

MISSION MESSENGER

P. L. Faenger
Bonne Terre, Mo.

VOLUME II

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, JUNE, 1949

NUMBER 6

ANCESTOR WORSHIP

By W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

The Japanese toiling up the sides of a hill to the shrine of his honorable ancestors, there to bow in homage and adoration, differs only in the degree of his devotion from many members of the church today! The progress of truth is retarded now as it has always been, by misguided souls who profess a supreme loyalty to God, and claim to be defenders of the faith, when they are but zealots, superstitiously



clinging to traditionalism. These, who unconsciously have been transmuted into modern Pharisees and scribes are still asking as they did two thousand years ago, "Why do you break the rules handed down by our ancestors?" And just as those made void the law of God by their traditions sanctified to them by constant repetition, so do their twentieth century prototypes. It was blinding tradition which twisted hearts to the place where they prompted clinched fists with hammers to drive the nails into the physical body of God's Son; it is tradition which even yet drives the dagger of schism into the spiritual body of the Lord.

The church is filled with human traditions, bearing not one iota of divine recognition. Men expend more time and effort in an attempt to defend these human restrictions upon Christian liberty than to discover the depth of pure unsullied truth. They cater to partisanism, which produces cliques and castes, and one who cannot pronounce each little "shibboleth" is slain at the river crossing by those who would perish before they surrendered their hoary and bigoted ideas.

Every religious reformation has eventually gone to pieces on the rocks of reaction. Men start back along the road to Jerusalem and after travelling so far, they reach certain conclusions, embody them in a creed and use that as a bar to further progress. They draw a visible line in the sands of time, and declare with dogmatic authority, "Hitherto, and no farther shalt thou come, and here shall your scriptural research and investigations cease." Little souls become imbued with the idea that they have a full knowledge of all truth, and men are measured by their willingness to

align themselves with some pet foible. If one dares to climb the steep and views the promised land, and thenceforth refuses to halt, "upon this side of Jordan," he is maligned, misrepresented and may be crucified upon a cross of envy. But reforms cannot be halted! They represent continual progress. When such a movement halts it is no longer a *movement*, and when it ceases to be a movement, it ceases to be a reformation.

The system of truth is perfect. The revelation of truth is perfect! It came forth from its divine author without frailty or imperfection, proceeding from his throne as the pure water of the river of life. But our understanding of it is not perfect. We are still fallible. We are finite. We are liable to err, and do! That's why we can *grow in grace and knowledge of the truth*. It is only a bitter sectarian spirit which asserts that we have learned all that can be learned about truth. We cease to be disciples when we cease to be learners! Shall we then abandon our quest for truth and rest in complacent content? Will we circumscribe the future advance of the Kingdom among men by the discoveries of the fathers, and make their opinions, interpretations and customs a bar to further development? If we do, then we shall have an unwritten creed—more binding than any ever devised by Methodism or Presbyterianism.

To me, one of the greatest statements ever made in the reformation commenced by Luther, was not made by the eminent doctor from Erfurt at all, but by his brilliant young contemporary, Melancthon, who in his first theological writing said, "We ought not to explain the Holy Scripture, by the Fathers, but the Fathers by the Holy Scripture." He went on to add, "How often has not Jerome been mistaken? how often Augustine? how often Ambrose? How often do we not find them differing in judgment? how often do we not hear them retracting their errors? There is but one Scripture divinely inspired and without mixture of error."

I believe that I have read of David King saying, when someone suggested that we take the words of the fathers as explanatory of the practice of the church, "Let's go back beyond the fathers. Let's go to the *grand-fathers*—the apostles." Amen!

When new truth, or better, a new discovery of truth, is introduced, all that is needed to bar it and condemn it in most

places, is for one to rise up and declaim, "That's not the way we've always done it!" Pious men, with tears in their eyes, hold forth in opposition to things, with their only reason expressed in their statements, "Poor old Brother So-and-so would turn over in his grave, if he knew we were doing this, for he never saw it that way!" Thus, it must be wrong and sinful! "Why do you break the rules handed down by our ancestors?"

Shall we hold back truth with a skeleton hand from the grave, or go onward in security with our hand in the hand of Him who came forth from the grave? The divine standard of judgment in matters of right and wrong is not whether others have accepted it or not. A thing is not necessarily right because others have always done it that way. Nor is it necessarily wrong because no one has ever done it that way. The divine reed for measuring is not opinion or tradition from the fathers. It is the one which was handed to the apostle by the angel. It is the law and testimony of God. If a thing does not violate God's Word why be concerned too greatly if it nullifies some purely human concept?

I come behind no man in regard for the faithful worthies who have passed on to us through sacrifice the great heritage we now possess. But I do not believe anything in matters of religion *merely because* my father believed it; nor shall I supinely submit to a thing *merely because* that's the way most of our preachers have taught it. I expect to make a continual effort to discover truth, and I expect to adjust my life, teaching and practice in conformity with such discoveries of truth. Only by so doing can I keep from being narrowly sectarian. This means I'll change my mind on some matters. *I've already changed it on many!* The man who thinks to condemn me of changing will only commend me. The man who never changes, either doesn't learn anything, or is too shackled by tradition to exchange an old prejudice for a new truth!

How will such a course affect future relations of brethren? I answer that it will produce heart-searching and scripture-searching. Such searching will be personal! It will be carried on as free men, not as slavish adherents to other men. If we differ *honestly* where we have no express "thus saith the Lord" we shall have full discussion without fear of being proscribed by papal bulls, or of being written up by dictatorial editors. Our unity is not based upon opinions, and if we are sincere and charitable on such matters, they can never be made the grounds

of division among us. We'll not divide over what song books to use, whether it is right to have a baptistery in the church building or not, whether it is proper to pass a plate to receive the contributions of the saints, or scores of other things which have wreaked turmoil in the past.

