter passage refers to the *human* as well as the divine side of that plan. The former passage tells of what Christ has done in obedience to his Father's will, while the latter tells of what we are required to do in submitting to Christ's will. All who consider such differences honestly will doubtless see the reason why Matt. 26:28 should not be permitted to control Acts 2:38 in regard to translation; In view of the fact that Christ's blood was shed to *make an atonement for sins*, while water baptism is *in no sense* for an atonement, is it not dangerous to translate Acts 2:38 by the same form of expression that is used in Matt. 26th chapter and 28th verse? Yes, because by so doing the impression may be made that the blood of Christ and water baptism are for the same purpose. Certainly it is then dangerous, and as it is unnecessary it should be avoided. The difference between the meanings of *eis aphesin hamartion* in Matt.

26:28, and Acts 2:38 is a strong argument against translating that language by the same form of expression in English, especially as it is more consistent and more defeasible to translate them by different expressions.

Has any serious damage resulted from the doubtful, inconsistent, and indefensible translation of Acts 2:38 given in the Common Version of the Sacred Text. Yea, by disciples of Christ emphasizing that passage unduly they have made the erroneous impression on many that we have more confidence in water baptism than we have in the blood of Christ. "Besides, the translation of which we speak has furnished an unsound foundation for hobbyists in the church of Christ who seem to glory in disturbing as many immersed believers concerning their baptism as they possibly can, and who thereby work much mischief in the church.

Did Alexander Campbell admit that the translation "into remission of sins" is correct? Yes. On the 494th page of the Campbell and Rice Debate we find the following:

"They were baptized '*into* Moses' or *unto* Moses, '*into* Christ,' '*into* his death,' '*into* John's baptism;' and, if any one prefer it *into* repentance,' '*into* remission of sins,' '*into* one body,' etc. In every instance there is a *transition* from one state, profession, or place, into another. The person has suffered an immersion for something into the possession or enjoyment of which he now enters, or enters into more fully than before."

What is the strongest argument in favor of the Common Version translation of Acts 2nd chapter and 38th verso? *Theological custom*. As previously shown it is an *inconsistent* translation both in ignoring the primary meaning of the Greek preposition *eis* and in ignoring the translation which must be given to other passages of similar import, and on the same subject. Besides, it interpolates the definite article "the" and says "the remission of sins" though there is no word for that article in the common Greek text of that form of expression.

Why do some who know all this sometimes quote Acts 2:38 without correcting the translation? Simply because they know that the common translation of Acts 2:38, though erroneous, will do no special harm unless it is unduly emphasized,.

and the wrong translation be thereby made a basis of a mischievous doctrine. Readers of the Greek New Testament know that Acts 15:9, and Rom. 1:16, as well as many other passages are incorrectly translated, but they know that the error in them will do no special harm unless unduly emphasized. Moreover, sensible men understand that damage results to the common mind from preachers changing the translation of the Sacred Text. Therefore sensible preachers and writers only become translators when mischief is made out of an incorrect translation by hobbyists or some other grade of errorists.

Are preachers of Christ liable to be criticized for using the Revised Version or any other new translation of the Sacred Text before the public? Yes. If in reading the Scriptures the word "Spirit" is used instead of the word "Ghost," or if the word "immersion" is used instead of "baptism" a criticism is sometimes offered which should be avoided. We should read the Sacred Text as in the Common Version it is given, since that, is the one which the people reverence, as far as they reverence anything divine, and we should explain and differ from that version only when justice to the divine revelation so demands.

What is wrong with the translation of Acts 15:9, and Rom. 1:16 as found in the Common Version? Simply this: the definite article "the" is in the Greek text of the former passage before the word translated "faith" and it is omitted in the Greek text of the latter passage before the word translated "power." Thus the former passage should be translated "purifying their hearts by the faith," which means by *the gospel*, and the latter passage should be translated "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is God's power unto salvation," etc. Yet no one should on that account go before an audience as a translator every time he would preach the gospel, but the preacher of Christ should only deal critically with a translation when it is necessary in order to save people from fatal errors. Frequent efforts at giving better translations tend to break down reverence in the sanctity and integrity of the Sacred Text.

CHAPTER VII.

What is "sect-baptism?" That depends on the meaning of the word "sect," and the meaning of the word "baptism."

But if we admit that the word "baptism" means "immersion," then what is meant by the expression "sect baptism?" That is then determined simply by the meaning of the word "sect." By examination of the Greek text of the New Testament we find that the Greek word translated "sect" is the same as that translated heresy, and it means "choice, option, hence, a sect, faction; by implication, discord, contention." According to this definition of the word translated "sect" it becomes evident that what is called "sect baptism" is nothing more nor less than *choice immersion*, or immersion that originated ; in *human choice*.

In the light of this definition is there any baptism which may be justly called "sect baptism?" Yes, trine immersion may be thus called with justness. It is not mentioned in the gospel and it originated with the falling away from the primitive faith or pure gospel, which falling away occurred after the apostles had finished their ministry. Moreover, it is now advocated by certain sects which are not mentioned by name in the Bible. Nor is this all. It originated in human choice, as is evident from the fact that it is now advocated and defended by human reasoning, and by means of human history.

What shall we say of those who speak of single immersion performed in the name of the Godhead as "sect baptism" when it is performed in connection with certain sectarian errors? They might as reasonably speak of the Common Version and likewise of the Revised Version of the Bible as a *sect Bible* because both those versions are the results of translations made by sectarians, and therein are passages so translated as to favor and even set forth sectarian errors. But to speak of the Bible, which is of divine origin, as a "sect Bible" because of certain sectarian errors found in the translation thereof is not more certainly absurd than to speak of the divinely authorized single immersion as "sect baptism" when it is practiced in connection with certain sectarian errors. Nor is this all. We may

use the game reasoning concerning the Lord Jesus Christ and the Divine Father. In other words, we may say that certain sectarian errors preached in connection with Christ's divinity make him a sect Christ, and that the preaching of certain sectarian errors in connection with the Divine Father's Godhead makes him a sect God. Thus we see that certain brethren who regard themselves as wiser and purer and, better than all others should extend their denouncing if they would be consistent. For if certain sectarian errors, when preached and practiced in connection with single immersion, performed in the name of the Godhead make it "sect baptism," then certain sectarian errors inserted in the translation of the Bible make it a sect Bible, and such errors preached and accepted in connection with the divinity of Christ and the Godhead of Jehovah make them a sect Christ and a sect God. Are our brethren of assumed sanctity prepared to go that far? We suppose not.

Whence comes the authority for calling single immersion "sect baptism" when performed in connection with certain sectarian errors? There is no authority for so doing either in divine revelation or in right human reasoning.

