

Chapter Three

THE PROBLEM OF LEGALISM (3:1-18)

IDEAS TO INVESTIGATE:

1. Why is Paul bothered about “letters of recommendation”?
2. How do people become “letters of recommendation”?
3. If the old dispensation was so glorious Israel could not look on Moses’ face, how can the new dispensation be more glorious?
4. What is the “veil” that remained over the minds of the Israelites?
5. Where may we “behold the glory of the Lord” in order to be changed into his likeness?

SECTION 1

It Dooms The Soul (3:1-6)

3 Are we beginning to commend ourselves again? Or do we need, as some do, letters of recommendation to you, or from you? ²You yourselves are our letter of recommendation, written on your hearts, to be known and read by all men; ³and you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.

4 Such is the confidence that we have through Christ toward God. ⁵Not that we are competent of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our competence is from God, ⁶who has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life.

3:1-3 Ineffective: Legalism is an almost constant problem for preachers. The problem is either his own legalism or that of members of the congregation he serves. It is probably the most productive tool of the devil to thwart the work of the church on earth! It is a sin much more insidious than sins of the flesh. It damns more souls than for-

SECOND CORINTHIANS

nication and thievery put together! Legalism is a problem, not only for those inside the church, but for millions of impenitent sinners seeking to be justified before God by some meritorious code devised by their own self-righteous arrogance. Legalism is fundamentally an attitude. It manifests itself in behavior designed to conform to specific codes or rules. And those codes of conduct are almost as numerous as there are human beings! Legalism is the attitude that demands justification from God on the basis of having behaved in conformity with an established set of regulations or rules — usually regulations established by the individual. The Pharisees took the law of Moses, made their own code of behavior as “interpretations” (called, “traditions of the elders”) and declared they were justified before God because they had “kept the law.”

Followers of the Pharisees were everywhere in the first century world of Paul. Many of them had infiltrated the christian churches established in the Roman provinces. Paul called them, “false brethren” (Gal. 2:4) and “dogs” (Phil. 3:2). They were the Judaizers who insisted that before any Gentile could become a disciple of the Messiah (Christ) he had to be circumcised according to the law of Moses and keep the traditions of the elders.

Someone in the Corinthian church had impugned Paul’s credentials as an emissary of God because he had no commendations from the Judaizers. Some had come to the Corinthians with letters of commendation from the Judaizers and were received. These Judaizers were there, as in Galatia, Philippi, Colossae, Rome, Jerusalem, and other places, to undo Paul’s work and regiment the Corinthian christians into little cells of legalistic Judaism. They undoubtedly carried with them introductory letters from the Sanhedrin to accredit them. Once upon a time even Paul had had such letters himself (Acts 9:2).

Paul’s argument is that no amount of letters of accreditation from the Judaizers will produce eternal life or the christian freedom cherished by the Corinthians. That is because legalism is totally ineffective in clearing the conscience (*see Heb. 10:1-4*). It cannot produce life in the heart (mind) of man. The law of Moses produces condemnation, judgment, and eternal death. So do all “traditions” and codes of legal justification invented by men, no matter how liberal the code may be (*see Romans 2:12-16*). Man’s conscience tells him he has sinned and defaulted on his own standards, let alone God’s! The only way sinful

man can have a consciousness of life is through a dispensation of divine grace. Grace is dispensed through Christ.

The apostle contends that the converted heathen Corinthians were *living* credentials of his ministry. They proved he was the properly authorized emissary from Christ. Paul had written on their hearts the *eternal* gospel. They had become persons with a consciousness of immorality. They "looked to the things that are unseen . . . eternal" (II Cor. 4:16-18). Their mind-set and lifestyle was "known and read by all men . . ." (II Cor. 3:2). That was Paul's "letter of commendation" from God. The Greek philosopher Plato had said 400 years before Paul, that the good teacher does not write his message in ink that will fade; he writes it upon men. And that is the way the gospel of Christ operates. It becomes fixed upon the character, the personality, the spirit of the humble and contrite person. Christ's word is eternal. It shall never pass away. It never returns to him void but always accomplishes that for which it is sent (see Isa. 55:11). Christ had written his character, through his servant, Paul, upon the hearts of the Corinthian christians, not with that which was destined to fade (the law) — but with the eternal Spirit of God. Their relationship to Christ was Paul's accreditation (see I Cor. 9:2). It is an awesome thought that every christian, whether he likes it or not, is at once a "living letter" known and read by his contemporaries. Christians represent Christ to the world. Men judge the church by its members. The honor of God is in the hands of believers (see Rom. 2:24; John 13:35; I Thess. 1:7-8).

The possessive pronoun in the Greek text is *hemon* and should be translated "our." Some ancient Greek manuscripts (among them the Siniaticus) have *humon* for the pronoun which would read "your." Evidently the RSV translators chose the pronoun *humon* even though the preponderance of manuscripts show *hemon*. For Paul to say, "You yourselves are our letter of recommendation, written on *our* hearts, to be known and read by all men . . ." does not make sense and does not fit the context. Unless Paul's sentence could be separated this way: "You yourselves are our letter of recommendation to be known and read by all men, and you are written on our hearts." Another commentator has suggested that Paul means "the hearts of all christians, in general, not Paul alone." That is, Paul's credentials are written "on all *our* hearts" to be known and read by men, you

SECOND CORINTHIANS

Corinthians, too. But Paul goes on to say in verse 3, “and *you* show that *you* are a letter from Christ delivered by us . . .” so he is referring to that which is written on *their* hearts. The RSV translation seems in keeping with the context. *They* were Paul’s verification: *they* were read by all men.

The Greek verbs in this passage are instructive. The perfect tense participle *eggegrammene*, “having been inscribed” means what Christ had written on their hearts through Paul had been done in the past with a continuing result. And the present tense participles, *ginoskomene* (“being known”) and *anaginostomene* (“being read”) indicate that the Corinthians were continually being known and read by all men. Furthermore, the present participle *phaneroumenoi* (“being shown”) indicates they were continually showing that they were Paul’s recommendation.

