

**A Bible-Believer's Critique of**  
**H.A. Ironside's**  
**Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth**

By Eric Neumann

Copyright 2015

### **Copyright note**

Ironside's article is quoted in its entirety for the purposes of criticism and comment. Such quotation is allowed under the "fair use" rule governing copyright materials, as outlined in the 1961 *Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law*.

### **Contact the author**

The author may be contacted at [Bibledivider@gmail.com](mailto:Bibledivider@gmail.com)

## **Introduction**

The following is an article by H.A. Ironside regarding the dangers of Acts-28 dispensationalism. Eric Neumann has analyzed this article and provided his comments in bold. The comments appear as a parenthetical reference right after the material that is being commented on. H.A. Ironside is an Acts-2 dispensationalist, while Eric Neumann does not subscribe to either of these views. He is a Bible believer, who accepts the Bible as his final authority over all else.

For the most part, Ironside's paper, although written a few generations ago, contains the basic tenants and arguments of fundamental Christianity today against Bible believers. By reading Eric's comments, you will see the immense difference that exists between what God's Word says and what Christianity teaches. This difference exists because Christianity mostly contains human viewpoint with scripture taken out of context to support what man says, in contrast to believing the Word of God. As such, Jesus' critique of the Pharisees applies today: "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition" (Mark 7:9).

Eric's comments should instruct readers to take the Bible as their final authority, believe it over what anyone says, including the most respected Biblical scholars and pastors around, and rightly divide the Word of truth (II Timothy 2:15). By saying that the present dispensation began at Acts 2, rather than at Acts 9, Ironside, and mainstream Christianity, are "wrongly dividing the Word of truth," leading to many serious and false doctrinal positions that have made Christianity out to be hypocritical, leading the world into the pit of hell, rather than being "the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Timothy 3:15) that God called the church to be.



# Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth

ULTRA-DISPENSATIONALISM EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

by

H.A. IRONSIDE, Litt.D.

---

1. What is Ultra-Dispensationalism?.....	6
2. The Four Gospels and Their Relation to the Church.....	18
3. The Transitional Period – Is the Church of The Acts the Body of Christ?.....	42
4. When Was the Revelation of the Mystery of the One Body Given?.....	58
5. Further Examination of the Epistles.....	78
6. Is the Church the Bride of the Lamb?.....	92
7. Do Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Have Any Place in the Present Dispensation of the Grace of God?.....	112
8. Concluding Remarks.....	146

---



## CHAPTER ONE

### What is Ultra-Dispensationalism?

- "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

PAUL'S exhortation to the younger preacher, Timothy, has come home to many with great power in recent years. As a result, there has been a return to more ancient methods of Bible study, which had been largely neglected during the centuries of the Church's drift from apostolic testimony (**Note that the emphasis is placed on "apostolic testimony," when he should have said "the Church's drift from the truth of God's Word."**).

Augustine's words have had a re-affirmation: "Distinguish the ages, and the Scriptures are plain." (**We are not following Augustine in right division. Rather, we are following the words of our Lord Jesus Christ given to us through Paul. We are also following the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, who "rightly divided" Isaiah 61:1-3 between the two comings of the Messiah (see Luke 4:16-21).**) And so there has been great emphasis put in many quarters, and rightly so, upon the study of what is commonly known as "dispensational" truth. This line of teaching, if kept within Scriptural bounds (**In what way does the mid-Acts position go outside Scriptural bounds?**), cannot but prove a great blessing to the humble student of the Word of God who desires to know His will (**Paul said, "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things" (II Timothy 2:7). Therefore, I learn God's will in what Paul says in I Timothy 2:4: "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." I do not need to pray for hours on end until I receive an "unction of the Spirit" to go somewhere or do something for God. Rather, I trusted in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection in order to be saved (I Corinthians 15:3-4), and I consider what Paul says, which is to read God's Word rightly divided (II Timothy 2:15), in order to come unto the knowledge of the truth.**) or plan in His dealings with men from creation to the coming glory (**God's plan has already been accomplished through the crosswork of Christ. "It is finished" (John 19:30). God is just waiting for man to believe God in what He has already finished.**). A careful examination of the volume of Revelation shows that God's ways with men have differed in various ages. This must be taken into account if one would properly apprehend His truth.

