

This month's articles  
from TRUTH MAGAZINE  
Box 403, Marion, Indiana

May, 1976

Vol. 16/No. 5

## Public Reaction to Pesky Bus Ministry!

Raymond E. Harris

Box 915  
Florence, Alabama 35630



During the past couple years we have heard a great out pouring of pros and cons concerning the "Bus Ministries." It seems to be a subject most church members feel rather strongly about. They are either strongly in favour or utterly against the church bussing programs. This has caused no little stir within churches all across the country.

However, until now we were uncertain as to public reaction. Now we are beginning to learn that the general public is not nearly as excited about church bussing programs as the bus promoters would have us believe.

Recently negative reaction caught on in Bloomington, Indiana, where a number of letters came in to the newspaper editor. That was followed by newspaper articles revealing various problems with "candy giving bus drivers." In an article entitled "Evangelists Sour Tulip Tree Parents on Sweet Religion," Alan Kinney of the *Bloomington Herald Telephone*, reports the following:

Parents for years have instructed their children never to accept a ride or candy from strangers. But some parents at the Tulip Tree Apartments (I.U. married housing) complain they have a harder job because of the methods some area churches employ to get children to ride their buses on Sunday mornings.

"Just last Saturday morning I heard a man tell one of the kids to be sure to come to church tomorrow and check out all the free gum and candy. I'm trying to teach my daughter not to take anything from strangers, but they're not making my job easier," said a mother at Tulip Tree.

Another mother said that she had seen a bus parked in the circle drive at Tulip Tree every Saturday morning all summer.

"They waited for children to walk past the bus, and then one of the men jumped out of the bus, shook hands with all of the kids, and gave them candy and gum. My kids are cavity prone, and this man isn't helping my husband or myself with the dentist bills. Why should he be allowed to give my children candy in the first place?"

The Reverend Oliver Rogers, minister of the North Central Church of Christ, 2121 N. Dunn, said his church has an active bus program at the Tulip Tree Apartments. He said he saw nothing wrong with giving the children "little gifts as a reward for coming to church." This practice was never meant to entice the children to ride the bus, he said.

"We place brochures under the doors at the Tulip Tree Apartments inviting children to come to the free puppet show in our bus," Rogers said. "When the show is over, we always try to have a little gift for the children."

"We are having a contest on our buses where the bus director, Joe Bernhardt, is offering the child that brings the most visitors a small radio. This is merely for incentive purposes, the same incentive a businessman would receive to do a better job," Rogers said.

"I took my children to the puppet show that had Ernie and the Cookie Monster from Sesame Street. We were notified of this by a note under the door and the note said nothing to the effect that this was church-oriented. I think it is deceitful to use something a child loves to push religion down their throats," another mother said.

The Reverend Herbert Hull, minister of the First Assembly of God, 801 Matlock Road, said area churches compete for children, but the children also compete to ride on certain buses.

"We have what we call a McDonalds Sunday, where we take the children to McDonalds for a treat after church. Many times we've heard of children riding our bus rather than a different bus because we were going to McDonalds, and the other churches were only giving out bubble gum," he said.

From the foregoing interviews it is obvious that many of the parents up and down church bus routes resent the bus ministries intrusion into their family affairs. Little children are gullible enough to want to accept candy and gum anywhere they can get it. However, older children and adults are perceptive enough to spot the religious con of reward motivation. It would be interesting to know the average age of the bus riders, how many are baptized and what percentage stick. If all those facts could be viewed 10 years from now in the light of bussing costs for 10 years, it would be interesting to know how many will still call bussing an "Expedient."

# Come study with us.

# The Mormons and Polygamy

John McCort

802 N.E. 62nd Street  
Gladstone, Missouri 64118



One of most glaring discrepancies in Mormon doctrine is their position on polygamy. Over the years their position on polygamy has changed like the colors on a chameleon. They try to give the impression that their position has never changed on this particular subject. History does not bear that fact out.

The original Mormon position was that polygamy was sinful. The *Book of Mormon* scathingly condemns polygamy in no uncertain terms,

"But the word of God burthens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold, thus saith the Lord: This people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the Scriptures, for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son. Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord . . . Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: For there shall not any man among you have save it one wife; and concubines shall he have none; for I the Lord God delight in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me, thus saith the Lord of hosts" (Jacob 2:23, 24, 27, 28).

The original *Doctrines and Covenants* likewise rebuked the practice of polygamy,

"Inasmuch as this church of Christ has been reproach with the crime of fornication, and polygamy: we declare that we believe, that one man should have one wife; and one woman, but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again" (*Doctrines and Covenants*, Section 101:4, 1835 edition.).