3:4-5 Insufficient: The Judaizers went to Corinth with letters from the “fathers” at Jerusalem, no doubt. But no human being is sufficient to produce in man what God desires. Paul would not even claim that sufficiency on his own. He would have the Corinthians understand that his confidence is through Christ — his sufficiency is from God. Legalism is insufficient because it does not come from God. God gave the Law. But God never intended the Law to be used in a legalistic, self-justifying way. The Law had a holy and good purpose (see Rom. 7:7-12). It was actually intended to teach just the opposite from what the Judaizers taught. The Law was to bring all who knew it to a consciousness of condemnation and total inability to be justified by it. It is not the law which is insufficient — it is legalistic perversion of the law which is insufficient. The Law is sufficient for its purpose — to produce awareness of sin, the need for grace, and tutoring unto faith.

Paul would not even take credit for what had been produced in the Corinthians through him. He gave all the credit to Christ and God. That is another of the glaring insufficiencies of the legalistic spirit. It dare not be honest and give credit where the credit is due. The legalist is a legalist because he wants all the credit for himself. Grace, unmerited favor, is anathema to him! Let all preachers and congregations beware of legalism. It is ineffective and insufficient. In fact, it produces exactly the opposite of what God’s powerful word produces. Stay with the Word. Preach the word — leave “traditions” and

“codes” to the legalists.

Like it or not, right or wrong, people generally manifest what they have been taught or what they have learned. Teaching and learning is a character-building process. People become “books” to be read by all those with whom they associate. The apostles were “read” as having “been with Jesus” (Acts 4:13). That is how people become “letters of recommendation.” Paul told the brethren at Thessalonica they were his “joy and crown” of boasting (I Thess. 2:19-20; II Thess. 1:3-4).

3:6 Incriminating: Legalism dooms men under the judgment of God even more so than the Law of Moses. The Law of Moses was given by God and provisions were made in it for having faith reckoned as righteousness (see Gen. 15:6; Heb. 11:1-40). But legalism takes the Law and prostitutes it into a system of human self-justification. But by the law shall no flesh be justified (Gal. 2:16).

Paul reminded the Corinthians that his credentials testified that he had been qualified by God to be a minister of a *new* covenant, not in a written code which kills, but in the Spirit which gives life. Law condemns to separation from God (death) because man cannot, does not, keep the Law. Man is guilty. God’s penalty for breaking his Law is eternal banishment. But from the very first violation of his Law, God started preparing to forgive and justify men by a totally gracious deed of his own. All who believed in that in the O.T. were justified by God’s gracious deed (redemptive work of Christ). The new covenant was prophesied, typified and proclaimed in the O.T. All those in the O.T. who refused to trust in the coming grace of God through the Messiah (and there were many), but trusted in their legal standing according to Law, never had the salvation of God. Paul plainly says that the *new* covenant was a manifestation of the righteousness of God apart from law, although the law and the prophets had borne witness to just such justification by faith (Rom. 3:21-26).

In this letter to the Corinthians the apostle wants it understood that he has been qualified to be a minister (dispenser) of the new covenant which is all about life. The new covenant does not condemn or sentence anyone to death. It holds forth the word of life. Of course, anyone who does not enter into the new covenant will die forever because all who refuse the gospel must accept law — one kind of law or another (see Rom. 2:12-16). And to trust in law for justification is

the very essence of legalism. Legalism incriminates and kills. The Spirit of God, given gratis (by grace), brings justification and life.

SECTION 2

It Diminishes God's Splendor (3:7-11)

7 Now if the dispensation of death, carved in letters on stone, came with such splendor that the Israelites could not look at Moses' face because of its brightness, fading as this was, ⁸will not the dispensation of the Spirit be attended with greater splendor? ⁹For if there was splendor in the dispensation of condemnation, the dispensation of righteousness must far exceed it in splendor. ¹⁰Indeed, in this case, what once had splendor has come to have no splendor at all, because of the splendor that surpasses it. ¹¹For if what faded away came with splendor, what is permanent must have much more splendor.

3:7-8 Deteriorates: The Law of Moses was a dispensation of death, carved on deteriorating stone. Of course, it had *splendor* (Gr. *doxe*, glory)! Anything God does has glory. All God's actions in history are glorious. His creation of this universe was glorious; his providential intervention (miracles) in creation was glorious; but this universe is destined to pass away, and is passing away because he has subjected it to futility (see Gen. 3:14-19; Rom. 8:18-25). This universe was temporary from the day of its creation for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (I Cor. 15:42-54). So with the Law of Moses. It was glorious but temporary from the moment of its revealing. It was destined to be fulfilled with that which was permanently glorious — the Gospel.

The Law came to Moses with such splendor that the Israelites could not look at Moses' face because of its brightness, *fading* (Gr. *katargoumenen*, being done away, being brought to an end, rendering powerless) as this was. When Moses came down from Mount Sinai, after receiving the Law of God, his face shone so that both Aaron and the Israelites were afraid to come near him (Exod. 34:29-35). Just as objects exposed to light or radiation sometimes glow even after being removed from the light, so Moses, having been with God who dwells in light unapproachable (I Tim. 6:16) had acquired some of the glow

of God (see Rev. 21:23), even though he had seen only the "back part of God" (Exod. 33:23). Jesus' *transfiguration* (Gr. *metemorphothe*, metamorphosis) is described thus: ". . . his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as the light" (Matt. 17:2); ". . . his garments became glistening, intensely white, as no fuller on earth could bleach them" (Mark 9:3); ". . . the appearance of his countenance and his raiment became dazzling white" (Luke 9:29).

This transfiguration of Jesus was a sign to the apostles that his coming with the dispensation of the Spirit was to be with *greater* splendor than that dispensation of death given to Moses.

If the Law of Moses, which originated with God, revealed a diminishing splendor from the moment of its inception, how much more will *legalism*, a perversion of the Law, diminish the splendor of God. This is Paul's aim in this admonition to the Corinthian church. They must not allow the legalists to come in with letters of commendation (no matter from whom) and diminish the glory of the Gospel.]

3:9-11 Disappears: The Law of Moses, the dispensation of condemnation, would inevitably be superseded should a dispensation of righteousness be inaugurated. And that is precisely what took place. Paul had preached that to the Corinthians. He had converted them to Christ with a gospel of righteousness (see I Cor. 1:26-31; II Cor. 5:11-21). Logic, therefore, demands that the Corinthians not be deceived by the Judaizers into returning to a faded splendor of condemnation because the splendor of righteousness in Christ to which they had been called *must far exceed* the Law of Moses. The dispensation of righteousness, the Gospel, supersedes any and *all legal systems*, whether revealed to Moses or written on nature and the conscience of man (see Rom. 1:18-2:16).

