

A
SERIES
ON THE THEME

“Let us Reason Together”

ISAIAH 1 : 18

ARRANGED BY

BILL HUGGINS

Published by
World Literature Publications
Box 3815
New Delhi 110049

Printed by

Ravi Mahajan at

Print India, A38/2 Phase-I, Mayapuri

New Delhi-110064

INTRODUCTION

I first met Bro. Bill Huggins and his family several years ago while he lived and worked with the church of Christ in Natchez, Mississippi, U.S.A. I had other occasions to be associated with him when the family moved to a similar work with the church in Booneville, Mississippi, U.S.A., a congregation that I have known from the time When I first began to preach.

Bro. Huggins is a faithful gospel preacher and one who does a good work wherever he goes. Along with his pulpit preaching, he is also an excellent teacher. His work includes a daily radio programme and several meetings each year. He and his lovely wife and children are highly respected where they live and are a real asset to the cause of Christ.

In response to my personal request of him for help in the area of Christian literature, he has offered this Bible study booklet, and hopefully, this is just the beginning of materials that we can expect from him in the future. I certainly want to thank Bro. Huggins for his willingness to share these lessons with us and I am sure that they will be likewise appreciated by all who read and study them.

J. C. Choate
Church of Christ
Box 3815
New Delhi 110049
February 7, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Baptism, Let us Reason Together on,	1
Church, Let us Reason Together on the,.....	9
Eternal Life, Let us Reason Together on,	17
Faith, Let us Reason Together on,	20
Grace, Let us Reason Together on,	23
Kingdom, Let us Reason Together on the,.....	26
Name, Let us Reason Together on the,	30
Worship, Let us Reason Together on,.....	39

"LET US REASON TOGETHER ON BAPTISM"

I. Is Baptism A Declaration Of Past Salvation Or A Sign That One Has Already Been Saved?

1. Baptism cannot be an outward sign that salvation has already been given because the Bible says (a) Men are baptized into Christ, Rom. 6 : 3 ; Gal. 3 : 27, and (b) that salvation is in Christ, II Tim. 2 : 10. If salvation is in Christ and men are baptized into Christ, how can one have salvation BEFORE baptism ?

2. If baptism declares that salvation has already been given it would likewise declare that whatever is equivalent to being saved has taken place.

a. To be saved is the same as being reconciled to God in one body (the church), Eph. 2 : 12-16. Those who get into the one body are baptized into it, I Cor. 12 : 20. How, then, can baptism be the sign that one has already been reconciled to God or saved ?

b. To be saved is the same as being redeemed. But redemption is in Christ, Eph. 1 : 7. Those who get into Christ are baptized into Christ, Gal. 3 : 27. This being true, how can baptism

be the sign that one has already been redeemed or saved ?

3. Baptism cannot be a sign that salvation has already been given because in passages where salvation, or its equivalent, and baptism are mentioned together salvation (or its equivalent) always follows baptism. It never precedes baptism. Some examples :
 - a. Believeth - Baptized - saved. Mk. 16 : 16
 - b. Repent - Baptized - Remission of Sins. Acts 2:38
 - c. Believeth - Baptized - Rejoicing. Acts 8 : 38, 39
 - d. Arise - Baptized - Wash away sins. Acts 22 : 16
 - e. Baptism - Raised - Walk in newness of life. Rom. 6 : 4
4. Baptism cannot be a sign that salvation has already been given because no one can be saved before having been raised with Christ through faith in the operation of God who raised Christ from the dead. Col. 2 : 12. Such takes place only in baptism. Rom. 6 : 4.
5. If, as some claim, baptism is an outward sign of an inward grace, or salvation, then Saul of Tarsus was saved in his sins. Acts 22 : 16
6. If baptism shows one has already been saved, why did the apostle Peter write these words, "Baptism doth also NOW save us?" I Pet. 3 : 21. That baptism is not the only thing that saves, or that plays a part in one's salvation, is shown by the word "also".
7. Baptism cannot be a declaration of past salvation because true rejoicing follows salvation rather than preceding it. Acts 8 : 39 shows the Ethiopian Eunuch rejoicing *after* he was baptized. The conclusion drawn from this is that he was not saved prior to being

baptized. If so, why did he not rejoice *before* baptism?
The Bible does not say he did.

II. Is A Penitent Believer Saved Before And Without Baptism ?

1. Some so teach. But how can they explain the fact that each time baptism and salvation (or its equivalent) are mentioned in the same verse, salvation always follows, or comes after baptism ?

Example : I Pet. 3 : 21 "...the answer of a good conscience toward God," follows baptism. It does not precede it. Can one be saved without the answer of a good conscience toward God ?

Other cases : Mk. 16 : 16 ; Acts 2 : 38 ; 8 : 39, 22 : 16.

2. To say one is saved before and without submitting to water baptism is to say, in consequence, that one can be saved before and without being in Christ. Gal. 3 : 26, 27.
3. If one can be saved before and without being baptized in water, he can be saved before and without remission of sins. Acts 2 : 38.
4. If one can be saved before and without being baptized in water, he can be saved before and without being raised to a new life. Rom. 6 : 4.
5. Further, if one can be saved before and without baptism in water, he can be saved before and without the answer of a good conscience before God. I Pet. 3 : 21. Berkley translation renders this "without a clear conscience in God's presence."

6. If one can be saved before and without submitting to baptism, he can be saved separate and apart from the church of the Lord. Acts 2 : 41, 47. The saved were added to the church. But those who were added to the church were those who were baptized. Therefore, those who were baptized were saved.
7. If one is saved before and without baptism, he is saved before and without a glad reception of the word. Acts 2 : 41.