This section was included in every edition of the Utah *Doctrines and Covenants* until 1876. In 1876 Section, 101 was removed and Section 132, which allows polygamy under certain circumstances, was inserted.

"David also received many wives and concubines, and also Solomon and Moses my servants, as also many others of my servants, from the beginning of creation until this time; and in nothing did they sin save in those things which they received not of me. David's wives and concubines were given unto him of me, by the hand of Nathan . . . And in none of these things did he sin against me save in the case of Uriah and his wife" (*Doctrines and Covenants*, 132:38-39, 1876).

The contradiction between the *Book of Mormon* and the 1876 *Doctrines and Covenants* is unmistakable. "Behold, David and Solomon truly had wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me" (Jacob 2:24). Compare that with, "David also received many wives and concubines . . . and also Solomon . . . and in nothing did they sin" (*Doctrine and Covenants* 132:28-29). How can the Mormons explain deleting Section 101 from the original *Doctrines and Covenants*, since the *Doctrines and Covenants* are supposed to be inspired? How can they reconcile what the *Book of Mormon* says on polygamy

and what the revised *Doctrines and Covenants* say?

The early leaders of the Mormon movement officially favored polygamy. Joseph Smith had approximately 44 wives, some of which were joined to him by "celestial marriage." Brigham Young, who succeeded Joseph Smith as President of the Latter Day Saints church, stated that if any denied the scripturality of polygamy they would be damned:

"Now if any of you will deny the plurality of wives, and continue to do so, I promise you that you will be damned; and I will go still further and say, take this revelation, or any other revelation that the Lord has given, and deny it in your feelings, and I promise that you will be damned" (Brigham Young, "Journal of Discourses", Vol. III, p. 266. Delivered July 14, 1855).

Orson Hyde, a later president of the Latter Day Saints church, stated,

"The revelation of the almighty from God to a man who holds the priesthood, and is enlightened by the Holy Ghost, whom God designs to make and ruler and a governor in his eternal kingdom, is, that he may have many wives, that when he goes yonder to another sphere he may still continue to perpetuate his species, and of the increase of his kingdom and government shall be no end . . ." (Orson Hyde, "Journal of Discourses", Vol. II, p. 85. Delivered October 6, 1854).

This same Orson Hyde declared that *Jesus* was a polygamist,

"We say it was Jesus Christ who was married (at Cana to the Marys and Martha) whereby he could see his seed before he was crucified." (Apostle Orson Hyde, Sermon 3). "If all the facts were written, we, no doubt, would learn that these beloved women were his wives" (*The Seer*, p. 159).

Their position makes Christ not only a polygamist but a fornicator. The *Book of Mormon*, in no uncertain terms, states that polygamists are fornicators and whoremongers. The Mormon position forces them to take the position that Jesus was married. (The Bible never mentions Jesus' being married.) They take the position that in order to enter into the "celestial kingdom" (the highest of the heavenly kingdoms), an individual must be married. They suddenly discovered that Jesus couldn't go to the celestial kingdom because He wasn't married. They had to invent this story about Jesus' being married and having children to get him into the celestial kingdom. In the process they made him a fornicator.

The Mormon churches now teach that polygamy is sinful. Either they must repudiate Brigham Young as a prophet, or they must concede that they will be damned as Brigham Young stated. (My guess is that both alternatives are true.) They have been guilty of blatant dishonesty by telling people that their position has never changed. The polygamy issue certainly is a millstone around their neck.

# The First and Second Comings of Christ

Roy E. Cogdill

439 Cypress Drive  
Panorama City  
Conroe, Texas 77301



The mission of Christ into the world was fully accomplished. He will not be reincarnated to dwell on Earth. He will come a second time to award salvation to them that wait for Him.

For four thousand years the world looked forward to the Coming of Christ. It was heralded by all the prophets as the hope of the race. Every event in Old Testament history was made to converge into the design of His Coming. It was the event of supreme importance. Any doctrine, the consequences of which make the Lord's first coming a failure, is pernicious, and cannot be ignored as some are wont to do.

We want in this article to contrast the Lord's first coming in both manner and purpose with what the Bible has to say concerning His second coming. The text suggesting the basis for such a contrast is Hebrews 9:27-28: "And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment; so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him unto Salvation."