Paul puts it this way, "Indeed, in this case, what once had splendor has come to have no splendor at all, because of the splendor that surpasses it." The Law of Moses (and all legal systems or legalisms) *have no splendor at all!* All religious, philosophical, or ethical systems advocating justification by law-keeping or self-improvement are bereft of any glory in the eyes of God. It is, therefore, senseless and useless to seek glorification from God in the Law of Moses or in any form of legalism.

The transfiguration of Jesus Christ was an actual, historical event. It was empirically observed (seen and heard). When Jesus was

SECOND CORINTHIANS

“metamorphosed” from his fleshly nature back into his divine glory, there appeared with him (seen by the disciples) Moses and Elijah (representatives of the Law and the Prophets, the dispensation of death) (see Matt. 17:3-8; Mark 9:4-8; Luke 9:30-36). It was at that moment God spoke to the disciples (Peter, James and John) and said, “This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to him.” God thus served notice that Jesus was to supersede, fulfill and abrogate the Old dispensation and surpass it with such divine glory in the gospel that the Old would “have no splendor at all.” After God’s message, the disciples looked and “saw no one but Jesus only.” The Law was to disappear in Jesus.

The New dispensation, the Gospel, *remains* (Gr. *menon*, is remaining or abiding) is *permanent*. It shall never fade away. It was the promise according to faith from the beginning, and the law which came 430 years later did not annul the promise (Gal. 3:10-18). Justification by faith in Christ has always been God’s intent for man. It has been God’s *permanent, most glorious*, dispensation of grace from the foundation of the earth for Jesus was the lamb slain then (I Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8). The Gospel is the *eternal* gospel (I Pet. 1:25-26; Rev. 14:6). Heaven and earth may pass away but Jesus’ words will *never* pass away (Matt. 24:35.)

Hebrews 2:1-4 gives an awesome warning to men to “pay closer attention” to the gospel than to the revelation given by angels (the Law) because the gospel came through the Son (see Heb. 1:1-4). The entire book of Hebrews is a clear and absolute command not to return to the Law (or any form of legalism) for justification. Those who seek justification by legalism are apostates who have no avenue for repentance before God (see Heb. 6:1-8) but only a fearful expectation of judgment (Heb. 10:1-39). Paul’s epistles to the Romans and the Galatians are also unequivocal treatises on the fulfillment and abrogation of the Law of Moses in Christ, and the apostate nature of legalism as a system of justification.

SECTION 3

It Divests People of Freedom (3:12-17)

12 Since we have such a hope, we are very bold, 13 not like

Moses, who put a veil over his face so that the Israelites might not see the end of the fading splendor. ¹⁴But their minds were hardened; for to this day, when they read the old covenant, that same veil remains unlifted, because only through Christ is it taken away. ¹⁵Yes, to this day whenever Moses is read a veil lies over their minds; ¹⁶but when a man turns to the Lord the veil is removed. ¹⁷Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.

3:12-13 Conceals: Moses put a veil over his face *after* he finished speaking with the Israelites (Exod. 34:33-34) and removed the veil when he went in to speak with Jehovah in the tabernacle. But Moses always put the veil on when he came into the presence of the Israelites. Paul states that Moses put the veil on his face so the Israelites would not see the "end" of the glory that was fading away (3:13). Paul states the veil was because Moses did not have enough hope in the "fading away" revelation to be bold enough to let Israel see the "fading glory." Moses certainly did not veil his face because the Israelites were not allowed to see the glow, or because it was so bright it blinded them, for Moses talked to them *before* putting on the veil. The apostle used the fading glory of Moses' face as a symbol or type (which is prophetic) of the fading glory of the Old covenant (the law). That covenant passed away, like the glow of Moses' face. Even though the Old Testament predicts in a number of places that the old covenant was to be done away (e.g. Jer. 3:15; 31:31-34; Dan. 9:24-27; Isa. 66:1-24; etc.), most Jews refused to accept that doctrine then and Jews do not accept it now! The Israelite people to whom Moses ministered were certainly not spiritually mature enough to be reminded over and over of the "fading glory" of Moses' relationship to God — that is why Moses covered his face. The Jews killed the prophets for predicting the fulfillment of the old dispensation with the Messianic age; they killed Christ for that; and they authored the deaths of a number of the apostles for preaching that doctrine.

Legalism veils the freedom (so did the Law of Moses) God intended to give believers in Christ. The prophets hinted at the freedom that would come to man when the Messiah came (see especially Isaiah 61:1-4 as fulfilled in Luke 4:18-19). But that freedom was concealed and obscured in the Law. Any form of legalism certainly hides the

SECOND CORINTHIANS

freedom which God reveals in the New Testament of Christ Jesus.

3:14-15 Calluses: Legalism hardens the mind against grace. The veil over Moses' face was also a symbol of the hardening of the minds of the Israelites in rejecting Christ. Fourteen centuries after Moses, the Jewish mind was still hardened in Paul's day whenever the Law of Moses was read in a Jewish synagogue — a veil lay upon the hearts of the Jews and they became satisfied with a system of justification by legalism. Twenty centuries after Paul, that hardness is still like concrete over the Jewish mind. Paul told the brethren of Thessalonica that they had suffered the same things from their own countrymen as the Christians of Judea did from the Jews, who (the Jews) killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us (apostles) out, and displease God and oppose all men by hindering us (the apostles) from speaking to the Gentiles that they may be saved — so as always to fill up the measure of their sins. But God's wrath has come upon them (the Jews) *to completion* (Gr. *eis telos*, unto perfection), see I Thessalonians 2:14-16. That same kind of callused opposition to Christ and his church continues to go on in modern Israel and among modern Jews.

Jewish legalism is not the only legalism which opposes the gospel. All forms of legalism are set against grace! There is an inveterate legalism within the Christian Church which takes an obscurantist and obdurate stand in opposition to Christian grace and freedom in Christ. The human arrogance that is proud of its pseudo-righteousness through legalistic justification makes war on the humility which rejoices in its freedom through grace alone.