A century ago a devout writer asserted, "The writers who participate in these dis-

cussions love one another with a love stronger than that of party, and the brotherhood to whom the arguments are addressed, know too well the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, to allow their affections to be turned away from the true apostolic ground of Christian union, by any differences of opinion which they may hold." To this, witness also, we say, Amen!

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE — A FORUM

"But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God hath called us to peace" (1 Corinthians 7: 15).

Does this scripture mean that if an unbelieving companion leaves a believer, that the latter is free to marry again. We have asked this of a group of preaching brethren. Read their replies as sent in to us.

J. H. MABERY, Bonne Terre, Mo.

My opinion is they do not have a right to marry again. Opinion is a belief or judgment, and my belief is based upon the following scriptures: (1) The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth" (verse 39 of this chapter); (2) "And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another committeth adultery; and who so marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" (Matt. 19: 9). Now back to 1 Corinthians, chapter 7. In verse 12 we learn that if any brother hath a wife that believeth not and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. So also with the woman in verse 13. The believer is plainly told he must not leave the unbeliever. If he is mistreated by the latter he should bear it and show the true Christian spirit, for in so doing the unbeliever may be led to Christ. But verse 15 declares that if the unbelieving depart, let him depart, which means that the Christian is not bound to live with the unbeliever if that one insists on leaving, for God hath called us to peace.

Moffatt's Translation says, "Should the unbelieving partner be determined to separate, however, a separation let it be; in such cases the Christian brother or sister is not tied to marriage; it is to a life of peace that God has called us."

**BORDEN HIGGINBOTHAM,
Anderson, Ind.**

I do not understand the expression to mean that a Christian is free to marry again. I understand it to mean that a Christian should not be compelled to fulfil such matrimonial engagement as would produce continual jarring and discord, "for God hath called us to peace." The only scriptural right for divorce and remarriage is found in Matthew 19: 9. If this be the case with the

deserter, then the Christian is free to marry again.

HERSHEL OTTWEILL, Hartford, Ill.

My understanding of the expression is that a brother or sister who could not live in peace with an unbelieving companion had the right to separate. Paul declares that it is best for them to dwell together in peace, and he gives this reason in verse 14. However, they were not compelled by law to live together if peace could not be promoted. I do not believe the apostle is dealing with the subject of "remarriage" in this passage.

HAROLD SHASTEEN, Crystal City, Mo.

In my opinion, a brother or sister is not free to marry again under any circumstance, except the one stipulated by Christ in Matthew 19: 9. The expression, "A brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases" is not intended to teach that they are under bondage to what the Savior taught in Matthew 19. In verses 12 and 13 of 1 Corinthians 7, Paul had just commanded men and women to not put away their unbelieving partners; however, if the unbelieving partner has a sinful and rebellious disposition which tends to make the intimate relationship of marriage an unholy alliance, the Christian is then not under bondage to live with him.

ELLIS CRUM, JR., Bridgeport, Conn.

The passage says in effect that the wife no longer needs to "reverence" her husband, or the husband is no longer obligated to "provide" or support his wife. However, until one party has committed fornication, the other is not free to remarry (Matthew 19: 9). The passage under consideration provides only for a separation as far as Paul states here by permission. In this verse, the Greek word translated "bondage" means, "to be held subject to," or "be in bondage." The word "depart" in the Greek is "separate." Separation is taught in this verse, but it does not outline a scriptural right for divorce. The Savior tells us that the husband who puts away his wife for any other cause than fornication "causeth her to commit adultery" i. e., if she remarries without scriptural grounds.

J. ED ULAND, La Junta, Colo.

I believe the passage is discussing the subject of separation and that divorce and remarriage are irrelevant topics in this consideration of the word "bondage."

1. There is only one scriptural reason for divorce. That is fornication or adultery as mentioned in Matthew 5: 31, 32; 19: 9.

2. There are only two scriptural reasons for remarriage; divorce caused by adultery, and death which is an act of God (1 Cor. 7: 39, 40).

3. Marriage is a fleshly tie until one of the marital partners breaks that tie, they are still one in the eyes of God (Gen. 2: 24, 25; 1 Cor. 6: 16).

Therefore, the word "bondage" evidently refers to legal obligations and social responsibilities, such as support of the departed one. God does not hold a Christian responsible for the marriage contract in a legal sense, if the unbelieving mate chooses to depart.

I would like to quote from some recognized authorities to substantiate my convictions on this matter. The following three are held in high repute in the religious world.

1. Moffatt's Translation. (Quoted by J. H. Mabery above.)

2. George W. DeHoff in "Sermons on First Corinthians": "If a Christian is married to a heathen or a non-Christian, God requires that he not put her away but continue to live with her. If she leaves, God declares the Christian is not under bondage. This does not mean that he is free to marry again. Many fine Bible scholars have so taught but they are undoubtedly in error. It simply means that a Christian is not under bondage to live with the person and support the person. A Christian can still pray for the companion, and hope to convert her."

Jamieson, Faucett, and Brown: "Is not bound to renounce the faith for the sake of retaining her unbelieving husband. The believer does not lie under the same obligation in the case of a union with an unbeliever, as in the case of one with a believer. In the former case he is bound not to separate, if the unbeliever separate or depart; in the latter nothing but fornication justifies separation."

FROM THE EDITOR

We have addressed this question to six elders in the brotherhood: "A man who is not a member of the church divorces his wife on the ground of incompatibility. Later, he becomes engaged to a sister in the church, who deserts the church and marries him. At the end of a year, she calls you and asks what she must do to be reinstated in the fellowship of the congregation of which you are one of the elders. What would you tell her?"

It is not inconceivable that this problem

could arise anywhere and at any time to confront a congregation. We have requested C. H. Cassell, Pomona, California; John Pace, Riverside, California; Dewey Lowe, Des Moines, Iowa; Otto Schlieper, Hartford, Illinois; Tilden Lawson, New Castle, Indiana; and Carl Landes, Kansas City, Missouri to express themselves upon the matter. We shall begin giving their replies next month. It will be interesting for you to note how they would handle the situation.