Is it not then a matter of option or choice? Certainly, and as the Greek word translated "sect" means "option or choice" it is evident that those who by choice are assuming special sanctity, and by choice are denouncing what they call "sect baptism," do thereby and to that extent become sectarians. According to the Greek text of the New Testament a *sectarian* is a *choicearian*—one who adopts one or more features of his religious position by *choice* and not by *divine authority*. This is expressed by the sectarian doctrine—"Join the church of your choice."

Does not the Greek word translated "sect" also mean "faction," and by implication mean "discord, contention"? Yes, and therefore it is evident that those persons are sectarians who by choice denounce what they call "sect baptism," and thereby cause "discord" and "contention," and they are a "faction" in the church of Christ. Thus, in their fear of endorsing sectarianism our brethren of assumed sanctity become

sectarians, because they become *factionists*. "The fear of a man bringeth a snare, but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe." Prov. 29:25.

Is the preaching of immersion by certain sectarians a matter of choice? No. Those who preach immersion do so because they believe it to be of *divine authority*.

How is it with those sectarians who do not advocate immersion, but only give persons the choice of immersion? Such sectarians regard immersion as a matter of choice, but those under their teaching who insist upon being immersed do so, with very few exceptions, because they believe that Christ requires it. Thus while the preachers among such sectarians have the idea of "choice" in their minds, yet those under their teaching who decide to be immersed generally do so because they wish to do *what divine authority requires*. Their immersion is not sect-immersion because it is not choice-immersion, but it is *authority immersion*. Moreover, their immersion is not *faction-immersion*, when measured by the New Testament, and therefore is not sect-baptism. But that is sect-baptism, and is *faction baptism*, which *makes a faction in the church of Christ*.

How should the churches of Christ treat all re baptism preachers who are so extreme that they are factionist and thus are sectarians. The churches of Christ should require of them that they cease to preach their faction-baptism, and cease to denounce baptism which has been accepted because of the fact that it is commanded by divine authority. If they refuse to cease their factious preaching and denunciations then the churches of Christ should refuse to employ them, but let them go to their own place—*among sectarians*.

What is the principle or procedure which underlies religious-sectarianism? It is that which underlies all sectarianism—*extreme emphasis or stress, which by choice is placed on a single point of doctrine, and adopting new features of doctrine and practice*. In other words, sectarianism is the outgrowth of *hobbyism* and *innovationism*. By this method of procedure a truth can be made to serve the purpose of error. Thus it is that Calvinistic sectarianism is the result of extreme emphasis

on the scriptures which speak of grace or favor, and Arminian sectarianism is the result of extreme emphasis on the scriptures which speak of faith or belief, and re-baptism sectarianism is the result of extreme emphasis on the expression "for the remission of sins" as found in Acts 2:38. Certain preachers and writers have emphasized that passage of scripture till they think that they see in it something which they call "the design of baptism." They read and quote Acts 2:38, and talk about it, and lay stress on it till they seem to think that they must preach the supposed "design of baptism," and that all who have been baptized without understanding what they call "the 'design of baptism'" should be charged with having accepted "sect baptism." Then they decide by their own option or choice that they should urge their notions on this question among the churches. As a result they become factionists, and thus become heretics, or they may be justly called *factious heretics*. There are heresies which may not be factious or divisive in their results because those afflicted therewith keep them to themselves. But this is not true of the re-baptism heresy. A majority of its advocates urge it to such an extent that they divide churches thereby, and thus they make it a *factious* or *divisive heresy*.

CHAPTER VIII.

What did Alexander Campbell teach on the subject of re baptism? In one of his essays on "The Ancient Gospel" he expressed himself as follows:

Some persons have thought that because, they did not understand the import of Christian immersion at the time of their immersion, they ought to be immersed again in order to enjoy the blessings resulting from this institution; but as reasonably might a woman seek to be married a second, a third, or a fourth time, to her husband, because at the expiration of the second, third and fourth years after her marriage, she discovered new advantages and blessings resulting from her alliance with her husband, of which she was ignorant at the time of her marriage. It is true that she may regret that she lived so long in that state without enjoying the privileges belonging to her,

but her having the right of matrimony celebrated ten times, or once for every new discovery she makes, would give her no better right to these enjoyments than she possessed through her first marriage. Nor will her repetition of the nuptial rights cause her to enjoy more fully the comforts of which she was deprived during the past years of her Ignorance, than the mere consciousness that she now enjoys them."

Will those who call every immersion "sect baptism" which was performed without understanding what they call "the design of baptism" accept what Alexander Campbell said 'in the foregoing paragraph as his real position on the subject of re-immersion. Yes, if they be honest. Moreover, they will accept what he says as *the truth*, on the subject. When a woman accepts a man in marriage she accepts him in all his relations and has a wife's right to all the blessings which he, as her husband, should bestow upon her, though she may be ignorant of most of them at the time of her marriage. So it is when the believer accepts Christ in baptism. Moreover, as a true man will not withhold blessings which he intended for the woman who accepts him in marriage because she does not, at the time of marriage, understand all his intentions, so Christ will not withhold any of the blessings which he intends for those who accept him in baptism because of ignorance on their part concerning some blessings which he intends. Finally, if a woman supposes at the time of marriage that she has already received her husband's richest blessings that supposition will not prevent him from bestowing on her all that he intended to bestow, and neither will the fact that sinners often suppose at the time of their baptism that they have already been pardoned prevent Christ from pardoning them when they are baptized.

Did Alexander Campbell ever write what seems to imply that it is necessary to understand the exact meaning of Acts 2:38 in order to valid baptism? Yes. In contending against those who endeavored to disparage baptism he sometimes wrote so emphatically that his language seems to imply more than he meant, unless we permit him to explain himself by what we have quoted from his teaching. The same is true of the apostle Paul. In writing against justification by the law he so

emphasized faith that it seems to imply more than he meant unless we consider Heb. 11th chapter and James 2nd chapter.

Did the Jews who obeyed the gospel on the day of Pentecost understand all that Christ had revealed of himself, or understand all that he had done, or had promised to do in behalf of mankind? No, They did not even understand the extent of the atonement, but thought that he was the Savior only of the ; Jews. See Acts 10th and 11th chapters. Now if those Jews could obey Christ acceptably while *believing a lie*, to state it in its worst form, concerning the atonement, why cannot persona now obey Christ acceptably while *believing a lie* concerning pardon and its evidence? There is no reason why a mistake in belief concerning pardon should be more fatal than a mistake in belief concerning the *atonement*.

But what shall we say of those twelve men of whom mention is made in Acts 19th chapter? We should simply say what the record says, and go no farther.

But why were they baptized again? Because they had not been baptized into (*eis*) the name of the Lord Jesus.