The word "dispensation" is found several times in the pages of our English Bible and is a translation of the Greek word "oikonomia." This word, strictly speaking, means "house order." It might be translated "administration,"

"order," or "stewardship." **(Why appeal to the Greek? Why not just let the preserved word of God in English speak for itself in the King James Version?)** In each successive age **(Note how Ironside gives you the Greek definition of "dispensation," then he uses a modern Bible perversion by saying "age," which lends credence to the New AGE movement and to the use of new Bible versions.)**, God gives to men of faith a certain stewardship, or makes known to them a certain order or administration, in accordance with which they are responsible to behave **(I would argue that they are responsible to believe, not behave, since salvation is always by faith, regardless of the dispensation. Without faith, it is impossible to please God (Hebrews 11:6).)** A dispensation then is a period of time in which God is dealing with men in some way in which He has not dealt with them before. Only when a new revelation from God is given, does a dispensation change. **(Such occurred with Paul: "The gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Galatians 1:11b-12). "A dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me" (I Corinthians 9:17).)** Moreover, there may be degrees of revelation in one dispensation; all, however, having to do with a fuller unfolding of the will of God for that particular age **(Yes, there is progressive revelation from God within dispensations. But, how does Ironside distinguish between "a new revelation" and "degrees of revelation?")**. This was very definitely true in the dispensation of law, from Moses to Christ. **(How was the giving of the law a new dispensation when God had already started the nation of Israel in Genesis 12:1-3 and declared that "Israel is My son, even My firstborn" in Exodus 4:22? Since the law was just a continuation of the nation of Israel, we must say that the law is a degree of revelation within Israel's dispensation. Therefore, Ironside does not even get one sentence out without going against what he said in the previous two sentences.)** We have the various revelations: of Sinai, both the first and second giving of the law; then added instructions during the wilderness years; the covenant with David; and the revelations given to the prophets. The circumstances in which God's people were found changed frequently during this age of law, but the dispensation itself continued from Sinai until Jesus cried, "It is finished." **(How did Jesus end the dispensation of law at this time? He told His disciples "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do" (Matthew 23:2-3a) and "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:20a). Thus, Jesus told the disciples to obey the law, and to teach the Gentiles to obey the law after Jesus cried "It is finished." In fact, as late as Acts 21:20, we still see Jews following the law, as Jesus commanded them. "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law." Therefore, "it is finished" is not a reference to the Mosaic law. Rather, it is a reference to something much greater: the payment for sin has been made.)** It is important to have this in mind, otherwise the vast scope of an ever unfolding dispensation may be lost sight of, **(Apparently, Ironside did not**



**keep this in mind, because he thinks that God started a new dispensation with Moses, when God started Israel's dispensation with Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3 and continued that dispensation until Acts 9.)** and one might get the idea that every additional revelation of truth in a given age changed the dispensation, whereas it only enlarges it.

One may illustrate a dispensation in a very simple way, remembering that the word really means "house order," and I might add, the Greek word has been Anglicized, and we know it as "economy." **(No, I know the word "dispensation" as "dispensation" because that is what the Bible says it is. Ironside is trying to make you think that dispensations are made up by man, when the word is used 4 times in scripture (I Corinthians 9:17; Ephesians 1:10; Ephesians 3:2; Colossians 1:25). Note that the word is only used by Paul, because the big dispensational break between prophecy and mystery occurs with Paul's writings.)** Let us suppose a young woman whom we will call Mary, is going out into service. She obtains a position in a humble home belonging to a good family of the working class. There are certain rules governing that home which she must learn to observe. All perhaps is not plain to her at once, but as time goes on, she learns more and more fully the desires of her mistress. We will say she is to rise at five every morning and begin to prepare the breakfast and put up the lunches for those who go out to work. At six she is to ring the rising bell; at half-past six the family are supposed to be at the breakfast-table; and at seven they leave for work. Dinner of course is at a certain hour at night, and in the meantime she has her different duties to perform in keeping the house in order. She learns quite thoroughly the domestic economy of this particular home and becomes a well-qualified household servant. Now let us suppose that later on she finds that a cook and housekeeper is needed for the large mansion on the hill. She applies for the position and is accepted. Moving in, her mistress undertakes to instruct her in the economy of the new home, but Mary says, "You need not give me any instructions, Ma'am, I know exactly how a house should be run. Just leave it to me and everything will be attended to properly. I have had some years of experience in housekeeping and I would not have asked for the position if I did not know what was required." Her mistress is dubious, but, for the time being, acquiesces.

The next morning, the waking-gong sounds at six o'clock. The family, who are accustomed to banker's hours during the day and are given to very late hours at night, are astonished and chagrined at being aroused so early. The mistress calls down to the housekeeper, "What does this mean?" and learns that breakfast will be on the table in half-an-hour.