WHOSE HERITAGE?

By W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

Even war, with all of its terror, has some compensation. So does religious controversy, much as it is to be deplored. One of the outstanding useful by-products of the latter is a renewed interest in a critical examination of the sacred Scriptures, and while it is regrettable that such personal study of the Word must be encouraged by differences of opinion which often wax strong, let us rejoice in the good that may come of it.

For the past two years we have been treated (or subjected) to a continuous rehearsing and re-hashing of ideas regarding a statement of the apostle Peter, in 1 Peter 5: 3, which reads, "Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." I have been asked upon numerous occasions to give my views of the meaning of the passage, but I have desisted in the matter, having no particular desire to add fuel to the fire which seemed to already be flaring up with considerable brilliance, and no lack of heat. Yet, one should be ready to give an answer to everyone that asketh him, and as Solomon declares that there is a "time to keep silence, and a time to speak," I presume it should somewhat be left to our judgment as to which time is here. Much of the time my judgment may be wrong on both counts.

In setting forth my views, I have no particular concern as to what position is occupied by any person. I am firmly convicted that one should search for the truth in an impartial spirit. Upon the question under debate, one writer affirms that the word "God" is not in the original, and the other accuses him of "wresting the scriptures" in order to sustain a position in error. It might do us all good, regardless of past happenings, to sit down calmly and dispassionately and let the Lord talk awhile. "Search the scriptures."

The word "lord" as applied to men has a bad sound in our ears today, and we might become unduly excited and prejudiced by it. That is true of many words which have changed in their aspect through the years. Certainly there was a sense in which the elders were not to be as lords. That must be admitted. Is the heritage under consideration that of God? The translators evidently thought so, for they put the word "God's" in without authority of the text. It

is not in the original, but most of us in discussing the passage have not noticed that fact. I have been led to investigate the issue prayerfully and carefully, prepared to make any concession for truth.

At the risk of being placed under the charge of twisting God's Word, a thing which I earnestly pray I shall never intentionally do, I place on record herewith my honest opinion. I believe it is what is meant in the passage. I believe it is the teaching of God's Word. Study it without bias, and criticize it with all candor.

The term "heritage" means "lot, or portion." It might refer to what a man receives as a patrimony or inheritance, in our common parlance. Since the word "God's" is not in the original, but the sense of possession must be, for the word is used in that grammatical case, it simply means, "Not as being lords over *your* heritage." Does the expression refer to the congregation which has fallen to the lot of the elders to supervise, or does it refer to their personal possessions? I am inclined to believe the latter is correct. I believe that Peter meant to say, "Do not act as if the church belonged to you elders, but conduct yourselves as patterns of the flock." A man has a right to conduct his private business, supervise his farm, regulate his store within limits of decency and honesty as he sees fit. His possessions are in his power. "While it remained was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" (Acts 5: 4.) But that is not true of the church. It belongs to Christ, and those who are rulers over it, must not conduct themselves as rulers over their own possessions, but as rulers over the Lord's possessions.

Certainly the elders are to "take the oversight of God's flock" for this the previous verse commands them to do. Certainly they are to rule the flock and we are to "obey them that have the rule over" us (Heb. 13: 17). But elders must never rule the flock arbitrarily and arrogantly. They must remember that they will have to give an account for the souls entrusted to their care. If I might be allowed the liberty of paraphrase, I would read the passage thus: "Feed the flock of God which is entrusted to you, accepting the supervision thereof not under compulsion but voluntarily; not for worldly gain but with a free mind; Neither as one who manages his own estate, but as examples to the flock." The New Testament Greek Interlinear translates, "Not as exercising lordship over (your) possessions."

In offering these suggestions, I do so with only a humble desire to set forth my firm convictions as to the meaning of the passage. I am ready to change if proven to be wrong. I have no desire to wrest the Scriptures, but here I am happy to rest my case. Let's study everything that is offered without partiality, when it has to do with interpretation of the Lord's precious will.

A GOOD SIGN

Dear Bro. Carl: This is to announce my intention to review changes that are appearing in the brotherhood, if it is God's will that I live to do so. Your attention is here called to a statement that you made in MMM, dated September 1947, as follows:

"I shall contend earnestly for an entirely different conception on the part of the church of God's system of worship and ministry."

This is a rather sweeping, and all-inclusive statement, and in its absolute meaning the Church of Christ will be expected to change its conception of God's system of worship and ministry in its entirety.

Changes are making their appearances, and while I am willing, and glad to concede that we may make improvements in many respects, and it should be our constant aim to draw closer to the requirements of God's Word, it also remains a duty to observe the following injunction: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. 5: 21).

There can be no harm in putting every change that appears to the above test, and that is the very thing I hope to do. I want to emphasize my intention to review the changes that have already made their appearance, and to follow others that may appear, in the Christian spirit, and to weigh them by the scriptures. I know I will make mistakes, for I am human, but it will be my intention to properly apply God's Word, and I will correct any and all mistakes as they are discovered.

My work will be on printed letter forms, and you are invited to make any reply that you may deem prudent. My first copy has not been prepared to date. Yours in Christ, Fred W. Fenton. (April 26, 1949.)

Dear Brother Fenton: It is with deep appreciation I learn of your expectation to test those things which we feel are of deepest importance to the growth of the restoration movement now in progress.

I shall be happy to have you consider anything which I have advocated, or shall advocate, and I stand ever ready to read what you shall write in love, and to give it prayerful study. Under no circumstances can we afford to have any "infallible" interpreters of the Holy Writ whose word must be accepted without question. To sink into such a condition would be to undo the very thing which as a people we have ever striven for—the right and freedom for each of God's priesthood of believers to search the divine revelation for himself.

Although I have made available to you the entire mailing list of the MISSION MESSENGER, and thus most of the readers will receive your reviews, such a mailing list changes continually. I hereby tender you the facilities of the paper, and will

print anything you offer on these questions without alteration or abridgement, thus guaranteeing that all will receive complete information. This will save you both expense and time. You may be sure that we shall reply in the spirit of meekness if we feel that a reply is in order. Yours for the Master, *W. Carl Ketcherside*. (May 3, 1949.)