## The First Advent

Our text declares that Christ "was once offered to bear the sins of many." This is the foundation of the Gospel of Christ. Paul preached that Christ died for our sins, "According to the Scriptures." God's law had been violated. Death was required as a penalty. Christ died in our stead. That is the doctrine of atonement.

The scriptures declare that Jesus came into the world to *destroy the works of Satan*. "To this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil" (1 John 3:8). The destruction of the works of the Devil was the very purpose of Christ's first coming. Premillennialism teaches that Christ will come again to accomplish that purpose. A mighty carnal war will be waged by him at the time of His second appearance, in their scheme, for the purpose of accomplishing what he came the first time to do, viz., put down Satan, destroy his works, and establish His Kingdom. That means that he failed to accomplish this at the time of His first advent; that instead of conquering he was conquered, and instead of being exalted and crowned in His ascension to the Father, He went home in defeat and humiliation. What other conclusion can such a doctrine have?

That is not all. Christ came into this world and was made flesh and blood in order "*To bring to naught him that had the power of death, that is, the devil*" (Heb. 2:14). Premillennialism teaches that He will triumph over Satan and bring him to naught, at His second

## A WORD OF EXPLANATION

We have been running behind schedule with the REFLECTOR for some time now. This was caused by a series of events over which we could not possibly have controlled. We are now in the process of trying to "catch up". Since the most time consuming part of this operation is type-setting. We are clipping and pasting good articles from other publications. We plan to do this for another issue or two. Besides, saving time, we just happen to think that other folks can write "jis as good as we'uns" can. We hope you profit from these articles.

We have some excellent material on hand from some good writers, materials that has not appeared elsewhere, that we plan to publish as soon as we get back on our schedule. Hutto, Keith, Maples and your editor will be back with their regular columns. Bob Waldron has submitted an excellent series. Others have promised articles. Look for them. —Ed

coming; again proving that they regard the first advent of the Lord a failure. Such consequences cannot be overlooked, nor excused with any regard for truth.

The Bible not only declares that Christ came into the world to "destroy the works of the devil" and to "bring Satan to naught" but, according to the Scriptures, he succeeded in accomplishing this. Paul declares in Col. 2:15 that He "despoiled the principalities and the powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it," and in Eph. 4:8 he said "when He ascended on high, He led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men."

Jesus said: "But no one can enter the house of the strong man, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man." Jesus came to destroy the works of Satan (1 John 3:8). This he could not do without binding Satan (Mark 3:27). He accomplished his purpose (Col. 2:15). Therefore Satan, the strong man, was bound. Satan has only the power and privilege that is yielded to him. "Each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed" (James 1:14). "Resist the Devil, and he will flee from you" (James 4:7). We have indeed been delivered from Satan's power and bondage to sin.

The second coming of Christ will be "to them that wait for him unto salvation" (Heb. 9:27). His promise is, "I will come again to receive you unto myself, that where I am ye may be also" (John 14:3). When He comes again, "even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him. . . then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thess. 4:14-17).

We shall not know Christ after the flesh again for "though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more" (2 Cor. 5:16). He will not, therefore, return to dwell in the flesh. Concerning His first coming, Paul says, "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the *likeness of sinful flesh* and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." But in sharp contrast, of his second coming he declares that Christ "shall appear a second time, *apart from sin*." Those words can have no meaning if Christ comes back in the flesh to dwell on earth (*The Gospel Guardian*, February, 1936).

If you change your address, please notify us.

## The Influence of Christ

Cecil Willis

4867 N. 300 E.  
Marion, Indiana 46952



No being who has ever existed upon this earth has so influenced every facet of life, and every culture, as has the meek and lowly Jesus of Nazareth. Even the most blatant infidel has to recognize His coming. Every time he dates a letter or a legal document, he tacitly admits to the existence and magnitude of Christ. More books have been written about Him than about any other being who lived upon this earth. Five thousand new books were written regarding Him last year. The berating infidel has some concept of morality. Yet there is no way whatsoever for him to say that one "ought" to do this or that, or that one "ought not" to do this or that, except as this "oughtness" relates to the will of Jesus and His Father, God Almighty. Had Jesus never lived, nor the will of God never been revealed, rationalistically speaking, there could be no standard of morality.