What is the evidence of this? Simply what the record says. Paul asked those men if they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed. They answered that they had not so much as heard whether there was a Holy Ghost, or, as some prefer to translate it, they had not "heard that the Holy Spirit had been given." Then Paul asked them "unto [*eis*] what then were you baptized?" They answered, "unto \ *eis* \ John's baptism." Then Paul preached Christ to them, and when they heard what he preached "they were baptized in the name [*eis to onoma*] of the Lord Jesus." So it is evident that Christ was left out of the first baptism of those twelve men of whom an account is given in Acts 19th chapter, and the Holy Spirit was likewise left out of their first baptism. Therefore the case of those twelve men gives authority for re-baptizing all persons from whose first baptism the name of Christ and mention of the Holy Spirit were omitted. But as the record of that case says nothing about remission of sins, nor of the so called "design of baptism" it is the most evident perversion of that case to use it

for the purpose of dissatisfying obedient believers who were baptized in or into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Was not John's baptism "for remission of sins"? It was *eis* remission of sins, and if that meant *for* remission of sins, then very likely those men of whom mention is made in Acts 19th were baptized *for* remission of sins. John taught concerning the name of Christ, and concerning the Holy Spirit," and concerning remission of sins in connection with his baptism. But those twelve men had missed what John taught with reference to the name of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Yet as they were baptized unto John's baptism there was nothing left of it for them to receive except that it was the baptism of repentance for (*eis*) remission of sins. This, however, was not sufficient, and thus when they heard what Paul said "they were baptized in the name of the Lord." Does this state or even imply that Paul ridiculed their former immersion in order to dissatisfy them therewith? Certainly there is nothing of that sort in the record, neither is there any intimation that Paul told them that they could not have membership in the church until they were again baptized, as he did not believe it was right to "shake 'em in." Finally, there is nothing in the account of those men which in any measure indicates that they were baptized a second time because *Paul so commanded*, nor that their second baptism was in order to *satisfy Paul's conscience*. But "when they heard" what Paul had said, "they were baptized in [*eis*] the name of the Lord Jesus." Paul did the teaching, and when they "heard" his teaching "they were baptized," which clearly implies that their second immersion was determined at the point of *their own conviction* produced by the apostle's teaching, and not to satisfy Paul's conscience.

Does this case furnish in any measure a precedent for ridiculing a baptism received with imperfect information, or denouncing such baptism as though it were ridiculous? No. But it furnishes a precedent or example for just the opposite behavior.

What do certain preachers and others mean by "shake 'em in," "shook 'em in" and such like expressions? They mean

that ordinary speech is not sufficient to express their objections to those who welcome persons into the church who have been immersed into the name of the Godhead without understanding the so-called "design of baptism," by extending to them the hand of fellowship. Therefore certain preachers and others resort to such unscriptural and ungrammatical language as "shake'em in," "shook'em in," "was'shook in," and other expressions to set forth their unscriptural feelings on this subject. What is the position of the Church of Christ on this subject of re-baptizing those who come to us from the sects? That position has already been set forth in these words: "A majority of those who have been Immersed by the sects should, no doubt, be immersed again. But of the necessity for a second immersion they must judge by hearing and reading the gospel, and not by any undue urging on our part. It is wrong to encourage people in being satisfied with an unacceptable immersion, and it is wrong to make them dissatisfied with an acceptable immersion."

Is it safe to go beyond this, or to be impulsive or erratic, or ridiculing on this or any other subject? No, and all those who Impulsively denounce what they call "sect baptism," and who urge the so-called "design of baptism," and who ridicule the reception of immersed believers because they did not understand that supposed "design of baptism" when they were immersed, by the expressions "shake 'em in," "shook 'em in," and such like—all those who are guilty of such misconduct may find, when it is eternally too late to repent, that they have made a *fatal mistake*.

What is the difference between sitting in judgment on the fitness of persons for baptism *before* obedience to Christ is rendered in baptism, and sitting in judgment on their fitness for baptism *after* obedience to Christ has been rendered in baptism? *None*. It is sectarian presumption in both cases, and is equally condemnable in both cases.

What is the difference between sectarians denying to believers the privilege of being baptized because they cannot say that

they "feel" their "sins forgiven," and denying membership to baptized believers because they cannot say that they understood "the design of baptism" when they were immersed? There is no *difference*, except that those guilty of the former misconduct admit that they are sectarians, while those guilty of the latter misconduct claim to be "loyal to Christ" and thus free from sectarianism. The question, "Do you feel your sins forgiven?" and the question, "Did you understand the design of baptism when you were baptized?"—these questions are both, and are equally, *unscriptural*.

Is there not great danger in preachers of Christ contending for extreme or technical accuracy in any part of the gospel? Yes. When any point is unduly emphasized or extremely criticized the tendency thereof is to make the Impression on certain persons that the highest excellence is found in being extremely critical, and that their eternal salvation depends on technicalities. Persons who have been thus impressed are unfit for general work in building up a church, and are generally a damage to any congregation.

What did Paul say of the man who wished to be technically accurate about how the dead are raised and with what body do they come? He called that man a "fool," and then proceeded to show the foolishness of his question. 1 Cor. 16:36-38.

Then what did Paul say of those who preached Christ through "envy," "strife," "not sincerely," "of contention," for the purpose of adding "affliction" to his "bonds" He said, "What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretense, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice " Phil. 1:16-18. Had it been wrong for those men to preach Christ, Paul would not have rejoiced in the fact that Christ was preached by them.

Did those men who preached Christ in order to afflict Paul have any authority to preach Christ? No. They had no more authority to preach Christ than sectarian preachers have to baptize persons, yet Paul rejoiced in the fact that Christ was preached by them.

What shall we then say of those who now ask whether a sec-

tarian preacher has authority to baptize any one? We should say that they are much more particular than was the apostle He rejoiced that Christ was preached even by men who had no authority to preach, and who preached through "envy," "strife," "contention," supposing to "add affliction" to Paul's bonds, while hobbyists in the Church of Christ are disposed to ridicule and denounce baptism when performed by those who are not authorized to baptize. So these hobbyists are either better or worse, more wise or more foolish than was the apostle Paul. That apostle wrote, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." 1 Cor. 1:17. Thus he had direct authority for preaching the gospel, and wrote concerning baptism as though no special authority was required in order to perform it for those desiring to be baptized. Yet our modern hobbyists speak as though special authority for baptizing in necessary. *Miserable reasoners!* What authority has a drunkard, a libertine, a defaulter, an adulterer, or a covetous man who is an idolater and yet who is sometimes found in the pulpit of the Church of Christ — what authority has such a man to preach or to baptize? He has neither *moral* character nor *religious* character, nor *official* character, yet he sometimes preaches and baptizes scores of people.