"Why, Mary," she exclaims; "we never breakfast here until half-past eight."

"But the breakfast is hot and the lunches are all ready, Ma'am."

"No one carries lunches in this home. You see, Mary, you do not

understand the arrangement here. I shall have to instruct you carefully today." And poor bewildered Mary learns the importance of dispensational truth!

The illustration, I know, is crude, but I think any one will see the point. God had one order for the house of Israel. There is another order for the house of God (**Is Ironside saying that the house of Israel is not part of the house of God, and that they do not have eternal life like we do? Is he also saying that Gentiles, in Israel's dispensation, are not saved? "House of God" is found 87 times in the Bible. 81 of these are in the Old Testament and only 1 mention is given in Paul's epistles. All saved people, including Israel, are part of the house of God. Better terms of distinction would be prophecy dispensation and mystery dispensation or Israel's program and the body of Christ.**), the Church of the living God today. There will be a different order in the millennial age, (**Where does Ironside get that there will be a different order in the millennial age? The millennial age is not a new dispensation, but it is a continuation of Israel's program. God told Israel under Moses that, "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Exodus 19:6). Then, in the millennial kingdom, God says that the Gentiles will call Israel "the Priests of the Lord" (Isaiah 61:6).)**) and there have been varying orders in the past.

All this comes out clearly in the pages of Holy Scripture, (**If it "comes out clearly in the pages of Holy Scripture," then why didn't Ironside give verses to support his statements, as I did with mine?**) and is certainly involved in the expression in our English Bibles, "rightly dividing the Word of Truth." Of course, this expression is not by any means to be limited to dispensational teaching. It also implies putting each great doctrine of the Word in its right place. (**If "each great doctrine of the Word" needs to be put "in its right place," what is its "right place" if it is not within dispensations? In other words, what other categories does Ironside have, that are included in "rightly dividing" that he is not telling us about?**) It has been translated, "cutting in a straight line the Word of Truth," that is, not confounding or confusing things that differ (**"Things that differ?" Is Ironside borrowing from Stam here? So, by Ironside's own admission, there are "things that differ" in scripture, and they must be put in their right place because different scripture are not always saying the same things. Yet, these "right places" are not dispensations, but are some other, abstract designation not divulged by Ironside.**). It even suggests the thought of honestly facing the Word of Truth. (**How does Ironside get "honestly facing the Word of Truth" out of "rightly dividing the Word of Truth?" These are two, completely different ideas. That is not to say that we should not honestly face the Word of Truth, but that idea comes from I Corinthians 13:12 and II Corinthians 3:18 and 4:6, not from II Timothy 2:15. Ironside thinks people will believe what he says just because he says it. He does not seem to need to support his ideas with scripture. But, we should ask**

**the question, “What saith the scripture?” (Romans 4:3.)**

It is right here then that we need to be careful, and not read into the Word of God ideas out of our own minds which are not really there. **(As I have pointed out, that is exactly what Ironside has done!)** Through doing this, some have ignored dispensational truth altogether. Others have swung to an ultra-dispensationalism which is most pernicious in its effect upon one's own soul and upon testimony for God generally. Of these ultra-dispensational systems, one in particular has come into prominence of late years, which, for want of a better name, is generally called "Bullingerism," owing to the fact that it was first advocated some years ago by Dr. E. W. Bullinger, a clergyman of the Church of England. These views have been widely spread through the notes of "The Companion Bible," a work partly edited by Dr. Bullinger, though he died before it was completed. **(All of the notes in the Companion Bible come from Bullinger. It's just that the latter part of the New Testament's notes were added after his death from Bullinger's other writings.)** This Bible has many valuable features and has been a help in certain respects to God's servants **(“Thou art no more a servant, but a son” (Galatians 4:7).)** who have used it conservatively, but it contains interpretations which are utterly subversive of the truth. **(Note that Ironside will only argue against an Acts 28 position, while ignoring the mid-Acts position that he was really opposed to. We should also note that, while Bullinger held to an Acts-28 position, most of Bullinger's notes in the Companion Bible have to do with cross references, alternate word meanings, and historical information, rather than being a defense of his Acts-28 position. Furthermore, most of Bullinger's writings support a mid-Acts position with the exception of his last work, “The Foundations of Dispensational Truth.” For example, his overview of Paul's epistles is outlined from a mid-Acts position.)** Some of Dr. Bullinger's positions are glaringly opposed to what is generally accepted as orthodox teaching, **(Just because a teaching is not orthodox does not mean it is not the truth.)** as, for instance, the sleep of the soul between death and resurrection; **(Yes, this is a false doctrine.)** and it is a most significant fact that while he did not apparently fully commit himself to any eschatological position as to the final state of the impenitent, most of his followers in Great Britain have gone off into annihilation, **(another false doctrine)** and there is quite a sect in America who began with his teaching who now are restorationists of the broadest type, teaching what they are pleased to call universal reconciliation, which to their minds involves the final salvation not only of all men, but of Satan and all the fallen angels. **(Another false doctrine. However, if you take the Bible as your final authority, you will reject all of these false doctrines.)** These two views, diverse as they are, are nevertheless the legitimate offspring of the ultra-dispensational system to which we refer.