Jesus made exalted claims for Himself. He said that "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (Jno. 14:9). He claimed equality with God (Jno. 5:17,18). He claimed to be the promised Messiah, "the Son of the Blessed" (Mk. 14:61-64). The worst charges that could be brought against Him were that He loved sinners, and ate with them (Matt. 9:10-13). But this charge He readily admitted, for His purpose in coming to earth was to "seek and to save that which was lost" (Lk. 19:10). Jesus challenged his enemies to convict Him of any sin (Jno. 8:46). He accepted worship from a leper (Matt. 8:2); from a ruler of the synagogue (Matt. 9:18); and from a blind man (Jno. 9:35-38). Yet this same Jesus taught that only Deity was to be worshipped (Jno. 4:23,24). He claimed that the shedding of His blood would bring remission of sins (Matt. 26:28; Matt. 20:28). It was said of him that "Never man so spake" (Jno. 7:46). Many were astonished at His teachings (Mk. 7:37; Lk. 2:47). His works were equally as astonishing (Lk. 5:26).

Is it any wonder that this Divine Being in the flesh, who brought salvation within the grasp of all, who lived sinlessly, who was the world's greatest teacher both in manner and message, and who wrought such wonders, signs, and mighty works should so influence men and their lives and literature? This author could never put into more eloquent language the influence of Christ than has already been done by far superior writers. Hence, this article will be closed by three classic quotations about the influence of Christ.

Under the heading, "Jesus, the Perfect Man," C. P. J. Mooney on December 22, 1911, wrote in the *Com-*

*mercial Appeal* of Memphis the following impressive lives. A line or two of this piece might be objectionable to you, just as I would have written a few of the statements differently. Though written in 1911, the content of this article is as fresh as the contents of tomorrow's newspaper.

### Jesus, The Perfect Man

"There is no other character in history like that of Jesus.

"As a preacher, as a doer of things, and as a philosopher, no man ever had the sweep and the vision of Jesus.

"A human analysis of the human actions of life that is amazing in its perfect detail.

"The system of ethics Jesus taught during His earthly sojourn 2000 years ago was true then, has been true in every century since and will be true forever.

"Plato was a great thinker and learned in his age, but his teachings did not stand the test of time. In big things and in little things time and human experience have shown that he erred.

"Marcus Aurelius touched the reflective mind of the world, but he was as cold and austere as brown marble.

"The doctrine of Confucius gave a great nation moral and mental dry rot.

"The teachings of Buddha resulted in mental and moral chaos that makes India derelict.

"Mohammed offered a system of ethics which was adopted by millions of people. Now their children live in deserts where once there were cities, along dry rivers where once there was moisture, and in the shadows of gray, barren hills where once there was greenness.

"Thomas Aquinas was a profound philosopher, but parts of his system have been abandoned.

"Francis of Assisi was Christlike in his saintliness, but in some things he was childish.

"Thomas A. Kempis' *IMITATION OF CHRIST* is a thing of rare beauty and sympathy, but it is, as its name indicates, only an imitation.

"Sir Thomas More's *UTOPIA* is yet a dream that cannot be realized.

"Lord Bacon writing on chemistry and medicine under the glasses of the man working in a twentieth century laboratory is puerile.

"The world's most learned doctors until a hundred and fifty years ago gave dragon's blood and the ground dried tails of lizards and shells of eggs for certain ailments. The great surgeons a hundred years ago bled a man if he were wounded.

"Napoleon had the world at his feet for four years, and when he died the world was going on its way as if he had never lived.

"Jesus taught little as to property because He knew there were things of more importance than property. He measured property and life, the body and soul, at their exact relative value. He taught much as to character, because character is of more importance than dollars.

"Other men taught us to develop systems of government; Jesus taught so as to perfect the minds of men. Jesus looked to the soul while other men dwelled on material things.

"After the experience of 2000 years no man can find a flaw

in the government systems outlined by Jesus. Czar and Kaiser, President and Socialist, gave to its complete merit their admiration.

"No man today, no matter whether he follows the doctrine of Mills, Marx or George as to property, can find a false principle in Jesus' theory of property.

"In the duty of a man to his fellow no sociologist has ever approximated the perfection of the doctrine laid down by Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount.

"Not all the investigation of chemists, not all the discoveries of explorers, not all the experience of rule, not all the historical facts that go to make up the sum of human knowledge on this day in 1912 are in contradiction to one word uttered or one principle laid by Jesus.

"The human experience of 2000 years shows that Jesus never made a mistake. Jesus never uttered a doctrine that was true at that time and then became obsolete.

"Jesus spoke the truth; He lived the truth, and truth is eternal.

"History has no record of any other man leading a perfect life or doing everything in logical order.

"Jesus is the only person whose every action and whose every utterance strike a true note in the heart and mind of every man born of woman. He never said a foolish thing, never did a foolish act and never dissembled.