III. Is Sprinkling Or Pouring Baptism ?

1. Sprinkling nor pouring can be baptism for the simple reason that the words are three different words, each with a different meaning in the New Testament.
 - a. The word for baptize is baptizo. It means to dip, plunge, or submerge.
 - b. The word for sprinkle is "rhantismos".
 - c. The word for pour is "katacheo".
2. If sprinkling and pouring is baptism, then we ought to be able to substitute the word *sprinkle* or the word *pour* for the word *baptize* wherever it is used in the scriptures and no damage be done to the sense or meaning of the language. Can this be done? Let's see. Read Matt. 28 : 19 and Acts 8 : 36-38 and make the substitution.
 - a. You may "baptize" THEM, the object of the verb baptize.
 - b. Can you sprinkle or pour THEM? How? Only by grinding or melting THEM.

3. Sprinkling and pouring cannot be baptism for the simple reason that in baptism one is buried. Col. 2 : 12. Rom. 6 : 4.
4. Baptism is not sprinkling or pouring because much water is needed for baptism. John 3 : 23. Just a little water is needed for sprinkling and pouring.
5. In baptism there is a coming to water, a going down into the water, a burial in water, a resurrection from the water, and a coming up out of the water. Such is not true of sprinkling or pouring. Acts 8 : 36-38.
6. John the Baptist baptized in the Jordan River. Mk. 1 : 15. Two sensible adults would hardly get in a river for one to have the other sprinkle or pour water on him. Matt. 3 : 13, 16.
7. Sprinkling and pouring for baptism originated with man—not with God.

IV. Are Infants Proper Subjects For Baptism ?

1. Infants are not proper subjects for baptism because they cannot be taught the requirements of the gospel. Teaching is to precede baptism. Matt. 28 : 19.
2. Infants are not proper subjects for baptism because they cannot believe. Believing is to precede baptism. Acts 8 : 37; Mk. 16 : 16.
3. Infants are not proper subjects of baptism because they cannot repent. They cannot be taught, they cannot believe and they cannot repent. Repentance precedes baptism. Acts 2 : 38. Infants cannot repent because they have no sins of which to repent. They are not capable of committing sin.

4. Infants are not proper subjects of baptism because they cannot confess Christ to be God's own Son. Acts 8 : 36, 37
5. Infants are not proper subjects of baptism because they are not lost. Baptism is in order to be saved. Mk. 16 : 16 "He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED..." I Pet. 3 : 21 "The like figure where-unto baptism doth also NOW SAVE US."
6. Infants are not proper subjects for baptism because baptism is a command, and infants are not capable of understanding and obeying a command. Acts 10 : 48
7. Infants are not proper subjects of baptism because they cannot do *after* baptism what is required of one who has been baptized. Acts 2 : 41, 42; Rom. 6 : 4; Col. 3 : 12.

V. Have You Been Scripturally Baptized?

1. The question is not "have you been baptized, and if so, are you satisfied with it?" The question is whether you were baptized according to the holy scriptures. The answer can be learned from what the scriptures teach.
2. Your baptism was not scriptural if, when you were baptized, you were under the impression that you were already saved. Mark. 16 : 16. Salvation always followed baptism rather than preceding it.
3. Your baptism was not according to the holy scriptures if it was preceded by the wrong confession. The confessions solicited by most religious bodies would, of themselves, invalidate one's baptism who subscribe to them. For example : "Do you believe (the candidate

for church membership is asked) that God for Christ's sake has pardoned your sins?" To this question an affirmative answer is given. This is *before* baptism. Such confession immediately removes the baptism to be received from the area of the scriptural. There is no divine authority for such a confession. The Bible confession is the simple, but glorious proclamation that Christ is the Son of God. Acts 8 : 36, 37

4. Your baptism is not scriptural if it was for any purpose, or reason, other than that divinely intended. That purpose was not to make one a member of a church to which no reference is made in the Bible. It is not intended as an outward sign of an inward grace. It was "for the remission of sins. Acts 2 : 38
5. Your baptism was not scriptural if it put you into a church about which you cannot read in the Bible. It is usually a rule that no one can be a member of a church without submitting to whatever that church understands baptism to be. Since Bible baptism puts one only into the Lord's church, which is His body, I Cor. 12 : 20; Col. 1 : 18, if the church to which you belong, and into which you were baptized, can't be found in the Bible, your baptism is not Bible baptism.
6. Your baptism was not scriptural if it gave you, or bestowed on you, a religious name not applied to God's children in the Bible. One is usually called by the name of the church into which he is baptized. This is not the case when one is baptized into the church of Christ. Such were called "christians" Acts 11 : 26; 26 : 28. Are you known by some other name ?

7. Your baptism, to be scriptural, must precede your salvation, and be preceded by the right confession. It must also be for the reason divinely intended and put you into the church about which we read in the New Testament. Furthermore, it must have the right authority behind it. Mt. 28 : 18, 19. There is no teaching of our Lord in all of the New Testament that authorizes one to be baptized because he has already been saved, or in order to become a member of any denominational body.

“LET US REASON TOGETHER” ON THE CHURCH

- I. Can We Identify The Church Of The New Testament In The World Today ?
 1. We can if we determine :
 - a. Where it began. Isa. 2 : 1-4; Zech. 1 : 16; I Tim. 3 : 15; Luke 24 : 46-49.
 - b. When it began. Mark 9 : 1; Acts 1 : 8; 2 : 1-4.
 - c. Who built it. Matt. 16 : 18.
 2. We can if we can ascertain what people had to do to become members of it. Acts 2 : 37-41, 47.
 3. We can if we can learn what its organizational structure is. Col. 1 : 18; I Cor. 1 : 1, 2; Acts 20 : 17, 28; Phil. 1 : 1.
 4. We can if we can determine the day on which the church broke bread, or ate the Lord's supper, and the frequency of the supper. Acts 20 : 7; I Cor. 16 : 1; 10 : 16.
 5. We can if we can know what its members did in worship to God. Acts 2 : 42, 20:7; I Cor. 10 : 16; 14 : 15; Eph. 5 : 19; Col. 3 : 16; I Cor. 16 : 1, 2.
 6. We can if we can find out what the members were called. Acts 2 : 47; I Cor. 1 : 2; Rom. 16 : 16; Col.