3:16-17 Constrains: Paul says plainly that when a person "turns to the Lord the veil is removed." Men are *free* only in the Lord. The obverse truth is that men are enslaved in Law and legalism. The apostle states it much clearer in Galatians. He specifically uses the words, "consigned under" and "confined under . . . restraint" in Galatians 3:21-25. In Galatians 4:1-7 he uses the word "slave" to describe those under the Law (see also Gal. 4:21-31 for the allegorical picture of those under the Law as "children for slavery"). Jesus told those who committed themselves to him that they were no longer *slaves* (John 15:15). He told the Jews that if they would continue in his word, they would be his disciples and they would know the truth and the truth would make them free (see John 8:31-38).

Legalism is even more enslaving than the Law, for legalism cannot do what the Law was sent to do — to bring people to an acknowledgment of their sinfulness and lead them to Christ for mercy. Legalism will have none of mercy for it does not acknowledge its need for mercy.

SECTION 4

Defense Against Legalism (3:18)

¹⁸And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit.

3:18 Transformation: The defense against legalism is a gradual process of transformation into the *likeness* (Gr. *auten eikona*, same image, or, same icon). The apostle uses the Greek word *metamorphoumetha* and it is translated into the English word *changed* by the RSV. This Greek word is a combination of the prepositional prefix *meta* (which can mean “over and beyond”) and *morphe* (which means “form”). Thus we have the English word *metamorphosis* from this Greek word. A “metamorphosis” is what a caterpillar goes through to become a butterfly; its form is changed beyond what it was from one degree of glory to another.

The metamorphosis Paul is talking about here for the believer is a spiritual one in this earthly existence. It is spoken of in the New Testament in a number of metaphors; it is called the “new birth”; “conversion”; “salvation”; “partaking of the divine nature” (II Pet. 1:3-11); “being born of the Spirit”; “being transformed”; “being conformed to the image of God’s Son” (Rom. 8:29), etc. Nearly all Bible believers agree on these terms as expressing the experience or action required by God for eternal life. The disagreement is usually over the question as to *how* this transformation takes place in the life of the believer.

Paul says in this text (II Cor. 3:18) that it occurs when believers “. . . with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this

SECOND CORINTHIANS

comes from the Lord who is the Spirit." An analysis of this text, as we compare it with other relevant scriptures, will clearly indicate how this action is accomplished. First, it requires an "unveiled face." The Greek verb for "unveiled" is *anakekalummeno*. It is a perfect tense verb indicating action in the past with a continuing action or result. It is a perfect passive participle of *anakalupto* and would be translated literally, "having been unveiled." Passive voice would indicate the unveiling was something done to the believer by someone else. Our "unveiling" is through the agency of the Holy Spirit. Of course, God's Spirit will not unveil our hardened minds unless we wish him to and cooperate with him in every instruction he gives in his Word. The Holy Spirit may be resisted. This unveiling is definitely a continuing, progressive process. It does not all take place at one time. The perfect tense verb clears that up. Furthermore, Paul states that it is a process "from one degree of glory to another."

Second, the "unveiled face" comes as a result of "beholding the glory of the Lord." The Greek work translated "beholding" is *katoptrizomenoi* (we get the English word *optometry* from this word). It is a present tense, middle voice participle. The present tense means action continuing to happen. The middle voice means the subject (the believer) is acting upon himself or in some way that concerns himself. The Greek word *katoptrizomenoi* might be translated, "beholding in a mirror" or, "seeing a reflection." One way or another, the human being must "behold" the glory of the Lord in order to be changed. And Paul says that even the *beholding* comes from the Lord who is the Spirit. Now the question is, how has the Spirit made the glory of the Lord visible to human beings?

We believe the New Testament is unequivocal on that point! We believe there is no room for opinion on the matter. We believe it is a clear teaching of the scripture and Scripture is always authoritative above opinions when sound hermeneutics are exercised. Many passages in the New Testament clearly indicate that in conversion and sanctification (being changed from one degree of glory to another, or, being transformed into the image of God's Son) the Holy Spirit operates *only* through the Word of truth: (a) we are made partakers of the divine nature (the nature of Christ) and granted all things that pertain to life and godliness through the knowledge of Christ and through his precious and very great promises (II Pet. 1:3-4) — the *knowledge*

THE PROBLEM OF LEGALISM

of Christ comes through the Word (Rom. 10:17), and certainly there is no other place for a human being to find the *promises* of Christ except in the written word; (b) we are to be transformed by the renewing of our minds motivated to that renewing by the mercies of God (Rom. 12:1-2) — the mind of the human being must contact the mercies of God to be renewed and those *mercies* can only be *mentally* appropriated from the written Word; (c) we are to be conformed to the image of God's Son (Rom. 8:29) by setting our minds on the things of the Spirit (Rom. 8:5-8) — the mind of the human being must be set on the things of the Spirit and these things are revealed through the apostles (see John 16:7-15, and see our comments on I Cor. 2:6-16) in the New Testament only (see I John 4:1-6); (d) we are called through the gospel so that we may obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ (II Thess. 2:14) — the gospel is the Word of the Spirit written which is at work in believers (I Thess. 2:13); (e) we purify our souls by obedience to the truth and are born anew of the imperishable seed which is the living and abiding word of God, the preached (or written) gospel (I Pet. 1:22-25) — the "seed" of new birth and continuing purification of the soul is sown in our minds through the written Word of the the spirit.

We might go on multiplying references from the scriptures showing that the Holy Spirit operates only through the Word of truth for there a many. We quote now from Alexander Campbell for clarification of this proposition:

"All moral facts have a moral meaning; and those are properly called moral facts which either exhibit, develop, or form moral character. . . . It so happens, however, that all his (God's) works, when properly understood, exhibit both his physical and moral character, when viewed in all their proper relations. . . . The work of redemption is a system of works, or deeds, on the part of Heaven, which constitute the most splendid series of moral facts which man or angel ever saw. And they are the proof, the argument, or the demonstration, of that regenerating proposition which presents God and Love as two names for one idea. . . . When these facts are understood, or brought into immediate contact with the mind of man, as a moral seal or archetype, they delineate the image of God upon the human soul. *All the means of grace are, therefore, only the means of impressing this seal upon the heart, — of bringing these moral facts to make their full impression on the soul of man.* Testimony and faith are but the channel through which

SECOND CORINTHIANS

these facts, or the hand of God, draws the image on the heart and character of man." Alexander Campbell in *The Christian System*, pub. Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, no date, pps. 90-91.