"No poet, no dreamer, no philosopher loved humanity with the love that Jesus bore toward all men.

"Who, then, was Jesus?

"He could not have been merely a man, for there never was a man who had two consecutive thoughts absolute in truthful perfection.

"Jesus must have been what Christendom proclaims Him to be—a divine being—or He could not have been what He was. No mind but an infinite mind could have left behind those things which Jesus gave to the world as a heritage."

### The Incomparable Christ

Another great piece of literature regarding the influence of Christ has been passed down through the ages. I wish I knew the author's name so that I might give him credit for a wonderful composition. But unfortunately, I have only seen it attributed to the prolific writer, Mr. "Selected."

"He came from the bosom of the Father to the bosom of a woman. He became the Son of man that we might become sons of God. He put on humanity that we might put on divinity. He left the region where the rivers never freeze, winds never blow, frost never bites, flowers never fade; where there are no undertakers, no doctors needed, because no one is ever sick; where graveyards never haunt, death never comes, and where no funerals are never conducted.

"He was born contrary to the laws of nature, was reared in obscurity, and lived in poverty; only once did he ever cross the boundaries of his own small country; he had no wealth or influence, training or education, and his parents knew nothing of the niceties of social traditions.

"In infancy, he startled a king; in boyhood, puzzled the wise; in manhood, ruled the course of nature.

"He healed the multitudes without medicine, and made no

charge for his services. He never wrote a book, yet all the libraries of the world could not contain all the books that could be written about him.

"He never wrote a song, and yet he has provided the themes for more songs than all earthly writers combined.

"He never founded a college, yet all the schools of earth have not had the students that sat at his feet.

"He never practiced medicine, yet has healed more broken hearts than the world has ever taken note of.

"He never marshalled an army, never drafted a soldier, or fired a gun, yet no leader has ever had the volunteers, who, under his orders, made rebels stack arms and surrender to his command, never firing a shot.

"He is the Star of astronomy, the Rock of geology, the Lamb and Lion of zoology, the Harmonizer of all discords, and the Healer of all diseases.

"Great men have come and gone; He lives on. Herod could not kill him; Satan could not seduce him; death could not destroy him; and the grave could not hold him.

"He laid aside his purple robe for a peasant's gown. He was rich but for our sakes became poor, that we might be rich. How poor? Ask Mary? Ask the wise men? He slept in another's manger; rode another's ass; he was buried in another's tomb. All others have failed; he never. The ever perfect one, the chief among ten thousand; altogether lovely."

### One Solitary Life

Yet the most beautiful piece, though much briefer, is attributed by some to Phillips Brooks. It was a favorite piece to Brother Luther Blackmon, and I often have heard him recite it, with great emotion upon himself and upon his hearers. Others have attributed this literary gem to James A. Francis. Perhaps some literary specialist will inform us as to its genuine authorship. But it is a beautiful description of the influence of Jesus, regardless of who wrote it.

"Here is a man who was born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He worked in a carpenter shop until he was 30, and then for three years he was an itinerant preacher. He never held an office. He never owned a home. He never wrote a book. He never had a family. He never went to college. He never put his foot inside a big city. He never traveled 200 miles from the place where he was born. He never did one of the things which usually accompany greatness. He had no credentials but himself.

"While he was a young man, the tide of public opinion turned against him. His friends ran away. He was turned over to his enemies. He went through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed to a cross between two thieves. While he was dying, his executioners gambled for the only piece of property he had on earth, and that was his coat. When he was dead, he was laid in a private grave through the pity of a friend.

"Nineteen wide centuries have come and gone, and today he is the central figure of the human race and the leader of the column of progress.

"I am far within the mark when I say that all the armies that ever marched, and all the navies that were ever built, and all the parliaments that ever sat, and all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life of man upon this earth, as that One Solitary Life."

# Titles of Jesus

Irvin Himmel

305 Glen Ridge Ave.  
Temple Terrace, Florida 33617



Jesus Christ is the central figure of the Bible. He is God's gift to man and Man's only hope. The Old Testament pointed to His coming. Virtually every line of the New Testament helps to portray Him. There is little danger of our over magnifying Him. To know God we must know Jesus (Matt. 11:27). To receive God we must receive Jesus (Matt. 10:40). To love God we must love Jesus (John 8:42; 16:27). To come to God we must come to Jesus (Matt. 11:28; John 14:6). To obey God we must obey Jesus (Matt. 7:21,24; Heb. 5:9). To honor God we must honor Jesus (John 5:23).