Does not the preaching of hobbyists on the so-called "design of baptism" have a constant tendency to make persons so critical on that subject that they are disposed to contend for a correct *administrator* of baptism as well as the supposed proper intelligence on the part of the candidate for baptism? Yes, and there are instances which can be cited to show that this tendency has already caused dissatisfaction, and has led to a rejection of baptism which had been intelligently accepted from a disciple of Christ who was of good character.

Why have disciples adopted or shaped the expression "design of baptism," as it is not found in the Sacred Text? It was adopted in opposition to the sectarian idea of baptism being an essential. Because the sects said "baptism is a non-essential." and that it is an "outward sign of an inward work of grace" disciples began to consider the importance of bap-

tism, and they decided that it had a "design," though the gospel makes use of no such word as "design" in connection with baptism/ To say that baptism has n "design" which must be understood in order for it to be performed acceptably is just as unscriptural as to Bay that it is "an outward sign of an inward work of grace." Both expressions are of human coinage or shaping, and both become exceedingly mischievous when used as standards by which to determine the value of baptism. If re-baptism hobbyists would be consistent, what would the confession of faith be which they would require of candidates for baptism? They would ask, "Do you believe with your whole heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and that the design of baptism is for the remission of sins?"

Have any of them actually required such a confession? Yes, but in two sentences or sections. When they find a person who has been baptized by a sectarian they generally ask "When you were baptized did you believe that baptism is for the remission of sins or, "Did you understand the *design* of baptism when you were Immersed?" If the answer be negative then that one's baptism is rejected.

What does this Imply? It implies that confession of faith *in doctrine* and not simply in *Christ* is necessary in order to become a Christian. This is one of the leading features of sectarianism, and against which disciples of Christ have protested from the beginning of their work in the early part of the nineteenth century. No further evidence is needed to show that re-baptism hobbyists are heretics and thus are sectarians.

CHAPTER IX.

What shall we say of those who settle themselves upon Acts 2:42, claiming to find therein the "the special order of worship," or "the divine order of worship"? We should say that they are wrong, as Acts 2:42 is simply a historic statement of, a part of the acts of worship in the primitive church at Jerusalem, and is not a series of commands. In a historic statement we find sanctification mentioned before justification. See 1

Cor. 6:11. But who will, on that account, contend that people must be sanctified in the scripture sense before they are justified? Even those errorists who contend for the absurdity of an instantaneous sanctification know better than that.

But suppose that those preachers who dwell specially on Acts 2:42, as they travel among the churches, make it their special business to set churches in order according to their notions of "the special," or "the divine, order of worship;" then what shall we say? Those preachers are making an undue application of that scripture, are straining it, and to that extent are acting the part of factions hobbyists. They might as well go among the churches and preach that all people must be sanctified before they are justified, because in a historic statement the word "sanctified" comes before the word "justified," But suppose that those who do thus with Acts 2:42 inform *us* that the great need of the churches is to be set in order according to that one verse, then what should be our response? We should inform them that the mentioned verse does not tell concerning the singing, exhortation, nor thanksgiving which belonged to the meetings of the primitive church, and thus that verse does not mention all the items to which Christians should attend when they come together.

But what if we are told that we should take Acts 2:42 and use it as far as it goes, supplying from other scriptures what is necessary in order to make the worship complete? We should answer that this would require two changes from what is ordinary among churches of Christ, and those changes would be, first, to have the contribution before the communion, and, second, to have all the praying that is done deferred till the close of the meeting. That is to say, in Acts 2:42 the "fellowship" or contribution is mentioned before the communion, and all other acts of worship are mentioned before the praying. Therefore if the contribution must come before the communion because in a historic statement it is so mentioned, then on the same principle of reasoning we must conclude that every other act of worship must be concluded before a prayer is offered. But this would be a positive violation of the commands "pray-

ing always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit" (Eph. 6:18), and "pray without ceasing" (1 Thess. 5:17), and that men should "pray everywhere." 1 Tim. 2:8.

But suppose that advocates of Acts 2:42 as the scripture which sets forth "the special divine order of worship" would say, "We have no objection to an opening prayer," then what should we say? We should tell those who thus speak that this is not a question of what they admit nor of that to which they have "no objection," but it is a question of *interpretation*, and no one can insist upon the contribution being made before the communion, because it is so mentioned in Acts 2:42, and yet admit that a single prayer, however short, is in place before the communion is over. Therefore all the praying in each meeting for worship *must be deferred till the communion is ended*, or it must be admitted that the historic mention of items of worship in Acts 2:42 *is not binding* so far as the *order* of those items is concerned.

But what should be our answer if some one should insist upon all the praying being done at the close of the worship? We should say to any one taking such a position that a time and place have then been found when it would be *wrong to pray*, which is contrary to Eph. 6:18, and 1 Thess. 5:17. What is worse for such a conclusion is the fact that such time and place are found *on the Lord's day*, and in the meeting of the church/*or worship*. This is too absurd to discuss further.

But suppose that "the special order of worship" advocate says, that if the order in Acts 2:42 need not be observed then the order of Acts 2:38 need not be observed, what should we then say? Our answer should be something like this: "Thou perverse hobbyist. Knowest thou not that in Acts 2:38 certain commands are given which are dependent on each other? According to the New Testament repentance is dependent on believing, and confession is dependent on both believing and repenting', and baptism is dependent upon believing, repenting, and confessing. But who will have the boldness to say that the communion depends on the contribution, or that praying depends on all the other acts of worship as necessary

antecedents? *No one*. Then the pretended argument in favor of observing the order of items in Acts 2:42 as based on the necessity of observing the order of commands in Acts 2:38 is a *failure*. Those who urge that pretended argument should be ashamed of themselves for presenting such miserable reasoning. What should then be our conclusion concerning those who travel among the churches and disturb, if not divide, them by trying to set them in order according to Acts 2nd chapter and 42 verse? They are *hobbyists* and as such *&re factionists*. They are liable to do more harm by their hobbyism than they can do good by their preaching of the gospel.

What then are the chief objections to regarding Acta 2:42 as a ritual or stereotyped order to be observed by churches of Christ when they come together for worship on the Lord's day? They are several, and are serious in their character.

1. That the Lord intended it as a ritual is strictly an assumption, unwarranted by the circumstances.

2. The same reasoning which is necessary to conclude that it was intended as a ritual will justify making rituals of a half dozen or more scriptures which mention acts of worship and work.

3. To adopt Acts 2:42 as a ritual would require congregations to defer all praying in each Lord's day meeting for the last act of worship, which would be an example for all other meetings, and this would exclude an opening prayer from all meetings of disciples.

4. If some one says, as the chief champion of adopting Acts 2:42 as a ritual has said, "I have no objection to an opening prayer," then on what ground can an objection be urged to placing the communion *before* the contribution? In Acts 2:42, the contribution is mentioned *before* the Lord's supper even as the supper is mentioned *before* the prayers. Therefore the same liberty which will permit "an opening prayer"—or a prayer before the contribution—will permit the communion *before* the contribution.