Alexander Campbell also wrote that in human experience, "No living man has ever been heard of, and none can now be found, possessed of a single Christian concept of one spiritual thought, feeling, or emotion, where the Bible, or some tradition from it has not been before him." See the Special Study at the end of this chapter from Alexander Campbell's, *Christian Baptism*, on this proposition.

While we endure the sufferings of this present time being changed from one degree of spiritual glory to another into the likeness of Christ, these sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us (Rom. 8:18-39). God is preparing for those metamorphosed into the image of his Son an eternal weight of glory beyond comparison (II Cor. 4:16-18) when we shall be clothed with life (II Cor. 5:1-5; I Cor. 15:35-57) and immortality.

And since he (God) is the source of our life in Christ, who is our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption, (I Cor. 1:30-31), let us renounce legalism and boast *only* of the Lord!

APPREHENSION:

1. What is legalism?
2. How was legalism a problem to the apostle Paul?
3. How did the Corinthians become "letters" from Christ delivered by Paul?
4. What is the dispensation of death? *Why* was it a dispensation of death?
5. What is the dispensation of the Spirit?
6. How could Paul say the dispensation of death had glory?
7. How did God show the Israelites that the dispensation of death would fade away?
8. Why would God want the Israelites to know the O.T. was to fade away?
9. What is the splendor of the new dispensation?
10. Is Paul teaching here that the Old Testament was completely and

THE PROBLEM OF LEGALISM

- totally fulfilled and abrogated? What other scriptures teach that?
11. What was the purpose of the veil Moses put over his face?
 12. Does it have some symbolic significance for the Corinthians and us? What?
 13. How is this veil removed?
 14. Where may a human being behold the glory of the Lord? Is this the only place? How do you know?
 15. What happens as a result of beholding the glory of the Lord?

APPLICATION:

1. Is legalism a problem with your preacher?
2. Is legalism a problem with you?
3. If Paul were writing to you and your congregation today, what kind of *letter of recommendation* for him would you be?
4. Do you have a consciousness of death or of life from your New Covenant relationship with God through Christ?
5. What do you think about your being saved by grace?
6. Is there a veil over your face when you try to be pleasing to God? Is there some hardness callusing your mind against the free grace of God?
7. Are you satisfied with the glory of the Lord revealed exclusively in the scriptures? Do you think the Lord should manifest himself to you in some physical glory?
8. Would you be more converted, more changed into his character if he would reveal himself to you physically?
9. To whom do you give credit for your changed character, day by day?
10. What kind of glory do *you* anticipate in heaven?

Special Study

NOTES FROM *CHRISTIAN BAPTISM*

by Alexander Campbell

PROPOSITION:

In conversion and sanctification, the Holy Spirit operates only through the Word of truth.

Argument from . . .

1. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MIND

In conversion "no new faculties are imparted — no old faculty destroyed!" "The Spirit of God, in effecting this great change does not violate, metamorphose, or annihilate any power or faculty of the man, in making the saint." p. 236

2. EXPERIENCE

"No living man has ever been heard of, and none can now be found, possessed of a single Christian concept of one spiritual thought, feeling, or emotion, where the Bible, or some tradition from it, has not been before him." p. 238

3. OBSERVATION

"No one, professing to have been the subject of the illuminating, converting, and sanctifying operations of the Spirit of God, can ever express a single right conception or idea on the whole subject of spiritual things, not already found in the written word," p. 239 "I have never heard one suggestion, containing the feeblest ray of light, which was not eighteen hundred years old, and already found in Holy Scriptures." pp. 239, 240

4. CONSISTENCY—"Whatever is essential to regeneration in any case, is essential to it in all cases." p. 240

"If then, the Spirit of God, without faith, without knowledge of the gospel, in any case, regenerates an individual, it does so in all cases. But if faith in God, or a knowledge of Christ, is essential in one case, it is essential in every other case." p. 240

5. THE HOLY SPIRIT'S OWN METHOD OF ADDRESSING MEN

“He seems to have sought admission into the hearts of the people by these glorious displays of Divine power presented to the eyes (miracles), and these words of grace addressed to the ear. . . . He used means, rational means; therefore, we argue, such means were necessary, and are still, in certain modifications of that same supernatural grandeur, necessary to conversion and sanctification.” p. 242

6. THE NAME CHOSEN BY JESUS FOR THE HOLY SPIRIT (*Paracletos* - advocate)

“Now as the Spirit is to advocate Christ's cause, he must use means. . . . He was to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment. . . . In converting men, the Spirit, the Holy Advocate, was to speak of Jesus. Hence, speaking of Jesus by the Spirit, is all that was necessary to the conversion of men.” pp. 242, 243

7. THE GIFT OF TONGUES (LANGUAGE)

“That language is essential to the completion of the commission, is proved from the great fact, that the first gift of the Holy Spirit, under the Messiah's commission, was the gift of tongues.” p. 243 “With Plato, then, I say, that God taught the primitive words, and from that, man manufactured the derivatives. With Newton, I say, God gave man reason and religion by giving him speech . . . the Spirit of God, now the Spirit of the Word, is the origin of all spiritual words and conceptions.” p. 245

8. SCRIPTURE

I Peter 1:23-“The Word of God is the seed, of which we are born again or renewed in heart and life. . . . Where this incorruptible seed is not, there can be no birth!” pp. 245, 246

James 1:18-“God's *will* is the origin of it; his *Spirit* the efficient cause of it; but the Word is the necessary *instrument* of it.” p. 246

I Corinthians 4:15-“The gospel is here the seed, the instrument of the conversion of the Corinthians.” p. 247

9. PAUL'S COMMISSION (Acts 26:15-18)

“God would use light, knowledge, the gospel, and would OPEN

SECOND CORINTHIANS

THE EYES of men — turning them from darkness to light, and from the kingdom and power of Satan to God. . . . Illumination is, therefore, an essential prerequisite to conversion and holiness.” p. 248

10. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

“Whatever influence is ascribed to the Word of God in the Sacred Scriptures, is also ascribed to the Spirit of God.” p. 248