Names and titles are meaningful in the Scriptures. The personal name given to the Son of God is significant. Many titles are applied to Him in the Sacred Writings, and we need to know their meaning that we might honor Him more fully. A "name" is a word or phrase that distinguishes and identifies; it is that by which something is marked and known. Adam gave names to the cattle, fowl of the air, and beasts of the field in Gen. 2:19,20. There are common and class names. For example, "apple" is the name of a certain class of fruit. There are proper and personal names. "Golden Delicious" is the name of a particular variety of apple. "Man" is the name of a class of creatures. "Sam Smith" is a proper name used by a man for personal identity.

A "title" is an appellation of rank, office, dignity, or honor. "Gerald Ford" is the personal name of the man who currently occupies the White House in Washington, D.C. He wears numerous titles, such as "President of the United States," "Chief Executive," and "Commander-in-Chief." We have no problem in understanding the difference between this man's name and the titles that reflect his office, rank, and position.

## The Name Jesus

The personal name worn by our Lord was chosen and announced prior to His birth. When the angel Gabriel was sent to Mary, a virgin, to announce that she would bear a child, the heavenly messenger spoke these words: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name *Jesus*" (Lk. 1:31). Later, when Joseph realized that his espoused wife was pregnant, supposing that she had played the harlot, he was thinking of putting her away privately. But the angel of the Lord informed him that she was with child of the Holy Spirit, "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name *Jesus*: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21).

This divinely-chosen name is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew name "Joshua." It signifies that "salvation is

of Jehovah." Like many other personal names in the Bible, it has doctrinal meaning. Consider, for example, the name "Joel" which means "Jehovah is God," or the name "Malachi" which means "my messenger." The personal name chosen for our Lord is appropriate. Since the name "Jesus" is not altogether uncommon, it is sometimes given clarification by the addition "Jesus of Nazareth" (John 18:5; Acts 2:22) or "Jesus of Galilee" (Matt. 26:29).

## Master

The title "Master" often was applied to Jesus during His earthly ministry. Six Greek words translated "Master" can be used as titles for Jesus. Two of these mean "Lord" and that title will be considered later, so I now mention the other four.

(1) *Didaskalos* is used in such passages as Matt. 19:16; Mk. 4:38; and Lk. 12:13. It is rendered "teacher" in John 3:2. Thayer says it means "... One who teaches concerning the things of God, and the duties of man." It sometimes refers to the teachers of the Jews' religion and is translated "doctors" in Lk. 2:46 in the King James Version. It is applied to John the Baptist in Lk. 3:12. It describes Christians as instructors in Heb. 5:12. Because He was recognized as a teacher, Jesus was addressed by this title on numerous occasions.

(2) *Rabbi* is sometimes translated "Master" (John 9:2; Matt. 26:49), but in some cases it is not translated (John 6:25). Thayer says it means "... *My great one, my honorable sir* ... a title with which the Jews were wont to address their teachers (and also to honor them when not addressing them ...)." It is interpreted as *didaskalos* in John 1:38. Like *didaskalos*, we find it applied to John the Baptist (John 3:26). Both *didaskalos* and *rabbi* were used by the Jews in reference to their teachers.

(3) *Epistates* is the word for "Master" in Lk. 5:5 and 17:13. Vine defines it as "a chief, a commander, overseer." According to Thayer, it means "*Any sort of superintendent or overseer*," and it was used by the disciples when addressing Jesus, not because He was a teacher, but because He had authority. Interestingly, this Greek word for "Master" is used only six times and is limited to the book of Luke. The *Pulpit Commentary* suggests that it may have been used in Luke's writing because it would have been better understood by the Gentile reader than *didaskalos* or *rabbi*. It is interesting to compare Mk. 4:38 which uses *didaskalos* and Lk. 8:24 which uses *epistates*. Perhaps the disciples used both words when addressing Jesus, or Luke may have used the latter as a kind of synonym for the former to portray to Greek readers (Theophilus and others) the authority of Jesus as a teacher.

(4) *Kathegetes* is used exclusively in Matt. 23:8,10 and translated "Master." It means a leader or guide. Albert Barnes says, "It refers to those who go before others; who claim, therefore the right to direct and control others. This was also a title conferred on Jewish teachers."

Jesus was "Master" in the sense of Teacher, Rabbi, Overseer, and Guide during His ministry. It appears that



these titles were regarded as inadequate following the ascension, so titles expressing Deity are more common after His exaltation. Vine remarks, "The primitive community never ventured to call Jesus 'Our Teacher' after He had been exalted to the Throne of God. The title *rabbi*, expressing the relation of the disciple to the teacher, vanished from use . . ."