6. To insist that it is wrong to commune before the contribution, and wrong to pray until the last act of the worship, is con-

trary to the Savior's example when the communion was first instituted, as they then sang a hymn and went out. Moreover, it is contrary to the example of Paul in Acts 20th, which shows that he met with the saints at Troas on the first day of the week, and continued his speech till the next day and then he himself took something to eat before he left them. Besides, \o insist that it is wrong to pray until the last act of worship is contrary to Eph. 6:18, and 1 Thess. 5:17, and 1 Tim. 2:8, where Christians are required to pray "always" and to "pray without ceasing," and "pray everywhere," Such requirements forbid that we should conclude that it is wrong to pray in the former part, in the middle, or in the conclusion, or any other part, of any and every meeting of the church. Therefore, Acts 2:42 should not be adopted as A ritual, for by so doing the church would array scripture against scripture.

6. To adopt Acts 2:42 as a ritual prevents churches from using preachers, however good and mature they may be, in their regular meetings for worship, and seriously embarrasses overseers and deacons in conducting a meeting la a mature preacher's presence. If the preacher be used to speak after the regular worship is over then the worship will be hurried over in order to "give time for preaching," which results in having the communion of saints before all have even a fair opportunity to be present, especially if they come from a long distance. Besides, it often results in causing outsiders not"to come to the place of meeting till they think the communion is over, which occasions much confusion at the very time when the church should have perfect silence and solemnity. Last, but not least, the outsiders who simply come in time to hear the preaching miss beholding the observance of the Lord's supper, which above all else sets forth the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, with which outsiders need to be impressed.

7. Finally, to adopt Acts 2:42 as a ritual makes an unnecessary deviation from what is common among the churches of Christ, and urging it upon them will cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine of Christ, which is a violation of Rom. 16:17, 18.

What should be the great and constant effort of the preachers of Christ in regard to the worship? We should try to impress upon all disciples of the Lord Jesus that daily reading of the Bible, together with daily thanksgiving and praying, are necessary to the health and strength of the spiritual man even as daily eating and drinking of material food is necessary to the health and strength of the physical man. Moreover, we should teach them that the word of God is medicine for the sick soul as well as food for the hungry soul, and we should thereby endeavor to impress them with the thought that they must live in close communion with God and Christ by daily reading of the Scriptures, and by daily thanksgiving and prayer. Then we should likewise do our best to impress upon them the fact that Christians are not their own, but belong to Christ who bought them with his own precious blood, and thus that all they are and all they possess should be regarded as belonging to the Lord, and therefore should be controlled to his honor and glory.

What effect will such impressions when ripened into convictions have upon Christians? The effect will be that they will so delight in the Lord's day worship that they will be present whenever it is right for them to go, and they will delight to give of their means as the Lord has prospered them,

Can preachers lead people to live in whole hearted devotion to God and Christ while not living in such devotion themselves? No. It is impossible for preachers who are half-hearted, and perhaps ungodly, to lift their hearers to a life of unreserved devotion and piety. In their discourses all preachers of that class generally avoid those themes which bring up the subject of godliness, and when they venture to speak of piety it is simply in cold and formal words which are as destitute of life as the sound of bones rattling in a charnal house. It is a misfortune for any brotherhood to have 'amongst its would-be reformers men who have never learned to reform themselves, or who have never brought themselves wholly under the power of the gospel. What does the Church of Christ always need in order to suc-

cess? It needs preachers, elders and deacons who reverence God and Christ and the Bible supremely, and who are whole hearted in their devotion to the best interests of mankind. It likewise needs a membership of individuals who are of the same disposition with wholehearted preachers, elders and deacons. In some churches this need must be supplied as far as possible, and this work must be commenced by the preachers urging wholeheartedness upon the people. In other instances it must be commenced by elders and deacons beginning in that direction. In still other instances it must be commenced among unofficial members. Wholehearted reverence for God and Christ and the Bible, and wholehearted devotion to the best interests of mankind will be noticed and will accomplish good results wherever found. Moreover, it is the best remedy for hobbyism of every kind, degree, and shade.

CHAPTER X.

What should be our response to those who teach that the only right attitude of prayer is kneeling, and the only right attitude of thanksgiving is standing on the feet? We should tell them that the Bible does not speak of "attitude" during either prayer or thanksgiving; if they insist that it does we should call on them for the evidence. This they will fail to give.

Suppose they refer to the fact that Solomon kneeled (I Kings 8:5-1, 55), and to the fact that certain Jews mentioned in Nehemiah 9:5 said, "Stand up and bless the Lord your God forever and ever," then what should we say? Our answer should be that no evidence exists that inspiration dwelt in either Solomon or those Jews. Moreover, all that is recorded concerning Solomon and those Jews is in the Old Testament which is for us a book of history, but not a book of authority. What is written therein is for our learning, but is not to us teaching of authority. Finally, we should refer to 1 Kings 8:57-60 and show that those verses contain a prayer which Solomon offered after he "arose from kneeling on his knees," and we should refer to Neh. 9:32 and show that prayer was offered by one or

more Jews after they had said, "Stand up and bless the Lord." Thus we should show that both Solomon in 1 Kings and certain Jews in Neh. 9th *stood up and prayed*. Then we should refer to Neh. 8:6 wherein it is stated that "all the people stood up" when Ezra opened the book of the law to read therein, and then show that such behavior on their part is as good evidence for having all the people *stand up* to hear the word of God read as there is anywhere in the Old Testament for kneeling in prayer or standing up to give thanks.

Suppose that we are then told that Christ "kneeled down and prayed" in the garden (Luke 22:41), and that when Paul was about to leave the elders of Ephesus "he kneeled down and prayed with them all" (Actg 20:36), what should be our answer? We should say that while it is true that Christ kneeled in the garden, and Paul kneeled on the shore with the elders of Ephesus, yet in neither instance was there a public congregation assembled for worship. We should also mention that when Christ spoke to his disciples about position in time of prayer he used a word which is justly translated "stand," and not the word for *kneel* (See Mark 11:25.) Finally we should show that the only instance recorded in the New Testament of giving thanks or offering a blessing at a private table is mentioned in Luke 24:30, and there it is stated of Christ "as he sat at meat with them, he took bread and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them," which shows that Christ gave thanks or expressed a blessing while he was *sitting or reclining at a table*. But suppose that we are told by a brother that a no less "authority" than Dr. Adam Clarke says that the word "stand" in Mark 11:25 does not refer to attitude, then what should we say? Our answer should be that a professed disciple of Christ who will speak of Adam Clark as an "authority" ought to change his profession or repent of his mistake.