1 : 18; I Tim. 3 : 15; Acts 11 : 26; 26 : 28; I Pet. 4 : 16.

7. We can if we know what its guide book or rule of faith and practice was. II Tim. 3 : 16, 17; Prov. 30 : 5, 6.

II. Does The Lord's Church Consist Of Different Denominations, Wearing Different Names, Teaching And Practicing Different Doctrines ?

1. If so, and Jesus knew it would be this way, he was a hypocrite in praying for all of his followers to be one. John 17 : 20, 21.
2. If so, the church Jesus promised to build, and did build, will fall. Matt. 16 : 18; Acts 2 : 47; Matt. 12 : 22-25.
3. If so, God's law of seeds bringing forth after their own kinds has been abolished, and we can no longer expect to reap what we sow. Gen. 1:11, 12; Luke 8:11; Gal. 6:7.
4. If so, God doesn't approve it. Different doctrines (teachings) result in different practices and, thus, a state of confusion. God is not the author of confusion, and he does not approve what he did not authorize. I Cor. 14:33.
5. If so, it makes no difference what we teach. I Tim. 1:13. If it makes no difference what we teach, it makes no difference what we believe. I John 4:1. If it makes no difference what we believe, there would be no false prophets or teachers and Jesus misinformed his disciples. Matt. 7:15-20.

6. If so, then why is religious division condemned in the scriptures ? Gal. 5:19, 20 ASV; I Cor. 1:10-16; I Cor. 3:19.
7. If so, it is a religious monstrosity (Distortion, deformity, or malformation). No ordinary body has more than one head, nor does a head have more than one body. Eph. 1:22, 23.

III. Is One Church As Good As Another.

1. Not unless one foundation is as good as another. Jesus promised to build his church on the foundation of truth, (And the church either stands or falls on this) that He is the Christ, the Son of the Living God. Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11.
2. Not unless one plan of salvation is as good as another. The New Testament tells us what plan was followed by those who were saved. Acts 2:37-41. The saved were added to the church. Acts 2:47.
3. Not unless those churches started by men are as good as the one started by Christ. Psalms 127:1; Matt. 15:13; 16:18.
4. Not unless being among the lost is as good as being among the saved. Eph. 5:25. The body of which Christ is Saviour is the church. Eph. 1:22, 23.
5. Not unless one husband or head is as good as another. Eph. 5:23-28.
6. Not unless one price is as good as another. Acts. 20:28.
7. Not unless one way is as good as another. Acts 9:1, 2, 4; John 14:1-6; Acts 8:3; Matt. 7:13, 14.

IV. Does It Matter To What Church One Belongs ?

1. It does if the one mentioned in the Bible is not the same as those NOT mentioned there. But is the one we read about in the Bible the same as the ones not in the Bible ? If not, then it does matter to what church a person belongs. Is the church to which you belong mentioned in the Bible ? Where ?
2. It doesn't if the ones NOT purchased by the blood of Jesus is as acceptable to God as the one that was purchased by His blood. Jesus purchased HIS church with HIS blood. Acts 20:28. This church is mentioned in the Bible. But every church in existence today is not mentioned in the Bible, nor identified in the Bible. Therefore, every church was not purchased with the blood of Christ.
3. It doesn't if God is as pleased with human designations as He is with divine or Biblical designations. Acts 2:47; Rom. 16:16; I Cor. 1:2; I Tim. 3:15. Other religious bodies, called churches, do not wear, and are not known by these designations.
4. It surely does if it matters whether one is a child of God or a child of the Devil. The church mentioned in the Bible is called "the house (family) of God..." I Tim. 3:15. All of God's children are in His house or family. How, therefore, could one in a church not mentioned in the Bible be a child of God ?
5. It does if it matters to whose religious authority one submits himself. Matt. 28:19; Eph. 1:22, 23; Col. 1:18. Jesus has All authority as Head of His church. This Bible position is rejected by men of denominational bodies. Those who are members of them are expected

to submit to the religious authority exercised by their own leader or leaders.

6. It does if it matters whether one's name is recorded in Heaven. Heb. 12:23; Rev. 20:15. "The church of the first born" is the same church of which Christ is Head and the one called by His name, "the church of Christ." Do references in the Bible mentioning this church refer to those churches not mentioned or identified in the Bible? Of course not. How, then, could one who is a member of a church not mentioned in the Bible have his name recorded in Heaven or in the Lamb's Book of Life?

7. It doesn't matter if what matters with God and Christ doesn't matter. If what matters with them doesn't matter with you, what difference would it really make whether you were a member of any church, even the one Christ built? It surely matters with God and Christ if you are a member of THAT church, since it cost Christ HIS blood, and since it is the one to which He adds the saved. Acts 20:28; 2:47. If not, why would Jesus have paid His blood for it?

V. Is The Church Important?

1. If not, then the foundation upon which it stands is not important. Matt. 16:13-19; I Cor. 3:11.
2. If not, then that which it supports is not important. I Tim. 3:15.
3. If not, then its mission is not important. Matt. 28:19, 20; Eph. 3:10; Gal. 6:10.
4. If not, then the price paid for the church is not important. Acts 20:28.

5. If not, then why did Christ love it and give Himself for it ? Eph. 5:25.
6. If not, then why did Paul care for the local congregations ? I Cor. 11:28.
7. If not, then why is Jesus coming back for it ? I Cor. 15:23, 24.