### Lord

*Kurios* is the commonly-used word for "Lord" and appears in every book of the New Testament except Titus and the epistles of John. It has several general and customary usages, four of which I now mention.

(1) It often means the possessor or owner of a thing. The householder who hired laborers to work in his vineyard is called "lord of the vineyard" (Matt. 20:8). He was what we think of today as a landlord. In Gal. 4:1, Paul reasoned that the heir, as long as he is a minor, is no different from a servant, though he be (potentially) "lord of all." Ownership is the idea.

(2) It sometimes means a master in the sense of one to whom some kind of service is due. At Philippi, Paul and Silas found a damsel who "brought her masters much gain by soothsaying" (Acts 16:16). Jesus pointed out that no man can serve "two masters" (Matt. 6:24). The two masters or lords to which he was referring are God and riches.

(3) In some cases it means a ruler. When Paul appealed to Caesar, Festus was troubled that he had no certain thing to write to his "lord" (Acts 25:26). The "lord" to which he made reference was the Emperor. Jesus is called "Lord of lords, and King of kings" (Rev. 17:14). This means that He rules over all earthly rulers.

(4) It can be used as a title of respect and courtesy. In this sense Sarah called Abraham "lord" (1 Pet. 3:6). It is translated "Sir" in several passages. For example, the jailor at Philippi addressed Paul and Silas as "Sirs" (Acts 16:30). It was in this sense that Saul of Tarsus called Jesus "lord" before knowing His identity. "Who art thou, Lord?" (Acts 9:5).

*Kurios* was used by the Jews in a special sense to honor Jehovah. This title is applied frequently to Jesus in the New Testament. Although Jesus could be called "Lord" because He is our Owner, having purchased our redemption, or as Master deserving our service, or as Ruler over us, as His Deity was revealed the title took on deeper meaning. Vine suggests that the title "Lord" in its full significance "rests upon the resurrection." There is certainly more to it than a mere expression of courtesy. When Thomas exclaimed, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28), he was acknowledging Lordship in the highest sense.

### Messiah and Christ

*Messias* is the Hebrew word for "anointed" spelled as if a Greek word; anglicized, it is "Messiah." It is used in the New Testament only in John 1:41 and 4:25. Translated into Greek it is *Christos*; into English, "Christ." "Messiah" and "Christ" are identical in meaning.

In Old Testament days the priests were anointed with

a special anointing oil (Ex. 30:22-30; Lev. 4:3). Kings were anointed, also. Saul was anointed by the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. 10:1). David, though threatened by Saul, always respected Saul as "the Lord's anointed" (2 Sam. 1:14-16). David was anointed on three separate occasions (1 Sam. 17:13; 2 Sam. 2:4; 5:3). Since it was foretold that Israel's Savior would be both King and Priest (2 Sam. 7:11; Zech. 6:13), the Jews came to think of Him as "the Anointed One" to come. This is the background for the well-known title "Messiah."

Jesus is called "Christ" in such familiar passages as Matt. 16:16; 22:42; 26:63; John 1:19,10; and many others. Sometimes the title appears immediately after the personal name, hence "Jesus Christ" (Matt. 1:18; Acts 8:12; Eph. 2:20). Sometimes the title appears just before the personal name, therefore "Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1; 1 Cor. 4:15; Eph. 2:13). Sometimes the title "Lord" appears before the personal name and the title "Christ" immediately after, so we find "Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1; 1 Cor. 15:57; 2 Tim. 4:2). Jesus is truly the Christ, the Anointed One of God.

### Savior

The title "Savior" means deliverer or preserver. It is sometimes applied to God (Lk. 1:47; Tit. 3:4), but it is fitting for Jesus as the author of our salvation. Many Samaritans acknowledged Jesus to be "the Christ, the Savior of the world" (John 4:42). It is not uncommon to find several titles grouped together, such as "our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 3:18).

### Lamb of God

This is one of a number of metaphorical titles for Jesus. A metaphor is a term denoting one kind to suggest a comparison with another. Lambs were used for sacrifice under the law of Moses. Jesus is the "Lamb of God" because He is the sacrifice that God provided for us. John the Baptist honored Jesus with this meaningful title (John 1:29,36). Furthermore, it was prophesied that the Messiah would be led as a sheep to the slaughter (Isa. 53:7; Acts 8:32). Like the literal lamb that was suited for sacrifice, Jesus stood without blemish and without spot (1 Pet. 1:19). In the book of Revelation, Jesus is symbolized as the "Lamb" about thirty times. Note especially Rev. 5 and 13:8.