The foregoing exchange speaks for itself. It is a good sign when brethren who differ on their concepts of the Word will exchange ideas to the mutual benefit of each other and the church. I am not unaware that many are worried, concerned and troubled because of the fact that we have dared to batter against traditional positions in the church. Sometimes, as in the case of the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, much rubbish accumulates which has to be cleared away before constructive work can begin. Too many mistake the rubbish for the foundations!

Brethren ought not to supinely accept anything *merely because* an editor believes it or sets it forth. Brother Fenton is right in stating that everything must be proven, and that by every individual in the church. We are engaged in the restoration of a restoration, which was stopped, and is only now beginning to gain momentum. I want what I believe put to the test. I want the truth, and truth cannot be gained by suppressing any views or all views. Open and above-board discussion will not harm the church. It will help it, and that a great deal. Of course, those who have never made mistakes, who know all that there is to know and who can never be changed, will not profit by honest discussion. They will pull out the old stock chestnut, "That's not the way we've always heard it" and will then close their ears against anything else, or perhaps divide the church and claim that honest seekers after the truth are creating apostasy. This is a sign of little-mindedness. We hope our readers will be big enough to weigh carefully everything that is said, and remember that God's Word is our only guide and not the interpretation of that Word by *W. Carl Ketcherside*! Where that interpretation varies from the Word, you stay with the Word!

We have now arrived at the most critical part of this steadily growing movement to

get back to Jerusalem—all the way back! It is when men find themselves differing and begin to examine those difference that grave danger of division and schism arises. Sometimes brethren cannot differ in love. Often they lose patience with each other, because they cannot see alike. But it is my opinion that we have learned how to be brethren in Christ, and that mutual respect for each other and love for God will let us examine critically everything that others say and still maintain unity and brotherly affection.

Since the exchange of letters above, our

Brother Fenton has written that he fears he would use more space in the paper than is justifiable, so he will place his articles in your hands in the form of letters to the brethren under the heading of "Radiant Truth." He does not feel that he should use the mailing list we gave him, so we are asking that you write him personally for a copy of his reviews. He may be addressed at 7523 West 63rd Street Terrace, Merriam, Kansas. We will always welcome a review of anything we set forth, and if we reply it will be in a spirit of courtesy and brotherly kindness.

THE BRITISH SCENE

By GEOFFREY LODGE

I write to make plain something which Brother C. E. McGaughey has, either willfully, or by culpable lack of clarity, allowed many American brethren to misunderstand concerning the practice of the faith over here.

However I would first make it clear that I have no axe no grind, that I enter into this matter in no sort of partisan spirit. We in Britain have no college question to worry about, that problem is wholly an American problem and I do not take sides on the issue. Thus these words are not to be construed as the pratings of an anti-college fanatic, nor are they the eulogies of one infatuated by Brother Ketcherside, for I have rebuked him and still do so for what I believe to be unscriptural views of carnal warfare in relation to the saint. Let truth alone be served.

Knowing that Brother McGaughey is, to all intents and purposes, what we over here call a parson—a located minister to you, his pronouncement regarding a certain British congregation gives the impression of their having secured such an one for themselves. This is not so. The brother whom they decided to support will spend his time with weak causes and in starting new ones, rarely serving the congregation which supports him at all. An elder of that church assures me that this is so, and means to take the matter up with Brother McGaughey.

Concerning our "handicap" of mutual ministry, I will agree that we have been guilty of abusing this great scriptural institution. But on the other hand let us remember that the apostles were mostly "unlearned and unlettered men." Personally, I believe I have at least as good an education as any American college could offer; yet I declare in all sincerity that I would not have been any more readily convinced of my need of Jesus as Savior if all those I saw and heard on church of Christ platforms had been eloquent orators.

Indeed I should probably have been less readily convinced. As for those less burdened with intellectual fads and fancies

(among whom the gospel seems to have a freer course) they would assuredly prefer to trust a plain man. Sincerity and dignity are the things to impress a visitor and these can be learned from any worthy elder brother in the church. Our brethren of 100 years ago were simple men—men of one Book—and therein lay their power to bring down the most formidable of foes. Let us never forget that "The word of God is quick, and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." The unencumbered Word has the power to strike home and needs no bolstering aid of hand gestures, deportment, voice production, intonation, etc. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of truth." This can be done full well in any odd corner of the globe. America is *not* the fountain head of all good things; please get rid of the dollar complex.

The arrogance of the statement regarding the keeping of the Lord's Supper here in Britain (he predicted that in a few years they would do better, and that so far they had only been keeping house for the Lord) is quite inexcusable. There is not one vestige of evidence that the loyal brethren here will soon forsake the New Testament pattern now followed out in our breaking of bread meetings, where the Lord is remembered in the symbols, and the disciples are exhorted to holy living as in Acts 20: 7. We feel that to make the Lord's Supper an appendage of yet another gospel meeting is to miss something precious. The brethren are not receiving their full diet of spiritual food. This may in a measure explain for me the reason for congregations of several hundreds depending on one man for its preaching—the brethren must be spiritually weak. In my humble opinion a church of two hundred should begin to think of separating to start a new Cause, lest the brethren become lethargic. Remember the Lord scattered the

MISSION MESSENGER

Published monthly in St. Louis, Mo. Subscription Rate \$1.00 per Year. Entered as second-class matter December 28, 1948, at the post-office at St. Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879 (as amended by the Act of June 11, 1934).

W. Carl Ketcherside
Editor and Publisher

Publication Office
7505 Trenton Avenue
St. Louis 14, Missouri

Dedicated to the task of arousing churches in this state and elsewhere to a greater zeal in mission work, and assist in developing the talents of all to be used to the glory of God.

church at Jerusalem by persecution (Acts 8: 1). Dear America, *you* can and must "do better" for the love of the Lord.