VI. Can One Be Saved, Or Be A Christian, Without Being A Member Of The Lord's Church ?

1. If so, he can be saved, or be a christian, without any relationship to Christ. Christ is the Head of the body which is the church. Col. 1:18, 24.
2. If so, he can be saved, or be a christian, without having his sins forgiven. The reason is this : The same means by which the church was purchased is the same means by which sins are forgiven. Acts 20:28; Matt. 26:28.
3. If so, he can be saved, or be a christian without being saved. This may sound ridiculous, but it is the consequence of the idea that one can be saved outside the Lord's church. The same process by which one is saved is the same process by which he is added to the church. Acts 2:37-47.
4. If so, he can be saved or be a christian outside of that which the church is. The church is God's house or family. I Tim. 3:15. It is God's kingdom. Col. 1:13. It is Christ's body. I Cor. 12:12, 27.
5. If so, he can be saved without having his name in the Book of Life. Rev. 20:15; Heb. 12:23.
6. If so, he can be saved, or be a christian, not only outside of what the church is, but he can be saved, or be

- a christian, without what is in the church. Eph. 1:3-7; Eph. 1:22, 23; Eph. 2:16; II Cor. 5:17.
7. If so, he can be saved, or be a christian, without obeying the gospel of Christ. Rom. 1:16; I Pet. 4:16-18; II Thes. 1:7-9.

VII. Did Alexander Campbell Start The church Of Christ ?

1. No, because Jesus said He would build His church. Matt. 16:18. Was he who said, "I will build my church" really Alexander Campbell alias Jesus Christ ?
2. The church of Christ had its origin on the first Pentecost Day after our Lord's Resurrection, A.D. 33. Matt. 16:18; Acts 2:47. Was Alexander Campbell living then ? If not, how could he had have anything to do with starting the church of Christ ?
3. If ANY man started the church of Christ, that SAME man started whatever one has to do to become a member of the church of Christ. To become a member of the church of Christ, one is required to believe in Christ, repent of all past sins, confess faith in Jesus as God's Son, and be baptized for the remission of sins. Did all these things originate with Alexander Campbell ?
4. If Mr. Campbell started the church of Christ, he also started that which constitutes her worship. We cannot separate the worship of a church from that church. The worship of the church of Christ consist of (1) Singing God's praises (2) Praying to God (3) Teaching or preaching the word of God (4) Eating the Lord's

Supper (5) and giving as we have been prospered. Did all these originate with Mr. Campbell ?

5. Mr. Campbell didn't start the church of Christ unless he started that which perpetuates the church. Luke 8 : 4-15; I Pet. 1:22, 23; Jas. 1 :18. One may as well reason (1) That the church originated with Paul, I Cor. 3:68. (2) That the first farmer to plant cotton in the State of Mississippi originated cotton.
6. If Campbell started the church of Christ, then it is human in origin just like all others started by men. Psa. 127:1; Matt. 13:15.
7. If Campbell started the church of Christ, which one did Jesus start ?

“LET US REASON TOGETHER” ON ETERNAL LIFE

I. Is Eternal Life Conditional ?

1. It is promised to those who believe in Christ. John 3:16; 6:40.
2. It is conditioned on coming to Christ. John 5:40. But why would one come to Christ on whom he does not believe ?
3. It is something on which one must “lay hold” by fighting the good fight of faith. I Tim. 6:12.
4. One must “sow to the spirit” to reap eternal life. Gal. 6:8.
5. It is conditioned upon hearing the voice of Christ, the Shepherd, and following Him. John 10:27, 28.
6. Jesus authorized eternal life for only those who obey Him. Heb. 5:9.
7. Eternal life is only in God’s Son, I John 5:11. But, men are baptized into Christ. Rom. 6:4; Gal. 3:27.

II. When Do Men Receive Eternal Life ?

1. Those who comply with divine conditions have it now, in promise. Heb. 9:15; I John 2:25; I Tim. 4:8.

2. Those who comply with the divine conditions given have hope (expectation of and desire for) eternal life. as did Paul. Tit. 1:2; 3:7; Rom. 8:24, 25.
3. In reality in fulfilment it will be given to those on our Saviour's right hand at the time of the great separation and judgment. Matt. 25:46. The context shows why those receiving eternal life were on the right hand of the Lord instead of His left hand.
4. Eternal life will be received in the world to come. Mark 10:30.
5. The Romans had been made free from sin and had become servants of righteousness. Therefore, Paul said, "Ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Rom. 6:22. See also verses 16-18 and verses 3-6.

III. Can One Who Has Met The Conditions Of Eternal Life, And Obtained The Promise Of It, Forfeit It ?

1. The example of the Israelites shows that one can. Jude 5. "...the Lord SAVED the people out of the land of Egypt afterward (after their salvation) destroyed them that believed not." Unlike the Israelites of verse 5, and the angels of verse 6 who "kept not their first estate, but LEFT their own habitation," and those of verse 12 who are *twice dead*, as well as the "ungodly among them," verse 15, Jude exhorts his readers to "keep themselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Verse 21. To these same readers he wrote : "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy." Verse 24.

2. That one who is a brother may sin a sin unto (leading to) death, and that the apostle would not say the brother seeing it should ever pray for it, shows that eternal life, given only in God's Son, may be forfeited. I John 5:16, 13.
3. A brother, one who has eternal life in God's Son, (I John 5:11) may hate another brother. But no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. I John 3:15.
4. To further see that those who have eternal life in Christ may forfeit it look at Hebrews 10:23-39. We see, first of all, those who have received a knowledge of the truth, verse 26. We see those who were sanctified, verse 29. We see those who were illuminated and endured a great fight of affliction, verse 32. We see those who had compassion with the writer in his bonds, took joyfully the spoiling of their goods and knew in themselves that they had in heaven a better and an enduring substance, verse 34. However, we also see in this context that these same people could : forsake the assembly, verse 25; sin willfully, verse 26; trample under foot the Son of God, count the blood by which they had been sanctified an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of grace, verse 29; Cast away their confidence, verse 35, Draw back and incur the displeasure of God, verse 38; Draw back unto prediction, verse 39.

“LET US REASON TOGETHER” ON FAITH

- I. Does Faith Alone Save One ?
 1. If so, then the chief rulers who refused to confess Christ will be saved. John 12:42-44.
 2. If so, why did James say, “Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone?” James 2:17.
 3. If so, why did James write : “Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only?” Jas. 2:24.
 4. If so, why are we told by James that faith without works is dead just like the body without the spirit ? Jas. 2:26.
 5. If so, why did the apostle Peter write, “Baptism doth also now save us?” I Pet. 3:21.
 6. If faith alone will save, why would Peter tell his readers to “add to their faith?” II Pet. 1:5-11. He promised that if they added virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and love, and abundant entrance would be given them into the eternal Kingdom.
 7. If faith alone will save, why would Paul have said, “And though I have *all* faith, so that I could remove

mountains, and have not charity (love), I am nothing?"
I Cor. 13:2.