- 1) Enlightenment-Heb. 6:4-Psa. 19:7, 8
- 2) Conversion-Titus 3:5-7-Psa. 19:7
- 3) Sanctification-Rom. 15:16-John 17:17
- 4) Be filled with-Eph. 5:18-Col. 3:16
- 5) Life giving-Rom. 8:6, 11-Psa. 119:25, 50

11. RESISTANCE

“Resisting the Word of God, and resisting the Spirit of God, are shown to be the same thing.” p. 249

- 1) Acts 7:51-53
- 2) Neh. 9:20, 30

12. CREATION

“Every work of creation is represented as the product of his Word.” (Heb. 11:3; Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26) p. 251

“God, therefore, made man in his own image by his Word, and he now restores him to that same image by his Word of power.” p. 251

13. GOD’S WILL AND POWER

“The Lord has imbodyed his will in his Word. . . . The Word of the Lord is the Lord himself.” p. 251 “As the Lord Jesus is the Word of God incarnate, so is his Word an embodiment of his power. . . . The Word of God is, then, the actual power of God.” p. 252 “The power of God to salvation is the persuasive power of infinite and eternal love, and not the compulsive and subduing power of any force superadded to it.” p. 253

14. THE CONVERSION ACCOUNTS IN ACTS

“In not one of these cases did the Holy Spirit operate *without the Word*, but always through it.” p. 254 (Acts 2:41; 4:4; 5:14; 8:5, 6, 12; 8:35; 9:4-9, 17-19)

Special Study

ARE WE FUNDAMENTALISTS?

Historically

The answer to that is Yes and No! While the Restoration Movement parallels the great revival of religious conservatism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, our Movement predates the historical founding of the movement called "Fundamentalism." It is also evident that the Restoration Movement, although believing in the great "fundamental" doctrines declared at the first by fundamentalism, does not adhere to later theological deviations and dogmatism.

George M. Marsden, Professor of History at Calvin College, in his book, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 1980, sees Fundamentalism rising out of the ashes of the destructive debate which occurred at the 1873 Evangelical Alliance.

Until that time, American Protestantism had been riding the crest of a wave of evangelicalism swept along on the tide of revivalism in the late 1700's and early 1800's. It is significant that the Restoration Movement in America was begun during this time.

This old order correlated faith, learning and morality with the welfare of civilization. Two premises were absolutely fundamental — that God's truth was a single unified order and that all persons of common sense were capable of knowing that truth. The implications of these assumptions were carefully worked out by the philosophical school known as Scottish Common Sense Realism." (Marsden, op, cit, p. 14)

In 1869 Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr. (who moved in the ultra-liberal Transcendentalist circles in Boston) predicted the imminent demise of christian conservatism, saying: "The truth is staring the Christian world in the face, that the stories of the old Hebrew books cannot be taken as literal statements of fact." Holmes was seduced by the destructive criticism of such men as F.C. Baur, D.F. Strauss, and J.E. Renan.

Throwing fuel on the flame already begun, James McCosh, President of the College of New Jersey (later, Princeton), stated on the floor debate of the 1873 Evangelical Alliance, he thought that evolution and Christianity could be reconciled without violating belief in

God and creation. But others, among them the great Charles Hodge of Princeton, countered that the supernaturalism of the Biblical view was utterly incompatible with the naturalism they saw as essential to Darwin's position.

Almost all the basic battle lines had been drawn, but the battle was far from settled. Higher criticism and Darwinism went far beyond the realm of empirical science and took the leap into philosophies of origins and purposes. This threatened the very foundations of Christian belief.

Most American evangelicals were so firmly committed to both objective science and historical Christianity they were forced, by the severity of the conflict, into one of two extreme positions. They could say with Charles Hodge that Darwinism and higher criticism was irreconcilable with Christianity; or they could redefine the relationship between science and religion until religion would no longer be seen as dependent on historical or scientific fact susceptible of objective inquiry, but would have to do with only the experiential and moral aspects of life — areas not open to scientific and historical investigation. Religion was already, in fact, being redefined this very way by Schleiermacher and Ritschl (advocates of Kant's "categorical imperative"). At this same meeting in 1873, this new direction was suggested by the most popular American preacher of the day, Henry Ward Beecher.

Beecher and others continued to press the new theology of experience. Some say 1877 was the turning point when a minor controversy over future punishment occurred among the Congregationalists. The real shock waves came from abroad. Three strong concussions were felt almost simultaneously — evolutionary naturalism, higher criticism of the Bible, and the newer Idealistic philosophy and theology. Theology was no longer viewed as a fixed body of eternally valid truths. It was seen rather as an evolutionary development that should adjust to the standards and needs of modern culture.

The conservatism of the Blanchards of Wheaton College and Dwight L. Moody's evangelical revivalism played major roles in swinging the religious pendulum away from the new liberalism. Moody's close friends and younger lieutenants (Reuben A. Torrey, James M. Gray, C.I. Scofield, William J. Eerdman, and others) lent their able energies and abilities to shaping fundamentalism.

ARE WE FUNDAMENTALISTS?

There were four main emphases in early fundamentalism: apologetics, holiness, eschatology, and evangelism. In 1910-1915 twelve paperback volumes, written by "the best and most loyal Bible teachers in the world," were published. The funds to publish them came from a Southern California millionaire. Among the authors were men of the caliber of James Orr, B.B. Warfield, Sir Robert Anderson, Reuben A. Toreey, and G. Campbell Morgan. The series gave positive, scholarly, conservative expositions of the inspiration and authority of Scripture, the deity, virgin birth, supernatural miracles, atoning death, physical resurrection and personal return of Jesus Christ, the reality of sin, salvation by faith through spiritual regeneration, the power of prayer and the duty of evangelism. From that time on, it seems to have become habitual for American evangelicals to refer to these articles as "the fundamentals." In 1919 the World Christian Fundamentals Association was formed, and in 1920, a group of evangelical delegates to the Northern Baptist Convention held a preliminary meeting among themselves to "re-state, re-affirm and re-emphasize the fundamentals of our New Testament faith;" whereupon an editorial in the Baptist *Watchman-Examiner* coined the title "Fundamentalists" to denote "those who mean to do battle royal for the fundamentals." The word was at once taken up by both sides as a title for the defenders of the historic Christian position.