As to open communion ("Neither invite nor "debar" if you prefer that weakling phrase), how can one remember in that special sense, a Lord to whom he is not attached? The idea is preposterous even if it were not patently unscriptural. Without faith no man can please God, and the first act of faith is repentance, then confession of Jesus as Lord, then baptism in His name, and only then come the privileges of membership. Only an unfaithful and unjust steward will dare to alter this divine plan of things. As to the practicability of "close communion" I am well aware that our assemblies here are generally of smaller numbers than in America; but if a brother or sister can sit down in his home chapel without knowing whether or no his neighbor is a member of his own congregation (however large), or alternately without caring to ask after his soul's salvation, then Britain has yet more to export to you. "By this shall all men know that ye are Christ's disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John 13: 35). A man cannot learn to love his brethren till he knows them.

Finally brethren, I know the Cause over here fairly well and can assure you that the account which Bro. Ketcherside gave of us in the M. M. was a fair and just account of what he saw here. Furthermore, I can assure you of no change, known to me, in our practices. Above all, I would exhort you most earnestly that, even should we fall headlong into apostasy, you will still hold to the faith as it was once for all delivered to the saints.

(Editor's note: Regardless of your position on the points at issue as covered by this article and previous ones, I wish to say that it must be admitted by all that our brother is right on the subject of churches becoming so large that all family feeling is lost. A church of 200 members should certainly divide scripturally so that all would have a chance to edify and thus be edified.)

TURNER REPORTS

I spent the week of April 17 at Brookfield (Mo.) in a five nights study on church government. Preached there April 24, with 28 present at both services. There are 13 members there meeting in a hall, 121 East Brook Street, who are determined to follow the New Testament teaching on church government. Faithful brethren passing through should stop off and worship with them. Your presence will be appreciated.—C. R. Turner.

Your cooperation is solicited in making this a larger paper. Will you please ask other members to subscribe? You can aid by sending gift subscriptions to your friends!

Views of the News . . . By ROBERT T. HARTMANN

The Sign of San Marino

The death of Kathy Fiscus, the little girl who fell into an abandoned Southern California well, is too well-known and too painful to relate in detail.



The whole United States, and other nations as well, waited anxiously for two days and nights while hundreds of volunteers sank a rescue shaft 94 feet into the earth in a determined attempt to rescue the child alive.

There were prayers said during those 49 hours of heroic toil, literally millions of earnest prayers that Kathy's life might be spared. Because the last supreme effort was made on "Palm Sunday" the hope was frequently expressed that a "miracle" would be vouchsafed in response to this vast, uncommon and undoubtedly heartfelt outpouring of petition.

The people were looking for a sign, like the Pharisees of old. But the prayers of many were stilled as they brought the little girl's body forth, and the world knew at last that her spirit had returned to God

who gave it. Only the strong in faith could say in that moment, "Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine be done."

Yet there was a sure sign given. It was not the sign people were looking for; there was nothing supernatural about it. But seldom has this writer seen a more convincing demonstration of what human beings can accomplish when they forget about themselves. The weary volunteers who burrowed through shifting quicksand with the single thought of saving a little girl they had never seen, risking death without a suggestion of reward, preached the gospel of Jesus Christ more eloquently than it is preached from many a pulpit. For Jesus taught this self-same truth, and in fact made it the first condition of discipleship. "Whosoever will come after me," he said, "let him deny himself, and take up His cross, and follow me."

Whenever and wherever men deny themselves, whether they be Christians or not, they are as close to the Kingdom as the scribe who came to question and stayed to praise the Master. By the same token, whenever and wherever men assert themselves, they deny Christ before the world, and if they count themselves faithful, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

ARE YOU GUILTY?

By JOHN H. PATRICK

Thousands in the world today are crucifying Jesus afresh! As he was nailed to the tree on Calvary's Hill, he is now being put



to death upon a cross of human lust. In spite of all that Christ had done for the murderous ones of his generation, they were willing to bring his good life to an end with the worst death imaginable. A few days before all had seemed full of hope. Jesus had been hailed as king. The people had

carried branches to bestrew his triumphant entry. They had cried "Hosanna!" Now hope was gone! There is still a crowd, but not of friends. Swords and staves have taken the place of palm branches. The cry is "Crucify" and not "Hosanna!"

The issues which met at Calvary are not merely the ones of a distant past. Those same issues still divide civilization. Just as men were forced to make a decision of ap-

proval or disapproval of the act of crucifixion then, so they are still confronted with that awful choice. In Hebrews 6: 6, Paul says, "Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Pilate could find no fault in Jesus. He had no accusation against his life or teaching. But Pilate was a moral coward and gave sentence that it might be "as they required." There are modern Pilates who find no fault with the lowly Nazarene, but give in to the desires of the mob about them.

The world cries that there is nothing to Christianity. They denounce it as silly and old-fashioned. They tell us to have a good time while we are young, for you only live but once! And heedless and helpless, the few follow the many because they dare not stand for conviction. Most persons today are seeking to get rid of Jesus by altering his gospel so that they can screen themselves from its piercing truths.

Will you crucify your Savior
When for you He bore such loss?
Will you put to shame your Savior
Will you nail Him to the cross?
Are temptations so alluring?
Do earth's pleasures so enthrall
That you cannot love your Savior
Well enough to leave them all?

What Does That Mean? . . . by E. M. ZERR

1 Corinthians 1: 17

The first clause of this verse is the part to be considered chiefly in this article. It has become the practice of some to belittle the importance of baptism because of what Paul says here. They make capital out of the distinction between "to baptize" and "to preach the gospel." These perverters of God's Word even go so far as to accuse the apostle of belittling the ordinance because he thanked God for having baptized

only a few people. They ignore the fact that he did baptize some of the ones who came under the influence of his preaching. They also ignore his teaching elsewhere that shows he regarded baptism as an essential condition for the pardon of sins. (See Rom. 6: 3, 4; Gal. 3: 27; Col. 2: 12.) The apostle would not have written these passages had he regarded baptism an unimportant ordinance.