But what should be our response when we are told by a brother that he has no doubt" that somebody gave thanks while standing at the table in Emmaus before Christ sat down at that table? We should respond that whoever can, become so firmly convinced of a fact that he has "no doubt" concern-

ing it without a particle of testimony is very far gone in the direction of error, and is not to be trusted on any question where his prejudices are involved. Moreover, we should show that even if some person or a dozen persons had given thanks while standing on their feet at the table in Emmaus, yet the fact that Christ "took bread and blessed it *he sat at meat with them*" that were there—this fact shows that it is right to *sit at a private table and give thanks while sitting*. Whoever denies this ought to be ashamed to live and afraid to die until he repents before God and his fellow man.

What classes of disciples contend most earnestly for kneeling always in time of prayer? Some of them are persons of correct life, but many are unusually defective in life. All of them seem to be conscious of a lack of reverence, and seem, extremely disposed to adopt a pious position in time of prayer, perhaps, to compensate for their inherent lack of reverence.

Is the practice of those who contend for exclusive kneeling in time of prayer consistent with their teaching on that subject? No. Some of them will preach while at the meeting house in favor of exclusive kneeling, and declaim against standing or sitting in time of prayer, and then when they go to the water to baptize they will stand and offer prayer. Others will kneel at the water even though in order so to do they must kneel in mud, snow, slush, or kneel among sharp stones or on the ice. Yet even when such come to dismiss the audience they stand and pray this prayer, "And now may grace, mercy, and peace abide with us all, amen," or they offer some other prayer to the same effect. This shows that exclusive kneeling for public prayer is a doctrine which is not practiced even by those who advocate that doctrine. In other words, it is a doctrine not in harmony with the word of God, nor is it exemplified by its advocates.

Can the commands "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit" and "pray without ceasing" be obeyed if we only pray when we are permitted to kneel? No, and this is sufficient to overthrow all the reasoning urged in favor of exclusive or invariable kneeling. It is right to kneel in time

of prayer, but those who only pray when they have opportunity to kneel certainly don't pray near as much as they should, and certainly do not come near fulfilling the commands "praying always" and "pray without ceasing." Moreover, those who contend for invariable kneeling do not in the prayers they offer in public give much evidence of much prayerfulness.

Do persons generally show in their public prayers whether they do much praying in private? Yes, the more people pray in secret the better they will be able to pray in public. Daily and frequent communion with God and Christ in secret is the only remedy against cold, formal, and blundering prayers in public.

Do those who insist upon always kneeling when they pray show more signs of piety, or humility, or devotion than many others who are not so particular about attitude? No. They seldom or never give evidence of much communing with God and Christ.

Should individual Christians and congregations of Christiana kneel in prayer whenever circumstances permit? Yes. But who should kneel, and when the posture of the body in time of prayer should be kneeling must be left to the individual worshiper and to the circumstances. The Lord has wisely left it thus, and we should be satisfied therewith. He foreknew that age, infirmity, crowded houses and many other hindrances to kneeling in course of time would exist, and so he has left the question of posture of the body in time of prayer so that Christians may "pray everywhere" (1 Tim. 2:8), pray "always," (Eph. 6:18), and "pray without ceasing," (1 Thess. 5:17).

In view of all this what shall we say of those who preach and teach in favor of exclusive kneeling in time of prayer, and perhaps in favor of exclusive standing in time of thanksgiving so as to disturb and, perhaps, divide the brotherhood to the extent of their influence? They are factious hobbyists, and should be everywhere admonished to keep their strained notions to themselves, and if they feel that they must practice them to do so under circumstances which will do no harm to others. If they will not heed such admonition they should be rejected.

CHAPTER XI.

Is it permitted unto Christians to refuse to vote or hold office in civil governments?. That depends on whether they are in God's sight responsible for any evil that they might prevent by voting or holding office.

By what should Christians be guided in regard to civil governments? By the Bible, and that teaches Christians to use their influence in behalf of the oppressed and against the oppressors. The epistle of the apostle James gives clear teaching on this subject, as it shows that God is opposed to the proud and oppressors among mankind, and that he looks with compassion upon the lowly and the oppressed.

But suppose that a man has been educated to think that he should not vote nor hold office, even if office be proffered to him, then what? In the language of scripture we should answer, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Rom. 14:6. This language was used in regard to persons who thought that they had no right to eat meats which had been offered to idols. Though it was right to eat such meats, as all meats were "created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth" (1 Tim. 4:3), yet meats are "evil for that man who eateth with offense." "And he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:20, 23. This is the mildest and the best that can be justly said of refusing to vote and hold office in civil governments, if office be proffered. In other words, it, possibly, is the privilege of men to refuse to take part in the affairs of civil governments if they think that it is wrong for them to take part therein. But even this admission in their favor should be made on the condition or with the proviso that God does not hold man responsible for any evil that he might avert by voting or accepting an office. For instance, if a vote for local option be taken in any state or county, city or town, and by one Christian refusing to vote, and refusing to be convinced that he ought to vote, the local option cause be lost; then suppose that as a result that Christian man's son or some other man's son becomes a drunkard

and commits murder, who is responsible? This is what is meant by the question, whether the Lord does or does not hold

a man responsible for the evil which he might avoid by voting or accepting office at the proper time. In view of all this it is barely possible, but not probable, that any Christian man has the divinely given privilege to refuse to vote in behalf of right, and refuse to hold a proffered office in which he can legislate for the right or execute what is right in civil governments.

What did Christ teach concerning civil governments? He said, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's." Matt. 22:21. Does this mean anything more than that Christians should pay taxes? That depends on whether Caesar, or the civil government, does any thing more than protect Christians in regard to property.

Do not civil governments protect Christians in regard to religious meetings, reputation, character and even life? Yes, and for that reason civil governments have the right to call on Christians who are their subjects for something more than money. What is called "the golden rule" teaches this much, in Matt. 7:12 the Savior said, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them " This requirement clearly forbids that we should be willing to receive benefits, favors, or service from others which we are unwilling to render unto them. In other words, it is contrary to Matt. 7:12 that Christians should receive personal and religious protection from civil governments by the personal service of others, and then refuse to render such service if called on to do so by the civil government under which they live. It seems beneath the dignity of manhood, to say nothing of the golden rule, to receive favors from others when we are in need which we are unwilling to render to them in return when they are in need.

But did not Christ say before Pilate that his kingdom is not of this world, and does not this show that Christians must not take part in the affairs or civil governments? Yes, he used such language, but that verse does not show that Christians

should not take part in civil governments any more than Rom. 14:17 shows that Christians should not eat nor drink. In. Jno. 18:36 the Savior said, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence," and in Rom. 14:17 the apostle, Paul said, "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Now then, as it is absurd to say that Rom. 14:17 means that Christians must not eat nor drink, so it is absurd to say that John 18:36 means that Christians shall not take part in civil governments, even to the extent of fighting for the right that is in them.