In almost every major American denomination, sometime between the late 1870's and World War I, serious disagreements broke out between conservatives and liberals. In these struggles the conservatives were not necessarily fundamentalists in any strict sense. They were first of all denominational conservatives who had their own distinct traditions and tenets. Some, like the conservatives among the Restoration Movement, were regarded as a part of the fundamentalist movement largely because their aims were parallel and in certain of their "battles" they had common opponents. The issues debated most intensely centered on the authority of Scripture, its scientific accuracy, or the supernatural elements in Christ's person and work. There were also parallel and closely related disputes over the distinctive doctrines, such as Calvinism among Presbyterians and the necessity of baptism by immersion for church membership among the Disciples of Christ. This is the way Marsden (op. cit.) views the contribution of the Christian Churches to the fundamentalist movement:

SECOND CORINTHIANS

When fundamentalism became a national sensation, conservative denominational movements with their own traditions and backgrounds temporarily joined in the fundamentalist fray. Some of them had only a tangential relationship to the rest of fundamentalism. Among Disciples of Christ, for instance, although the controversy was as intense as among the Presbyterians or Baptists, their conservative party had a unique set of interests. They shared with the main body of fundamentalists a strong opposition to liberalism, especially the liberalism represented by the former journal of the Disciples, *The Christian Century*. The controversy focused, however, on preserving strict Disciples traditions, particularly Baptism by immersion. This exclusivism separated the Disciples conservatives from other fundamentalists, even though both groups recognized some mutual affinities. By the 1920's the conservative Disciples 'Restoration Movement' had been battling liberals strenuously for a decade and a half. In 1924 at the height of the other denominational controversies, the conservatives established the Christian Restoration Association which seriously threatened to split the denomination. Although a formal schism was averted, within a few years separatism had led to the virtual independence of the liberal and conservative factions within a loose denominational structure.

At the North American Christian Convention Theological Forum, summer 1973, Dr. Jack Cottrell, Prof. of Theology at the Cincinnati Christian Seminary, made an address on *Values in Evangelical Theology*. It has been published in *The Seminary Review*, Vol. 19, No. 4. This address gives an excellent perspective on the relationship of the conservative stream of the Restoration Movement to Fundamentalism. Dr. Cottrell says:

. . . in the 1920's the character and reputation of fundamentalism changed. The change was not basically in its theological position, but in its mood and temperament and attitude. Dispensationalism (including its pre-tribulation pre-millennialism) did become a more widespread characteristic of this view, but the greatest change was the development of a negative attitude, characterized in various ways such as legalism, anti-intellectualism, obscurantism, literalism, separatism, bigotry, harshness of spirit, and other-worldliness. Today when people speak of contemporary fundamentalism, they usually mean this kind of temperament.

. . . It was as a corrective to this negative attitude that the movement called evangelicalism (or the "new evangelicalism") began to emerge in the 1940's. In 1942 the National Association of Evangelicals was formed. In 1947 Carl Henry indicted *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern*

ARE WE FUNDAMENTALISTS?

Fundamentalism. The Evangelical Theological Society was organized in 1949. The aim of this new movement was to retain the conservative theological position of fundamentalism, but to rid itself of the negative attitude.

This brief historical summary has hopefully clarified the options before us. First, one must choose between liberal theology and conservative, orthodox, supernatural theology. Then, within conservative theology, one must choose between fundamentalism and evangelicalism.

Dr. Cottrell concludes that we need to "share with profit" some of the theological positions of evangelicalism while avoiding compromising the distinctives of the Restoration Plea.

Are we Fundamentalists? Are we even Evangelicals? No! Historically, the Restoration Movement was defending the Biblical faith more than a century before the 1920 formation of the Fundamental Association. Alexander Campbell wrote in his personal diary, January 29, 1809, "The Word of God, which is contained in the Old and New Testaments is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him." Mr. Campbell also said: "Reason deciding the testimony is true is believing; reason deciding the testimony is false is disbelieving; reason unable to decide is skepticism."

Are we Fundamentalists? Yes! The Restoration Movement was leading a return to christian foundations and the fundamentals of the faith while others in Christendom were falling away into human creeds and traditions. The Restoration Movement is both historically and theologically more fundamental than the Fundamentalists. Alexander Campbell said, in 1842, "The Bible alone must always decide every question involving the nature, the character or the designs of the Christian institution."

It is true, historically, that in the 1920's the Restoration Movement was invaded with the same deadly liberalism which had ravaged the rest of Christendom. And it is true that there were some faithful and courageous christians who fought the same battles as the "fundamentalists" were fighting. But it is also true that those same brave, Bible-believing christians in the Restoration Movement had been battling for a return to the *real* fundamentals of the faith long before the liberalism of the 1920's.

SECOND CORINTHIANS

Theologically

Most analysts of the phenomenon called "fundamentalism" characterize it by its five great fundamental doctrines: (1) the infallibility of scriptures; (2) the virgin birth of Christ; (3) his substitutionary atonement; (4) his bodily resurrection; (5) and his visible second advent. The most important of these five is the issue of the infallibility of scripture. James I. Packer, in his book, *Fundamentalism and the Word of God*, 1958, gives a brief definition of the fundamentalist concept of infallibility:

. . . the teaching of the written Scriptures is the Word which God spoke and speaks to His Church, and is finally authoritative for faith and life. To learn the mind of God, one must consult his written word. What Scripture says, God says. The Bible is inspired in the sense of being word-for-word God-given. It is a record and explanation of divine revelation which is both complete and comprehensible; that is to say, it contains all that the church needs to know in this world for its guidance in the way of salvation and service, and it contains the principles for its own interpretation within itself.

When this fundamental is granted (the inspiration, infallibility and authority of the scriptures) the other doctrines of fundamentalism, as originally stated, follow as a matter of course. "We," (of the conservative elements of the Restoration Movement) have no difficulty believing in the five great tenets of early Fundamentalism. In hundreds of Christian Churches throughout this land and the world we would find no deviation from these basic beliefs. Conservative Restorationists should have no reservations about being classified as "fundamentalists" within the tenets just stated. In fact, some of us would classify *obedience* to the gospel terms proclaimed on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:38) and the *unity* of all believers on the basis of the apostolic word (John 17:20-21) as fundamentals.