8. If one can be saved by faith alone, why does the Bible say that, men are :
 - a. Justified by Christ's blood? Rom. 5:9
 - b. Justified freely by his grace ? Rom. 3:24
 - c. Justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God ? I Cor. 6:11
 - d. Saved by hope ? Rom. 8:24
 - e. Saved "according to His mercy?" Tit. 3:5
 - f. Saved by grace through faith ? Eph. 2:8

II. Do We Come To Have Faith By Praying For It ?

1. In no place are readers and students of the Bible instructed to pray for faith.
2. Faith is produced by reading the written testimony of God's word. John 20:30, 31.
3. Faith comes by hearing the spoken word of God. Acts 15:7; 18:8; Rom. 10:14-17.
4. If faith comes through prayers, why did Jesus say in his prayer to the Father for the apostles, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that shall believe on me through their word ?" John 17:20.

III. What Kind Of Faith Will Save ?

1. Not the kind possessed by devils. James 2:19
2. Not a faith without works. James 2:14
3. Not a dead faith. James 2:20
4. A perfect, obedient faith. James 2:21-23; Heb. 11:8

5. The kind of faith that gives God glory. Rom. 4:20; 5:2
6. The kind of faith that works being motivated by love. Gal. 5:6
7. The kind of faith that moves one in the fear of God to do exactly what God commands. Heb. 11:7; Gen. 6:22

“LET US REASON TOGETHER” ON GRACE

I. Can One Be Saved By Grace Alone ?

1. If one can be saved by grace alone, why was Noah not saved without having to build the ark ? Gen. 6:8. v.22.
2. If one can be saved by grace alone, and Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord, what is meant by the statement that he was” a just man and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God?” Gen. 6:9.
3. If one can be saved by grace alone, and Noah found grace in the eyes of God, what is meant by the words of Hebrews 11:6, ??
4. If one can be saved by grace alone, why did Paul say “for by grace are ye saved THROUGH faith?” Eph. 2:8.
5. If one can be saved by grace alone, and Noah found grace in the eyes of God, what did Peter mean when he wrote the inspired words of I Pet. 3:20, 21 ?
6. If one is saved by grace alone why would not all men be saved ? Tit. 2:11.
7. If one is saved by grace alone, why would one have to do what he is taught to do by God’s grace : Tit. 2:12-14.

8. If one is saved by grace "alone" why isn't the word "alone" used by inspired writers in the New Testament in verses which teach we are saved by grace, such as Eph. 2:5 ? It says, "(by grace ye are saved;)" . Why doesn't it read, "by grace alone ye are saved ?"
9. If grace alone will save, why should Barnabas have exhorted those of Antioch, when he saw the grace of God, that with purpose of heart they should CLEAVE to the Lord ? Acts 11:23.
10. If one is saved by grace alone, why would Paul speak of being "justified freely (not only) by is grace THROUGH the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus ? Rom. 3:24; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14.

II. Can One Fall From Grace ?

1. If one cannot fall from grace, why did Paul say that the Galatians had ? Gal. 5:4.
2. If one cannot fall from God's grace or favour, why did Paul warn the Corinthians to take heed lest they fall ? I Cor. 10:12. How they could fall is clearly seen in the context. See v. 8.
3. If one cannot fall from grace, why did the writer of Hebrews warn : "Harden not your hearts...take heed, *brethren*, lest there be in any of *you* an evil heart in DEPARTING from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called today; lest any of you be hardened through the deicietfulness of sin." Heb 3:8, 12, 13.
4. If one cannot fall from grace, how could one explain the language of Hebrews 4:11 ? Notice the word

“labour.” Why labour? “Lest any man fall.” Then, the verse says we have an example of it.

5. If one cannot fall from grace, why would Jesus have instructed the apostle John to write the words of Revelation 2:5 to the church at Ephesus? Why would he have commanded them to repent? Of what were they told to repent? What were they told to do as evidence of their repentance? What would happen, or what would Jesus do if they didn't repent?
6. If one cannot fall from grace, from what would he fall if he should fall into what James calls condemnation? Jas. 5:12.
7. If one cannot fall from grace, why did Peter command, “But grow in grace” in II Peter 3:18, and in verse 17 warn, “beware lest ye also, being *led away* with the error of the wicked, *fall* from your own steadfastness?”
8. If men cannot fall from the grace of God, how shall we explain, or what is the meaning of, Hebrews 6:6 and its context?

“LET US REASON TOGETHER” ON THE KINGDOM

I. Has The Kingdom Of Christ Been Established ?

- 1. If it has not, no one has experienced the new birth, or has been born again. The kingdom cannot be entered without being born again, John 3:3, 5. If the kingdom has not been established, no one can enter it. If no one can enter it, and no one can if it has not been established, no one can be born again.**
- 2. If it has not been established, how were the Colossians translated into it ? Col. 1:13.**
- 3. If it has not been established why did John, the apostle, write in Rev. 1:9 that he was in the kingdom ?**
- 4. If the kingdom has not been established by what authority do religious people eat the Lord's supper ? In Luke 22:30, Jesus promised that we could eat and drink at his table in his kingdom.**
- 5. If the kingdom has not been established, there are some people somewhere who are near two thousand years old, Mark 9:1.**
- 6. If the kingdom has not, been established, no one can say he has been converted. The converted enter (become citizens of) the kingdom, Matt. 18:3. If the kingdom has not been established, no one has entered it. If no one has entered it, no one has been converted.**

7. If the kingdom has not been established, how could the writer of Hebrews 12:28 have written by Divine direction that we have received the kingdom ?