But what did the Savior mean in John 18th chapter and 36th verse. He meant simply what he said. In the kingdoms of this world the servants of a king fight in order that their king may not fall into the hands of his enemies. But as Christ's kingdom is not "of" or "from" this world the servants of Christ don't fight with carnal weapons in his behalf. In other words, they don't fight with carnal weapons in behalf of the religion which Christ has authorized. But this does not deny that Christians may fight in behalf of civil governments. On the contrary, it clearly implies that they may fight in behalf of such governments. "If my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight." This shows that those who are citizens of the kingdoms of this "world" may fight for those whom they regard as contending for the right, or for that which they consider a righteous cause, and in obedience to those in authority over them. To what extent should Christians submit to civil powers.

To the extent that the word of God gives them the right to command. When they transcend Bible limits in regard to giving commands we should refuse to obey. For instance, if civil governments remain within the domain of civil affairs in giving commands Christians should obey. But if they give commands in regard to religious matters, especially contrary to the gospel, then Christians should obey God rather than men. Acts 4:19-5:29.

What is the special office of civil governments? To maintain order among their subjects in their treatment of each other by punishing evil doers and praising those who do well. Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13, 14.

But does not Paul teach that Christians are not to take "vengeance," and does not this require that they shall not be officials nor soldiers in civil governments? Yes, he forbids vengeance, but the fact that personal vengeance is forbidden teaches nothing of that kind. As well might we say that to bear witness against a murderer, or to turn the disturber of a religious meeting over to the civil law, or to exercise scriptural discipline in a church is *personal vengeance*, as to say that for the judge of a court to pass sentence on a murderer, or for a sheriff as an official to hang a man, or for a soldier to shoot an enemy of his country in obedience to his country's command, is personal vengeance.

But are not politics too corrupt for Christians to engage therein? That depends on the Christian. As well might one ask if mercantile life is not too corrupt for Christians to engage therein. Moreover what classes of people are more corrupt in doctrine or are more dishonest than the preachers of Protestantism, to say nothing of the Roman Catholic clergy? Yet their corruption is no argument against Christians becoming preachers, and neither is the corruption of political leaders an argument against Christians becoming politicians. On the contrary, the corruptness in doctrine of Protestant preachers is a strong argument in favor of the greatest possible number of Christians becoming preachers of the gospel, and the corruptness of political leaders generally is a strong argument in favor of Christians becoming politicians.

Can any sound argument be presented in favor of an unsound position? No. All reasoning in favor of a wrong position is necessarily wrong, either in its foundation or in its conclusions.

Does a right position require wrong reasoning in its behalf? No, and when examination is made of the leading arguments advanced by the leading advocates of any position, and they are found to be wrong first, middle and last, we may generally

conclude with safety that the entire position is wrong. Any cause which depends chiefly, if not wholly, on wrong reasoning for its support is a bad cause.

What about the reasoning of those who deny that Christiana may take part in civil governments? It is wrong from beginning to end. More evident fallacies have perhaps never been urged in favor of any position than in favor of Christians giving civil governments wholly into the hands of the devil's children to work out the Lord's will.

What shall we then say of those who urge their fallacious reasoning on Christiana both publicly and privately, thereby disturbing the minds of individual Christians, and disturbing, if not dividing, churches of Christ? We should say that they are hobbyists—*factious hobbyists*. Moreover, their position is a matter of choice and not of divine authority, and it is therefore a *heresy*. There is not a fragment of divine testimony in favor of such a position, but it is wholly of inference. Those who advocate that position should be admonished to cease, and if they persist in their unauthorized course they should be rejected according to the instruction of Paul in Titus 3; 10, 11.

CHAPTER XII.

Is there any difference in the language of the Greek New Testament between preaching and teaching? Yea, there is one word which specially means publicly addressing an audience regardless of the doctrine announced. That word is *kentsso*, and it means to herald or proclaim publicly as an advance agent or forerunner as was John the Baptist. Then there is another word which specially means making known good news, or preaching the gospel either publicly or privately. That word is *euangelidzo*, and is specially used in the New Testament to express the preaching of the gospel of Christ to alien sinners. Closely related to this word is *matheteuo* which means to make disciples or learners. Then there are two other words—*didasko* and *dialegomai*—which mean to teach, regardless of the doctrine taught and whether addressed to sinners or saints.

It is thus evident that *kerusso*, *euangelidzo*, and *matheteno* are specially used in the Greek New Testament with reference to , making known the gospel, and the work of leading people to become Christians, while *didasko* and *dialegomai* are used with reference to teaching both sinners and saints.

Is it possible for a preacher of the gospel to comply with more than one of these words in a single discourse? Yes, he may comply with them all, and in view of the mixed audience which he is frequently required to address he should in one discourse often try to arrest attention, lead people into willingness to become learners of Christ, then make known the gospel as it is divinely intended for sinners, and finally he may teach the saints, or he may reverse this order and first teach the saints and then turn his attention to sinners. In other words, the preachers of Christ, and all other public speakers in the church who are capable of so doing, should always adapt their discourses to their audiences, setting forth, as far as possible, such truths as each listener should hear.

Should the word "preached" as found in Acts 20:7, be used as an argument *in favor of* preaching the gospel to sinners when the church meets for worship on the Lord's day? No, as ;the Greek word in that passage which is translated "preached" is not the one which specially refers to preaching the gospel to sinners.

Should the fact that a word is used in Acts 20:7 which does not specially refer to preaching the gospel to sinners be used as an argument *against* preaching the gospel to sinners when the church meets for worship? No, for the Greek word used in that passage is *dialegomai* and is used nine times in the New Testament in regard to what was said to *sinners*, and it seems only three times in regard to *Christians*. It is translated by the word *reason* in Acts 17:2; 18:4, 19; 24:25; and is translated by the word *dispute* in Mark 9:34; Acts 17:17; 19:8, 9; Jude 19; and is translated by the word *speak* in Heb 12:5, and *preach* in Acts 20:7. In the last two instances it is used with reference to what was said to *saints*, and in all the others it is used concerning what was said to *sinners*.

What then is the special meaning of *dialegomai*? It means the making of an argumentative discourse whether addressed to sinners or saints, and whether made in public or private.

What shall we then say of those who insist that on Lord's day when the church assembles for worship the gospel should not be preached to sinners, but the time should be wholly occupied in leaching the saints? All such make a serious mistake. It is true that on Lord's day when Christians meet for worship the time is then most favorable for teaching the church concerning the duties of Christians, and the time should be generally spent in so doing. Yet a restatement of the gospel in its relations to sinners is frequently important for Christians, and it is necessary for alien sinners who are present. Therefore it may be safely said that a *mixed audience* calls for a *mixed discourse* on Lord's day morning, and at all other times. The proportion of time given to saints or to sinners may be determined by the proportion of saints and sinners who are present. For this reason a preacher of Christ should often ask an elder of the church, or some one else who knows, concerning the character of the audience, and should preach or teach accordingly.