The reason he was glad he had not done very much of the baptizing was the wrong conclusion some might form as to his motive. Baptizing a few penitents showed that he was favorable toward the act, but that amount of exercising in it would not look as if it was the main object he had in engaging in the work. Besides, Paul was an apostle and a very busy man. No one but an inspired man could do the work he was doing in new fields. He could deliver the truth to sinners and if they were brought to repentance they could be baptized by others and let him go on with his inspired preaching. There is nothing in the New Testament that says who or who may not perform the physical act of baptism. Any restrictions that are made on that subject are purely human. The state of mind in the candidate is the only thing that affects the scripturalness of any given case. The character of the baptizer has no more to do with the validity of one's baptism, than the nationality of a midwife has to do with the blood of the infant she is delivering. This will be admitted by all real students.



Better than Rubies By NELL MAYNARD

"And . . . They Watched Him There"

If I were asked to cite the scripture which describes the most heartless scene in the Bible, I would give Matthew 27: 36. To even faintly realize the utter brutality, ignorance and indifference which this verse conveys, one must know something about the excruciating agony of crucifixion. It is thought the Jews borrowed this type of punishment from the Romans. It is the most horrible form of death conceived by

man. As it was used for the vilest criminals, the very act was a humiliation and a shame. The clothes were stripped from the body which was then stretched on the cross, the arms along the cross-beams, secured by nails through the hands. The feet were sometimes crossed and nailed, and when the cross was

planted in the ground, the feet could almost, but not quite touch the earth. To die in this fashion was to endure all ghastly pains in the catalogue of human agony—thirst, starvation, cramps, fever, sleeplessness and festering wounds, which somehow, ironically, did not bring about relief by unconsciousness. Many times the body hung on the tree for as long as three days before death came. That is why the Jews adopted the method of fracturing the legs to hasten the merciful end. In most cases the body was left to rot on the cross or to be eaten by birds and beasts.

Thus you can see why the passage selected tells a most horrible story in seven words: "And sitting down they watched him there."

Our very hearts cry out in protest. "I would not have slain him!" But is that true? Paul, in his day, warned of crucifying the same Savior afresh. How can we do that today? Just as they did at Calvary, by ignorance and indifference.

Many of us are not really bad; we are just not good enough. We are not awakened to individual Christian responsibility! Let us study that we may arouse to the needs about us. Let us not be like the mob on the Judean hill, of whom it was said: *and sitting down they watched him there!*

IN OR INTO

By W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

Our attention has been called to the fact that a great many brethren in administering the ordinance of baptism, use the words, "I baptize you *in the name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." This is undoubtedly because of the translation in the Authorized Version, and it is as misleading as the term used in that version to express the idea which the Spirit intended to convey in Matthew 28: 19. The Greek word translated "in" is *eis*, and beyond any quibble should have been rendered by our word "into." Now this may seem relatively unimportant to a lot of our readers, and there may be those who sneeringly ask, "What's the difference?" To this we reply it is the difference between teaching truth and error. As to its importance, Alexander Campbell declared, "I scarcely know any criticism upon a single syllable, of so much importance, in all the range of my conceptions, as this one."

To do a thing "in the name of" a person means to do it "by his authority." But nothing in the Bible is commanded to be done by the authority of God, Christ and the Spirit. The Holy Spirit has no governing authority. It is neither king or ruler. In the previous dispensation, the Father was in authority. In the Christian dispensation, he has delegated all power unto Jesus. In connection with the same commission we are reviewing, Jesus said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." In view of that, he authorized them to "Go ye, therefore, into all the world." The word "therefore" means "in view of the fact that I have all authority." The fact that he had been accorded all power on earth, enabled him to send the apostles into all the world.

They were commissioned to make disciples of all nations, and to baptize those who were taught "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." "Into the name of" signifies the object of the baptism, and not the authority by which it was administered. It signifies the state or relationship which we enter upon our immersion as penitent believers. We are baptized *into* the name of the Father, and thus become his children; we are immersed *into* the name of the Son, and obtain forgiveness from him as our Savior; we are immersed *into* the name of the Holy Spirit, and thus are made partakers of the Spirit which is given unto us.

But all of this is done *in the name of*



Christ. Any act we are called upon to obey in the Christian economy is in his name. So when Peter commanded the first Gentile converts to be baptized it was in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 10: 48). On the day of Pentecost when the Jews were pricked in heart and asked the momentous question, the answer to them was to "Repent and be baptized every one of you *in the name* of Jesus Christ." In neither case is the word in the Greek the word "*eis*" which we have found in Matthew 28: 19, 20.

Let us remember then that we immerse people *into* the name of the Father, and of

the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and that this act is *in* the name of the Lord Jesus. The latter shows the authority by which the act is committed, and the former the object of that act. Words are given to us as a means of conveying thoughts. Unless we employ the right terms we convey no thought, or an incorrect one, and the hearer gains no knowledge. I have never been able to understand why the King James translators gave us the word "*in*" in Matthew 28: 19. We should seek to study in order to obtain a pure scriptural language, and "hold fast the form of sound words."

associates. He must not be hypocritical. In these days of rapid transportation one may live a long distance from the meeting place. It would be wise in every case then to tactfully and judiciously check with "them that are without." Unless one has a good report of all he may fall into reproach and the devil's snare."

TWELVE PAGES?

Do you want 12 pages in the next issue? If so, just sit down right now and mail in a dollar gift subscription for a friend or brother. If enough of you do this you'll be assured of a larger paper next time. Why not do it now? If every reader of this journal sent us one new subscription for a friend now, we would go to twelve pages all of the time. That's all it will take!

FROM RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

Bro. Lloyd Riggins has been with us here in Riverside for some time, and without opposition from any. We welcome him as a great worker and much good has been done here. As he goes to other places to help with the Lord's work, our prayers go with him, for he is worthy of our help. We are looking forward to meeting Brother Winstanley from across the ocean.—C. B. Hysom.