II. Was The Kingdom Established Before Pentecost ?

1. If so, why did John the Baptist, Jesus and others preach and teach that it was "at hand", meaning "near by"? Paul told Timothy that the time of his departure was at hand, II Tim. 4:6. Did this mean that Paul had already departed or died ?
2. If so, it was without a King or Head. Christ, according to Paul in Eph. 1:20-22 was not given to be Head of the church until he was raised from the dead and set at God's right hand in Heaven.
3. If so, it was without the blood of Christ and, therefore, without the remission of sins, Heb. 9:22. Before Pentecost, people were still under the law of Moses. It was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins. Heb. 10:1-4.
4. If so, the Gentiles could not be citizens of it. The preaching of the twelve and the seventy was confined to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," Matt. 10 : 5, 6.
5. If so, why did Joseph of Arimathas wait for it ? Mark 15:43. Why wait for something that has already come ?
6. If so, why did the disciples think it would immediately appear ? Lk. 19:11. Is it natural for one to think something may appear immediately when it has already appeared ?

7. If so, Jesus had not come into (into possession of) the kingdom which would be his very own, and one of the Malefactors crucified with him did not know it. He said to Jesus, "Lord remember me WHEN thou comest into thy kingdom." Lk. 23:42. Does this sound like the kingdom was already a reality-already in existence ?

III. Will The Kingdom Be Set Up When Christ Returns?

1. If the kingdom does not *now* exist, but is to be set up when Jesus comes again we must conclude that Jesus is not *now* King. If he is King and the kingdom has not yet been set up he is King without a kingdom. For a kingdom to exist there must be a King, citizens or subjects, a law and a territory.

(a) Jesus is King of Kings. I Tim. 6:13-16; 17.

(b) Christians are subjects of the King. Col. 1:13; Eph. 2:19; Phil. 3:20.

(c) The New Testament is the law. Jas. 1:22-25.

(d) The world is the territory. Matt. 28:19; Mk. 16; 15, 16. This shows the universal nature of the Kingdom.

2. If the kingdom is to be set up when Christ comes, then the Holy Spirit has not come and will not come until Jesus returns. The kingdom, Jesus said, would come with power, Mk. 9:1. He further stated that the apostles would receive power when the Holy Spirit came upon them, Acts 1:8. Since the coming of the kingdom was to be accompanied with the Holy Spirit and power, it can be rightly concluded that if the kingdom has not come that the Holy Spirit has not yet come.

3. If the kingdom has not yet come and won't until Jesus comes again how could Jesus deliver it up to God, the Father, when the end comes ? I Cor. 15:24.
4. If the kingdom has not yet come and won't be set up till Jesus comes how will we explain Daniel 2:44 and its context ? Have "these kings" of verse 44 never ruled ? Will they not reign till Jesus returns ?
5. If the kingdom will not be set up until Jesus comes again, Daniel 7:13, 14 has not been fulfilled. (1) One like the Son of man has not gone to the Ancient of days. (2) He has not been given dominion and glory. (3) He has not been given a kingdom. (4) Peoples, nations and languages cannot serve him.
6. If the kingdom is not to be set up until Jesus comes again Jesus is not now in his glory. Compare Matt. 20:21 and Mk. 10:37. The mother of Zebedee's children, James and John thought that when Christ entered into his glory, he would be in his kingdom. Such was, and is, the case or else Jesus allowed them to continue in their deception. Jesus entered his glory after he suffered on the cross, Lk. 24:26; I Tim. 3:16.

“LET US REASON TOGETHER” ON THE NAME

I. If God's People Were Known By Any Name During The First Century, Can We Know What That Name Was ?

1. Knowledge of what that name was can be learned from Old Testament prophecy and its fulfillment. Isa. 56:5; 62:2. From these two prophetic statements the following things are observed. The name God promised to give would be :

- a. Given in His house. Paul said God's house is the church. I Tim. 3:15**
- b. A name better than of sons and daughters (human names).**
- c. An everlasting name.**
- d. Not cut off.**
- e. A new name.**
- f. Named by the mouth of the Lord.**
- g. Given when the Gentiles saw God's righteousness and all kings His glory.**

Note : In connection with this read and study Acts 9:10-16. Note especially verse 15. Now, turn and read Acts 11:19-26:

2. The Bible tells us what that name was in Acts 11:26. It says the disciples were called “Christians”.

3. We can know that the name was a worthy name, and that it was blasphemed. We can know that this name was the name by which they were called (known). Jas. 2:7; Acts 11:26.
4. King Agrippa was aware of the name by which Paul and other disciples of the Lord were known. Acts 26 : 28.
5. What that name was is further known from the words of the apostle Peter in I Pet. 4:16, ASV.
 - a. In what name do you suffer ?
 - b. Do you attempt to glorify God in some other name, a human name ?
6. We can know what the people were by how they lived and what they did. The name "Christian" means Christ-like. Living as Jesus lived and doing as He did made them consistent with what they were called. Being morally good did not make them Christians. But, because they were Christians they were morally good.

II. Should The Name One Wears In Religion Have God's Approval ?

1. If so, and God approves (accepts, acknowledges, endorses and commends) a certain religious name, we should be able to find that name applied to God's children somewhere in the Bible. If the presence of a religious name applied to God's children proves His approval of that name, then the absence of a religious name, as would be applied to His children, proves His disapproval to *that* name.

2. If we agree that the religious name worn should have God's approval, is it not reasonable to say that it would be the name which gives preeminence to His Son in all things? Col. 1:18. What name, other than the name "Christian", gives Christ preeminence?
3. If we do not need God's approval (Bible authority) for the religious name we wear, why would we need His approval of the name in which any religious deed is done? Col. 3:17; Acts 10:48; John 14:13, 14.
4. If a name, other than the name "Christian", is approved of God why weren't the disciples known or called by that name? Acts 11:26.
5. If religious names, such as those religious designations worn by men today, have God's approval why did Paul not persuade king Agrippa to be one of them instead of a Christian? Acts 26:28.
6. If the religious name you are bearing has God's approval where in the Bible is His approval of it found? I Pet. 3:15.
7. If one wearing an unapproved religious name approves himself in so doing, this does not mean that he has God's approval. 2 Cor. 10:18. God approves nothing which He does not authorize.