However, the inclination of present-day Fundamentalists to add to this body of basics, and to be dogmatic regarding their additions, presents a problem to many in the Restoration Movement. Ronald H. Nash, in his book, *The New Evangelicalism*, deplors the tendency of contemporary fundamentalists to reduce the Christian message to one of salvation alone, to the concept of religious faith as something

separate from everyday life, and the depreciation of scholarship in all fields. To these should be added their dogmatic approach to dispensational eschatology and their insistence on a "latter day" pentecostalism or outpouring of miraculous gifts of the Spirit. Carl F.H. Henry speaks of the temperament and attitude of modern fundamentalism as one of the main factors leading to its being discredited. He speaks especially of the attitude of rancor and negation often found in representatives of the movement:

By some fundamentalism is considered a summary term for theological pugnaciousness, ecumenic disruptiveness, cultural unprogressiveness, scientific obliviousness, and/or anti-intellectual inexcusableness. By others, fundamentalism is equated with extreme Dispensationalism, pulpit sensationalism, excessive emotionalism, social withdrawal, and bawdy church music. (*What Is This Fundamentalism?* by Carl F.H. Henry, 1956, p. 303.)

Contemporary fundamentalism's most conspicuous theological aberration seems to be dispensational-premillennialism. Some fundamentalists of great stature rejected dispensationalism. Reuben A. Torrey came to recognize it as faulty hermeneutics. G. Campbell Morgan also rejected it, saying, "I am quite convinced that all the promises made to Israel have found, are finding, and will find their perfect fulfillment in the Church. It is true that in the past, in my other expositions, I gave definite place to Israel in the purpose of God. I have now come to the conviction that it is the new spiritual Israel that is intended."

Nevertheless, dispensationalism is a widely *influential* position within contemporary American fundamentalism. Millard Erickson says in his book, *Contemporary Options in Eschatology*, 1977, pp. 109-110:

Because the rise of dispensationalism roughly paralleled that of the fundamentalist movement, it became virtually the official theology of fundamentalism. Some commentators have practically identified the two. Some proponents of dispensationalism consider it to be not an interpretation of the Bible, but simply a restatement of what the Bible says. Some have made it a test of orthodoxy, regarding one who fails to hold all of its points as one who denies Scripture itself. In many cases a whole mind set or collection of attitudes is involved. . . . For the dispensa-

SECOND CORINTHIANS

tionalist . . . the truth of the dispensational system implies the truth of pretribulationism, and the falsity of pretribulationism implies the falsity of dispensationalism. For such a person, then, an attack upon pretribulationism appears to be an attack upon the whole Christian system of belief. His entire Christian experience has been associated with this way of believing, and even conditioned to particular terms and expressions. . . . We must therefore bear in mind that their sense of religious security is bound up with what appear to them to be essentials of Christianity.

Many dispensational premillennialists are so thoroughly convinced their eschatological system is essential to loyalty to Christ, they have excommunicated dissenters or categorized them as apostates. All sorts of anathemas have been pronounced upon non-premillennialists:

- a. "The real hypocrites of our day are those who turn their backs on the real message of our day, the Second Coming of our Lord . . . Scripture indicts ministers and pastors who refuse to investigate the signs of the time leading to Christ's return, and warn the unsaved to prepare, as being ignorant, hypocrites, and false prophets. 1974-1978 - Jewish Temple rebuilt; 1981-1985 Beginning of the Tribulation; 1997-2001 - The Beginning of the Kingdom Age." (*The Gospel Truth*, pub. in Oklahoma City, OK)
- b. "Israel is invincible unless God is vulnerable." (from a church paper of one of our Christian Churches)
- c. "Opposition to premillennialism had its rise in the attackers of true Scriptural doctrine. . . ." (*The Millennial Kingdom*, John F. Walvoord, p. 39)

James Barr writes in his book, *Fundamentalism*, "The forecasting of the end comes to be the central preoccupation, and other things fall into the background . . . Millennial interest is also a dangerous threat to the unity of evangelicals: millennial schemes are many, and quarrels among their adherents are often bitter."

Clearly, the Restoration Movement's conservative brotherhood would be "fundamentalist" in its theology if *early* fundamentalism is our touchstone. Perhaps our Restoration Movement is *more* fundamental than the Fundamentalist!

But we must, for the most part of our Movement, disclaim the reductionism, the dogmatism, and the hermeneutical aberrations of contemporary fundamentalism's theology.

ARE WE FUNDAMENTALISTS?

For those interested in further study of the relationship of the Restoration Movement to Fundamentalism and/or Evangelicalism, I strongly urge the reading of Dr. Jack Cottrell's address cited earlier in this essay. Dr. Cottrell forms this conclusion:

I have suggested that this (Evangelicalism) is a theological position which the central stream of the Restoration Movement should and can share, with profit and without compromise. This is not a call for organic union with any evangelical bodies. This is not necessarily a call for overt cooperation with other evangelicals in any kind of projects. Indeed, such cooperation is impossible in some areas without compromising our plea. For instance, any cooperative effort which presupposes a common view of the nature of the church, and common view of the way of salvation (or which takes our differences as a matter of indifference) is a compromise of the Restoration Plea and must be avoided. In other areas, however, such cooperation is possible and even advantageous. This is true especially in areas relating to apologetical interests.

Let me conclude this presentation with an exhortation Bro. R.C. Foster made to the Cincinnati Bible Seminary chapel audience on November 11, 1958:

The Cincinnati Bible Seminary arose amid the wreckage of our older educational institutions, and our missionary organizations. The silence of pacifism had fallen like a pall upon the restoration movement. Many feared to proclaim the plain commands of the Gospel lest they offend their denominational friends. They feared to speak of the apostasy of the great organizations of the restoration movement, of the unbelief that sat in the high places, lest they be dubbed controversialists, and the heavy hand of the hierarchy be raised against them . . . then it became evident that unless a dynamic generation of preachers would be produced, men who believed and were able to defend the Gospel against all attacks, men who knew and could meet the critical issues at hand, then the extinction of the restoration movement is in sight. . . . If the student body of this institution once allows itself to be seduced by such ideas as this, then the curse of half-hearted pacifism will descend even upon the Seminary.

Let us here, today, resolve we shall not relax our faith in and our proclamation of the fundamentals of the "faith once for all delivered."