HELP CHEER THEM

If you know of anyone who is ill, or hospitalized for any cause, we will appreciate having the name and address of such person. Send it to Mae Klein, 1629 Delaware, St. Louis, Missouri. A unique booklet called "Bits of Cheer" will be mailed with a special letter to bring comfort and hope to the sick one. The name of the person will also be remembered before God's throne of grace in one of our public meetings. Please send all the names of those who would appreciate this booklet!

OUR NEXT ISSUE

The July number of the MISSION MESSENGER will contain some of the best reading matter we have ever printed. Featured will be "An Inspiring Example," by Roy Loney; a short article, "If Jesus Were Here," by Henry Boren; a forum on marriage by elders of some of the churches; "The Clerical Spirit," which will be an analysis of modern conditions by the editor, plus the regular columnists. If we can go to twelve pages we propose to publish a full review of "Radiant Truth," by Brother Fred Fenton, and it will no doubt contain some of our most important material in the current restoration movement. The paper will be one for study and not mere casual reading; for learning and not entertainment. If you know of those who should receive a free copy of the June issue, send their names at once. Better yet, subscribe for your friends! Don't let your own subscription expire.

Withdraw Yourself

By W. G. ROBERTS

The apostle Paul says, "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly" (2 Thess. 3: 6).



I am not writing this to show that Paul meant what he said, but to show that some apparently do not know what he said. They try to make it appear that Paul was not commanding the church to withdraw from disorderly

members, but that a *person* should withdraw *themselves*. Note that this is a command for the CHURCH to do the withdrawing. I command *you*! Who? Paul said "brethren" and I believe that word is plural. He also gave this command in the name of the Lord Jesus, which means, by his authority. Thus the Lord issued the decree to Paul to command the brethren (church) to withdraw from every brother who walked disorderly.

"Brother" is in the singular number, while "brethren" is plural. The plural was given the command to withdraw from the singular. Now let someone who says Paul was commanding the *singular* to withdraw from the *plural*, tell me how he can convert the plural (the church) into the singular (the individual who wishes to "step down and out") and I will be forced to admit the inspired apostle should have had some of our recent interpreters to have shown him (poor Paul!) how ignorant he was. Surely the apostle must have become sadly mixed up in his grammar, if our latest apologists are correct. However, the Lord told this to Paul, so it was really our Lord who made the awful mistake, if some of our modern day preachers are right.

Paul says "YE" are to withdraw from every brother that is disorderly. That "ye" addressed by Paul was the church to which he was writing. The *brethren* were to withdraw themselves from the *brother*, and not

vice versa. The same idea is in 1 Corinthians 5:13, where Paul tells the church to "put away from among you that wicked person." The individual was to be put away from the church. I know some pretend these passages do not teach the same thing, and they claim the Greek does not so teach it, but that is not true, for the Greek teaches the same thing as the King James Version. In 1 Corinthians 5: 13, the Greek word is *exairo*, which means "to lift up or take away out of a place, to remove"; while "withdraw" in 2 Thessalonians 3: 6, is from the word *stellomai*, and means "to abstain from familiar intercourse with one." In each instance the church is charged with carrying out the action, not an individual.

Brother Ketcherside explains this in his book, *A Clean Church*, but does not give the two Greek words, which I supply here to keep some from being deceived, who may have been told the action is not the same. Those who wish to dodge disciplinary action always try to fix scriptures to favor their actions and positions. But they cannot change the reading, person or number, in God's Word. Let us stand by the Old Book and not be led astray by those who rebel against God's authority.

Scriptural Bishops

By F. WILFORD LANDES

"Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." The



term "without" designates the unbelievers or unconverted. "Good report" indicates that the elder must make a good impression upon the non-Christians of the community, influencing them to respect the church by his good example. If his past life was degraded, he must have lived in Christ a sufficient length of time to overshadow the old, and make the new to shine. His character must be honorable in the eyes of all his

THIS and THAT from HERE and THERE

W. Carl Ketcherside and Hershel Ottwell assisted the church in Unionville (Mo.) the first part of May, with the latter returning on May 15 for two weeks of service and instruction. A great future seems to lie ahead for the faithful there, and we rejoice with them. . . . Borden Higginbotham, who has just completed his work at Shippensburg (Penn.) reports 2 restored in his meeting at Bloomfield (Ind.). . . . J. M. Lamb reports a good work with James Truitt at Mount View, Iberia (Mo.) closing April 24. Brother and Sister Lamb celebrated their golden wedding anniversary during the meeting with about 100 in attendance for the event. . . . It's a girl, Glenda Karleen, who has arrived to bless the home of Chad and Ruby Freeman, Kansas City (Mo.). . . . The young people in St. Louis sang for an Old Folks' Home on May 6, and for the ill and crippled soldiers at Veterans' Hospital, on May 20. . . . Don't forget the all day meeting at Bonne Terre (Mo.) on June 12. . . . R. A. Slone, Eldon (Mo.) says the MISSION MESSENGER is far the best paper he has ever read. . . . J. A. Freed, Topeka (Kansas) commends the Christian spirit shown in this paper in contrast to others which he receives. . . . F. A. Hall, Lovell (Okla.) reports 7 added by primary obedience under the preaching of R. O. Webb. This was at Fairview Church. Bro. Webb immersed 8 just prior to that meeting at Hennessy (Okla.) according to Bro. Hall, who also tells that the church at Fairview was encouraged by attendance of George Phillips and family, of Muskogee, who brought three Oklahoma A. and M. students one Lord's Day. . . . Howard McCann, Granite City (Ill.) reports four added to the fellowship at that place during the meeting held by William Hensley. . . . W. Carl Ketcherside spoke at Ellington (Mo.) on May 7, 8. . . . The church at Mexico (Mo.) is getting ready to start erecting their meeting house, and, folks, they need our help. . . . Arthur Freeman reports the establishment of a new congregation at Painesville (Ohio) with seven members. . . . Louisa Thompson, Goodwater (Mo.) tells us that Herbert Estep spoke there on May 8. . . . Carter Honn, Sullivan (Ill.) thinks the May issue the best one ever. . . . D. E. Springer, Wheeling (Mo.) says the paper is getting better all of the time. . . . Hershel Ottwell held a meeting with the new congregation at Springfield (Mo.) during this month. . . . L. C. Roberts labored with the church at Nixa during the same period. . . . Robert Brumback closed at St. Joseph on May 8, and started at Kirksville (Mo.) on the night of May 9. He began at Bonne Terre (Mo.) on May 22. . . . Roy Harris was enjoying a