III. Is The Name That One Wears in Religion Important?

1. It is if life (spiritual life) is important. John 20:31
2. It is if salvation is important. Acts 2:21
3. It is if unity is important. I Cor. 1:10
4. It is if what one does is important. Col. 3:17

5. It is if being sons of God is important. John 1:12
6. It is if departing from iniquity is important. 2 Tim. 2:19
7. It is if preaching repentance and remission of sins is important. Luke 24:46-47.

IV. Does It Make Any Difference What Religious Name One Wears ?

1. If it makes no difference what name one wears, what difference would it make what name one fears ? Rev. 11:18. If it makes no difference now what difference will it make when the dead are judged ?
2. If it makes no difference what name one wears in religion what difference would it make in whose name we assemble to worship ? Matt. 18:20
3. If it makes no difference what religious name one wears, why would it be wrong for one who wears the name of Christ (Christian) to renounce it and wear some other name ? Rev. 3:8
4. If it makes no difference what religious name one wears what difference would it make to whom one is married religiously ? Paul says that Christians are married to Christ. Rom. 7:4 Is it not right for a woman to wear the name of the man to whom she is married ? Does it make any difference to whom a women bears fruit (brings forth children) ? If so, it makes a difference to whom she is married. If it makes a difference to whom she is married it makes a difference whose name she wears. The same holds true in one's relationship to Christ.

5. The name of Christ is a name more excellent than the name of angels, Heb. 1:4. The name of Christ is superior to theirs. Paul prayed that the Philippians would approve the things that are excellent, or things that differ. If it makes no difference about the religious name we wear, why not wear the name of some angel instead of Christ's? Why not approve of some man's name (like Luther) or take a name from some doctrine like the doctrine of holiness or baptism? Many have.
6. If it makes no difference about the name what difference would it make whether one departed from iniquity? 2 Tim. 2:19. If we are His it is because we have named (chosen for ourselves) the name of Christ. In naming His name we penitently depart from iniquity. If it makes a difference whether one belongs to Christ and departs from iniquity it makes a difference what name he wears.

V. Is There Nothing In A Name ?

1. If not, why does the Bible say "a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches?" Prov. 22:1. Why wouldn't a "bad" name be as acceptable as a "good" name?
2. The name of Christ is a name. Is there nothing in His name? Peter declared salvation to be in His name. Acts 4:12. Was Peter wrong? Was he misguided by the Holy Spirit? John 16:13. Paul said that justification is in the name of Christ. I Cor. 6:11. Was he mistaken?
3. If there is nothing in a name why should those who say so resent being called LIARS or HYPOCRITES. Think! Your name is a name. If, as some claim, there

is nothing in a name, then there is nothing in your name.

4. If there is nothing in a name why would the Holy Spirit guide Peter to write : "But if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in THIS name." 2 Pet. 4:16, ASV. Why could one not glorify God in the name of Beelezebub, prince of demons ?
5. If there is nothing in a name why should it make any difference at all in whose name one is baptized ? Acts 2:38; I Cor. 1:14, 15. Would it make any difference in whose name we pray ? John 14:13; 14:15, 16. Would it matter in whose name anything is done ?
6. Is there no more in the name of the righteous than in the name of the unrighteous ? The wise man said "the memory of the JUST is blessed, but the name of the wicked shall rot," Prov. 10:7. Is there any wisdom in that statement ?
7. If there is nothing in a name, how would we explain the prophetic statement recorded by Matthew in Matt. 1:21. It says, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his NAME Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, GOD WITH US." God was with the people of that day in person the name Emmanuel represents. Is God with us in the person of Christ nothing ?

VI. Why Wear The Name "Christian" Only ?

- 1.- The name "Christian" represents my interests in, my relation to, and my dependence upon Christ. What

- other religious appellation does these three things? If the name you wear does these three things, how?
2. The name "Christian", and no other, gives preeminence to Christ. Col. 1:18.
 3. If ever I should be persecuted for religious convictions, let it be as one who wears only the name of Christ, "Christian." I Pet. 4:16, ASV.
 4. It honours the name of Christ, the name that is above every name. Phil. 2:9-11.
 5. There is no better name that one can wear, Isa. 62:2; Prov. 22:1. Why choose and settle for a human name in preference to that which is divine?
 6. Jesus prayed that all of those who believed on Him through the word of the apostles would be one. John 17:20, 21. He meant for them to be one in name too. In what other name can we all be one?
 7. There is only one of two things each responsible person can do—choose it or refuse it. I choose it.

VII. Will The Wearing Of Human Names Result In Salvation?

1. There are two ways to find out. (a) Read and believe what the Bible says about it. (b) Go to the judgment wearing a human name. I choose to do the former rather than the latter.
2. Not if salvation is in the divine name of Christ alone and Peter, the inspired apostle, said it is. Acts 4:11, 12.
3. Not unless one can be saved without being a Christian. No one can make a successful claim to being a Christian in the true and full sense of that term who

- chooses to wear a human name instead of, or in addition to, the name Christian anymore than one who wears the name, but is not living the life it takes to honour it.
4. Not unless those who are not children of God will share in the inheritance the same as those who are His children. All of God's children are in His family. But, members of the family wear the family name. Eph. 3 : 15; I Tim. 3:15. God's family is the church. If those who wear human names are in the divine family, why do they wear human names ?
 5. The wearing of human names will not result in salvation unless it is of faith. Rom. 10:17. If it is not of faith, it is sin, Rom. 14:23. That which is sin does not result in salvation, but damnation.
 6. A religious practice based on human authority cannot result in salvation. We can determine if the practice of wearing human names is based on divine authority by finding out if that name is applied to God's children in the Bible. If it isn't, it is based on human authority and not divine. Matt. 28:19.
 7. If one cannot be saved by teaching doctrines of human origin, how can one be saved wearing a human name in religion ? Mk. 7:7-9. Jesus asked the chief priests and scribes concerning John's baptism, "Was it from Heaven (of divine origin), or of men (of human origin)?" Matt. 21:25. Like the baptism of John, the religious name you wear is either from heaven or from men. Which ?