These are but a few of the many titles applied to Jesus in the Bible. These and other titles clearly reveal the concept that first-century disciples had of Him. Many of these disciples knew Him personally; some saw Him following the resurrection; they had firsthand information. Our efforts to honor Jesus should be greatly enhanced by studying these appellations of office, rank, and dignity. "To him be glory both now and forever. Amen."

## TIME

SPENT IN BIBLE STUDY  
\*Stimulates Spiritual Growth  
\*Motivates Self-Expression  
\*Illuminates the Mind

Irvin Himmel

305 Glen Ridge Avenue  
Temple Terrace, Florida 33617

## So You are Satisfied with Your Baptism!

Most denominations teach and administer some kind of an act which they call baptism. In some cases, the truth is set forth about the action of baptism but not about its design. Some do not follow the New Testament regarding either the action or design.

A lot of folks have submitted to denominational baptism (whatever kind or purpose), and it is hard for them to see why they need to be baptized in the name of the Lord. When attempts are made to teach them, a familiar response is, "Well, I am satisfied with my baptism."

The fact that someone is satisfied with his baptism does not prove that it is right. (Some are satisfied with their condition without anything that is even called "baptism.") The important question is not, 'Am I satisfied?' The vital question is, 'Have I satisfied God?'

### Sprinkling and Pouring

Some preachers pour a dash of water on a person's head, or it may be a mere sprinkle, and they call that action baptism. The person who has submitted to sprinkling or pouring may say, "I am satisfied with my baptism."

God is not satisfied with sprinkling and pouring. How do I know? I know, not because I am playing God or sitting in judgment, but because His word plainly says we are "buried" in baptism (Rom. 6:3-5; Col. 2:12). We cannot substitute an action of our own choosing for that which God has prescribed and expect to find approval with Him.

### John's Baptism

Paul found some men at Ephesus who had been baptized (Acts 19:1-5). They were perfectly satisfied with their baptism until Paul raised some questions. He correctly made them dissatisfied so they would want to obey the Lord. Their problem was not in the kind of action to which they had submitted; they needed teaching on the purpose of baptism.

Paul's questions brought the admission that these people had been baptized unto John's baptism. John baptized for the remission of sins (Mk. 1:4). He taught the people to believe on the Christ who would come after John. Paul explained the difference between this baptism and that commanded by Jesus (and which is New Testament baptism). The result: "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord."

Some men of the twentieth century would have argued with Paul, "That is not enough difference to amount to anything. I am satisfied with my baptism." Fortunately, the men at Ephesus did not so reason.

### Common Misconceptions

A lot of people think they have been baptized "for the remission of sins" when the fact is that they have not. Some think baptism is essential to salvation but only in the same sense that one must partake of the Lord's Supper or perform some other duty to please God. They do not understand that sins are washed away by Christ's blood **when** one is baptized, and not before baptism.

Some denominations make baptism essential to membership (in that denomination) but deny that it is essential to salvation. This kind of baptism is an institutional act, a denominational baptism, not the baptism taught in the New Testament. One who has submitted to such baptism may be satisfied with it, but where is the scriptural evidence that God is satisfied with it?

### The Purpose of Baptism

If one knows that baptism is designed to put him into Jesus Christ in order that he might obtain remission of sins, why would he submit to baptism into a denomination which teaches salvation before and without baptism? Foy E. Wallace, Jr., writing on the purpose of baptism, put it this way: "If one is baptized into the Baptist church, he is not baptized into Christ, because Christ is not in the Baptist church and the Baptist church is not in Christ. If he is in it, one might be baptized into it and get into him; or if it is in him, one might be baptized into him and get into it. But he is not in it, and it is not in him, therefore no one can be baptized into him and get into it, nor be baptized into it and get into him" (*Torch*, Nov.-Dec., 1950, p. 28).

New Testament baptism is not designed to put one into a false religion. If one has been baptized into a man-made religion, a denomination, or a cult, he has not been baptized for the purpose taught in the Bible. Baptism is "for (unto) the remission of sins" or to "wash away" sins (Acts 2:38; 22:16). Remission is found in Christ, not in a denomination, therefore we are "baptized into Christ" (Gal. 3:27). Furthermore, we are "baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13). That one body is the church of Christ, not a denominational body (Col. 1:18). And the body of Christ is not the lumping together of all the denominations!