good season of labor at Bolivar (Penn.) according to our last report. . . . Ellis Crum, Jr., is to work in California six months starting next December. . . . Wilford Landes announces the attendance in Vacation Bible Study at Lyons (Ind.) greatly in excess of last year. . . . Roy Loney, East Sixth Street, Las Animas (Colorado), has mimeographed lessons on the life of Christ, suitable for any type of study. More than 50 lessons, and you can secure a set from him for 25c. . . . Attendance at Compton (Calif.) on May 8, was 106 according to Robert Sankey. . . . W. G. Roberts preached twice at Decatur (Ill.), on May 8. His health is gaining continually, for which let us praise our God. . . . James Brown, Belfast (Ireland), says of the book, *A Clean Church*: "It has helped me immensely and given me a deeper insight into the ideals of the church." . . . Send a dollar to *Western States News*, Box 530, Klamath Falls (Ore.), for a year of real good reading. . . . Thanks to brethren at Chesapeake (W. Va.) for aid in our publication work, forwarded through J. F. Bosher. . . . Mrs. Russell Potter, Chillicothe (Mo.), says they enjoy the paper and wish it could remain at 12 pages. So do we! . . . L. C. Roberts was at Nixa (Mo.) for two weeks and gave all but 3 of the lessons on church government as suggested by Henry Boren. Bro. Roberts now has the oversight of the Nixa work. . . . Through the kindness of Richard H. Van Egdorn, Rippey (Iowa), a number of brethren overseas will receive copies of *A Clean Church*. . . . Marvin Mayden reports 1 immersed by Raymond Stevens at Wakenda (Mo.) on May 8. Thomas Dennis was scheduled to be with the Wakenda church on June 5. . . . E. N. Hope reports the need of assistance in paying for their building materials at Perris (Calif.) where he declares the prospects are good, with the assistance of Bro. Riggins in that work. Can't you aid this little congregation with a check to encourage them? Address gifts to E. N. Hope, Box 901, Perris, California. . . . We salute Karen Ann, new daughter of the Ray Turners at Decatur, Illinois. . . . And let's not forget that Winford Lee and wife are now happy parents also. . . . Will our brethren overseas write for copies of the book *A Clean Church*? These will be sent abroad without obligation to the ones desirous of studying them in connection with the Bible. . . . We rejoice in the report of Sidney Harbottle, from Leicester (England), that a number of young people now attend their meetings. . . . Winford Lee assisted Holli-day church near Green City (Mo.) for a few days, and began a Vacation Bible Study at Hepburn (Iowa) May 30. He starts in Des Moines (Iowa) on June 12. . . . Wilbur

Storm conducts a study at Farmington (N. Mex.) in June. . . . The attendance at the Bible Study in New Castle (Ind.) taught by E. M. Zerr is the highest in history, a total 579 attending the first ten nights. . . . William Hensley closed his meeting at Fairbury (Neb.) on May 15. . . . L. C. Roberts will assist in Vacation Study at Springfield (Mo.) . . . Bro. Roberts and John Patrick will also aid in a study at Red Cloud (Neb.) . . . Thanks to Trueman Sterner, Franklin (Neb.), for his great aid in our work. . . . W. Carl Ketcherside will speak at the all-day meeting at Warrensburg (Mo.) on June 5. . . . W. E. Ballenger, while quite nervous, is still able to attend public meetings of the church at Hale (Mo.) . . . Borden Higginbotham reports 2 restored in his work at Shippensburg (Penn.) on May 15. . . . Fred Killebrew and Milton Garner spoke at Cana-lou (Mo.) May 15, where one was restored. Bro. Higginbotham will labor with the church there a little later on. . . . Baptizing services are reported at West Riverside (Calif.) on May 15. . . . A great crowd was present for initial services in the new meeting house at Reedley (Calif.), Bernell Weems and Lloyd Riggins being principal speakers. The house is a monument to faith and hard work on the part of the little congregation. . . . Noah Smith, Sullivan (Ill.) sends his commendation of the article "Love the Brotherhood." Says it is the best ever. Thanks! . . . Lon Hasty, Oakland (Calif.), sends his greetings and a request for Albert Winstanley to visit them. . . . Hershel Ottwell reports a good work at Unionville (Mo.) where he began May 15. . . . The church at Section (Kansas) reports through Bro. Brumback restoration of fellowship with Bro. Roy Loney who satisfied the requirements of the brethren. We rejoice! . . . Our sister, Bessie McClaffin, suggests we discontinue use of the inelegant term "belly-aching." Our apologies, Bessie. You're right and we'll stop it. . . . On June 18, the church at 2907 Dean Avenue, Des Moines (Iowa) is sponsoring a get-together meeting for young people from far and near. The next day is the annual all-day meeting at 59th and University Church, in Des Moines, and the afternoon meeting will be devoted to work by the youth of the churches present. You are invited, young and old. Be sure and notify Mary Alice Suddeth, 3646 Vandalia Road, of the number in your group, so accommodations can be arranged. . . . Roy Harris began a Vacation Study at Bloomfield (Ind.) May 23. . . . The church at Festus held an all-day meeting, May 29, with Fred Killebrew preaching. . . . Robert Brumback started at Bonne Terre (Mo.) May 23. . . . Virgil Stevens spoke at Fredericktown (Mo.) May 29.