8. If salvation can result from wearing human names it can result from division because the wearing of human names is one of the causes of division. I Cor. 1:10-15.

"LET US REASON TOGETHER" ON WORSHIP

I. Is The Use Of Mechanical Music In Christian Worship Biblically Justified ?

- 1. No, because not one of the apostles of Christ or any inspired writer ever taught it. They were required to teach those taught and baptized in the name of the sacred three to observe (do or practice) all that Christ had commanded them. Matt. 28:19.**
- 2. No, because Jesus did not teach it. This is proved by the absence of any instruction from Him regarding its use as well as the fact of its absence in the teaching of the apostles. They were to teach us to do ALL Jesus commanded of us. Matt. 28:19.**
- 3. No, because Jesus promised the apostles that he would send them the Holy Spirit who would "teach them *all* things, and bring to their remembrance *whatsoever* He said unto them." The Spirit would "guide them into all truth." John 14:26; 16:13. Where, in what book, chapter, and verse, do we have any teaching of the Spirit concerning the use of mechanical instruments of music ?**
- 4. No, because from points 1, 2, and 3 there are certain inescapable implications.**

- a. If Christ taught it and the apostles didn't, they didn't do what Christ commanded of them. Matt. 28:19
 - b. If Christ taught it and the Holy Spirit did not, He did not do all that Christ promised He would. John 14:26; 16:13
 - c. If Jesus Christ taught it and the Holy Spirit taught it, brought it to the remembrance of the apostles and guided them into its use in worship of God, then they failed to pay any attention to the teaching and guidance of the Holy Spirit.
 - d. So, if Christ taught it, the blame for failure to teach it will have to be placed on either the Holy Spirit of the apostles. Which?
 - e. The truth is, Jesus did not teach it, the Holy Spirit did not teach it, and the apostles, therefore, did not teach it.
 - f. Its use, therefore, is without the approval of Christ, the Holy Spirit, or the apostles.
5. No, because it is not of faith. Faith comes by hearing the word of God, Rom. 10:17. "Whatsoever is not of faith (which comes by hearing the word of God) is sin," Rom. 14:23. "We walk by faith (which comes by hearing God's word) and not by sight," II Cor, 5:7
- a. Since Christ, the Holy Spirit and the apostles did not teach it we have no word of God for it.
 - b. Since faith comes by hearing God's word and we have no word of God for its use, it cannot be of faith.
 - c. Since it is not of faith its use is a sin, and to use it is walking by sight.

6. No, because it is not a good work. God's word furnishes us completely with every good work, II Tim. 3:16, 17. God's word does not furnish us with instructions for its use. It is not, therefore a good work.
7. No, because there is no example of it being used in any worship assembly. If so, where ?
8. No, because christians were commanded to sing in worship to God. Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16. No command has been given to "play" an instrument.

II. Does The New Testament Teach That Christians Are To Eat The Lord's Supper In Worship On The First Day Of Every Week ?

1. Paul, in I Cor. 11:26, shows that christians ate the bread and drank the cup "often." Would once a year be "often?"
2. Jesus had instituted the supper and instructed the apostles to eat the bread representing His body, and drink the cup representing His blood, Matt. 26:26-28. The apostles were also instructed to teach the disciples to do whatsoever Christ had commanded them, Matt. 28:19. Paul says in I Cor. 11:23 that he delivered (taught) to the Corinthians that which he received of the Lord. He did just that. It was the established practice of the christians to come together on the first day of the week, I Cor. 16:2. In this assembly, they gave as prospered. Their eating the Lord's supper was as "often" as their giving or laying by in store. That was upon the first day of the week.
3. The disciples came together to break bread upon the first day of the week. This was the real purpose for

- their meeting, Acts 20:7. This example teaches us that if we would be like them we must do as they did. Lest someone insists that this breaking of bread is a common meal, he should know that in I Cor. 10:16, Paul speaks of the Lord's supper as "The cup of blessing which we bless" and "the bread which we break" as the "communion" of the blood and body of Christ.
4. Christians are commanded to eat the Lord's supper. "This *do* in remembrance of me," were the words of the Saviour, I Cor. 11:24. How often? Acts 20:7 tells how often the church at Troas ate the supper. It was "upon the first day of the week."
 5. Those who "gladly received the word" and were baptized "continued steadfastly" in ... "the breaking of bread," Acts 2:42. "Steadfastly" refers to the regularity and frequency of the breaking of bread. It was "often," I Cor. 11:24. It was "upon the first day of the week," Acts 20:7
 6. To answer the question in the light of what has been presented, which of the three following selections gives the proper answer?
 - a. The disciples at Troas came together to break bread :
 - On the first Sunday of the quarter.
 - Once a year.
 - Thursday night before Easter Sunday.
 - On the first day of the week.
 - b. From I Cor. 10:16, we learn that "the breaking of bread" refers to :
 - the eating of a common meal.
 - the communion of the Body of Christ.

7. "The first day of the week" means the first day of EVERY week. The first day of the week comes EACH week. There can be but *one* first day of anything. Any objector who says, "It does not say *every* first day," is asked if he would also say the same about Ex. 20:8 and I Cor. 16:2.
- a. Ex. 20:8 "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Did this mean every Sabbath to the Jews ?
 - b. I Cor. 16:2 "And upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store..." Does this mean the first day of every week ?
 - c. If the first day of the week of Acts 20:7 does not mean every first day, why should the Sabbath of Ex. 20:8 mean every Sabbath and the first day of I Cor. 16:2 mean every first day ?