What shall we then say of those who make it their special business to talk about the difference between teaching and preaching as though the salvation of the world depended thereon? They would better quit if they do not wish to become factious hobbyists. Those who have already become hobbyists on this question would better repent thereof without delay. In a majority of congregations there are persons before whom it is dangerous to talk of an unimportant difference or discrimination. They are so constituted that when any distinction is presented to their minds, especially one that is not important, they are liable to catch at it as if their eternal salvation depended thereon, or as if the world will be converted in proportion as the distinction which occupies their minds is understood. Of course it is important to distinguish things that differ, yet in view of the weaknesses of mankind it is important not to magnify differences beyond what is necessary, or we

may cause OUR good to result in evil.

Are there any other hobbies which have in any measure troubled churches of Christ? Yes, certain disciples in various localities have decided that the "only liquid fit for communion is what they call the pure unfermented juice of the grape, while others have said that such grape juice is not wine because it is unfermented. Thus some have made trouble because *fermented* grape juice was used and others have made trouble because *unfermented* grape juice was used.

Does the New Testament ever use the word "wine" when referring to the grape juice used for communion? No. Christ used the expression "the fruit of the vine," and thus it was left by the apostles, What does this teach on the subject? Simply that we may use the pure grape juice or the fermented grape juice, as in both we have "the fruit of the vine." If some one objects to alcoholic wine because it inflames his thirst for strong drink then let the unfermented grape juice be used, That is prefer able at all times, and is certainly unobjectionable. But the Savior doubtless foresaw the varied circumstances of his people, and knew that they could not always have the unfermented juice, and so he simply said "the fruit of the vine." Let us do the same and Do try to be wise above what is written.

Then we shall never become hobbyists on the subject of what is called "communion wine.." Unfermented grape juice and unleavened bread seem most appropriate for the communion, and doubtless should be generally used. But it is wrong to dwell on this question so as to trouble the consciences of sensitive people, and cause them to refuse to commune if either the bread or the fruit of the vine be different from their notions.

Are there any other hobbies which preachers or others have been riding among the churches of Christ? Yes, there is "the running water hobby." Those who ride it are loud and strong in their denunciations of the "box" or "trough," as they call a "baptistery."

Do the advocates of this hobby really say that baptism is not valid if it be performed in a baptistery? Yea, some of them

do, while others are so strong and persistent in their denouncing and, perhaps, ridiculing of baptisteries that certain persons who were baptized in a baptistery or even in a pond or pool become dissatisfied therewith, and insist upon being baptized a second time for no other purpose than to be able to say "have been baptized in running water."

What do these running-water hobbyists say concerning the baptisms on the day of Pentecost? One of their number has contended that the apostles took the penitent believers all to the river Jordan, which was twenty or more miles distant. But in answer to him it was shown that in the absence of divine testimony such an idea is the most evident fiction. Besides, it was further shown that if they had gone to the river Jordan it would have been impossible to baptize that same day the great company that surrendered to Christ on the day of Pentecost.

After we leave what the inspired record says concerning the baptizing that was done in the river Jordan is there any testimony concerning running water having been used for baptizing? None whatever.

What does such an omission on the part of the Inspired Record indicate? To say the least it indicates that the Lord did not intend that readers of that Record should conclude that baptism can only be validly performed in running water. What is the difference between an artificial pool of water outside of a meeting house and a baptistery? None in principle. A humanly arranged pond, pool and baptistery are all on the same order. The same reasoning which condemns one of them condemns the others, and the same reasoning which justifies one of them justifies the others. Therefore those who reject baptisteries must for the same reason reject all humanly arranged ponds and pools on the outside of meeting houses as places of baptizing, and they must confine themselves to running water.

Is not a stream of running water sometimes very difficult to find? Yes, in some districts of country, especially in course of a dry season, it may be necessary to travel twenty, thirty or even fifty miles or more in order to find a stream of running

water. Such distances would require unscriptural delays in baptizing, and thus the running water fancy is a heresy. It is without a fragment of divine authority, is decided upon by human choice, and in some instances requires an unauthorized delay in baptizing. This should settle the question in the minds of all right thinking people. The gospel requires believing penitent ones to be baptized with a baptism in which is accomplished a burial and resurrection. The cleanest water that can be well obtained or found should be used, and for this purpose a baptistery is far better than many of the streams of water. Then let all opposition to baptisteries be at an end among disciples of Christ.

A few concluding remarks are now in order. The reader's attention has been invited to a severe analysis and strict review of seven extreme notions, each of which has done considerable damage among churches of Christ. Those notions in humanly chosen language have been called "hobbies" and "innovations," or "innovating hobbles." In divinely chosen language they are "heresies." From first to last they are unauthorized of heaven and thus are notions of choice or option. This gives them the essential feature of heresies.

Those who advocate the mentioned notions, and others of the same character, commonly regard themselves as the soundest of the sound in regard to doctrine and practice. But their unscriptural extremes, and the reasoning by which they try to defend those extremes, give them the character of hobbyists and innovation is and thus make them sectarians, for hobbyism and innovationism are the chief, if not the sole, factors of sectarianism.

No effort has been made in the foregoing pages to expose all the little, fallacious reasoning which has been done to defend the extreme notions which have been examined. But the principal fallacies have been handled so that all may see their erroneousness, and thus see their dangerous character. Men of peculiar casts of mind and disposition are constantly liable to take peculiar views of almost any passage of scripture, and in many instances they will cling to those views even to their

own ruin and to the damage of churches. But in some instances men strain or contract scripture to justify themselves in some perverse disposition. By reason of this, certain elders are assuming the right to exclude persons from the church without due notice, and perform other acts which may be justly called *lording over God's heritage*. At the same time there are others who are denying that there is any authority for an official eldership, but claim that all the elder-men together constitute the true eldership. But this is all absurd, and the two notions just mentioned are ditch-begotten errors on the opposite sides of truth. Both are heresies and should be abandoned without delay by all who hold them.

There are others who make a hobby of the words, "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," and press that language till they ruin themselves and damage the church. Some of that class press this language against Christians marrying those who are not of the same faith and order with themselves. Others press this language against Christians uniting with secret societies. The words of Paul may have been intended to bear against both of those practices, or it may have been directed simply against Christians marrying pagans or idolaters. In this view of the case it should now serve simply as a basis for positive opposition to Christians marrying infidels, and as a basis for advice against forming any other alliance which will likely interfere with such duties as the gospel enjoins.

Here the writer of this pamphlet bids the reader thereof good-bye, feeling confident that an important duty has been honestly performed, and hoping that good results therefrom may be evident throughout time and during the ages of eternity.