The present writer has been urged by many for years to take up these questions, but has always heretofore shrunk from doing so; first, because of

the time and labor involved, which seemed out of all proportion to the possible value of such an examination; **(How is there little value to such an examination, if the doctrine Ironside is against is so contrary to the truth of God's Word for today? The real reason Ironside "shrunk from doing so" is because he was a mid-Acts dispensationalist until he realized he would have a bigger following if he changed to an Acts 2 position. For example, in Ironside's "Lectures on Colossians", page 57, he states that "a special revelation [was] given not to the twelve, but to [Paul], as the apostle of the new dispensation." He also states in "Mysteries of God", page 74, "to the epistles of Paul alone do we turn for the revelation of this mystery....Paul, as one born out of due time, was selected to be the messenger to the nations, announcing the distinctive truths of the present dispensation.")** and secondly, because of a natural shrinking from controversy, remembering the word, "The servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." **(That verse refers to being patient with ignorant brethren in your church. However, when church leaders are into false doctrine, it must be immediately and harshly dealt with. For example, when Paul saw Peter's error, Paul said, "I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Galatians 2:11). When Paul saw false doctrine being taught by Hymenaeus and Alexander, he delivered them "unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (I Timothy 1:20).)** But the rapid spread of these pernicious views and their evident detrimental effect upon so many who hold them, has led to the conclusion that it would be unfaithfulness to God and to His people if one refused to seek to give any help he could in regard to these teachings.

Briefly, then, what are the outstanding tenets of Bullingerism and its kindred systems? For one needs to remember that a number are teaching these ultra-dispensational things who declare that they are not familiar with the writings of Dr. Bullinger, and repudiate with indignation the name of "Bullingerism." There are perhaps six outstanding positions taken by these teachers:

First, inasmuch as our Lord Jesus was "a minister of the circumcision to confirm the promises made to the fathers," it is insisted that the four Gospels are entirely Jewish and have no real message for the Church, the Body of Christ. **(Jesus said, "Salvation is of the Jews" (John 4:22). Is that the message that Ironside wants us to tell people today? Why would we when Jesus tells us through Paul that TODAY "there is neither Jew nor Greek...in Christ Jesus?" (Galatians 3:28). There must have been a dispensational change since the gospels. Besides, Ironside stated that the dispensation of law went from Moses to Jesus' cry from the cross of "It is finished." If that is true, then, by Ironside's own admission, the gospels are not written to us today because they belong to the dispensation of law. Why does Ironside go to the trouble of an**

**illustration of “house order”, explaining what a dispensation is, and then he turns right around and is guilty of trying to follow instructions that, by his own admission, belong to a previous dispensation or house order?) All might not put it quite as boldly as this, but certainly their disciples go to the limit in repudiating the authority of the Gospels. (If the gospels belong to the dispensation of law but Ironside tries to apply them today, why, then, does Ironside repudiate the authority of the Levitical law? Does he keep from marring the corners of his beard (Leviticus 19:27)? Does he make sure his clothes are only made of one fiber (Leviticus 19:19)? If he touches a dead body, does he stay away from the temple for seven days and purify himself on the third day (Numbers 19:11-13)? Christians do not follow these laws, because they say that Christ did away with them. So, when we are told that Jesus Christ called Paul (Acts 9:15), revealed to him a gospel (Galatians 1:11-12), and made him the apostle of the Gentiles (Romans 11:13), we should come to the same conclusion not to follow the gospels because they have been replaced by Christ by the mystery given to Paul (Ephesians 3:1-6).)**

Secondly, it is maintained that the book of Acts covers a transition period between the dispensation of the law and the dispensation of the mystery; that is, that in the book of Acts we do not have the Church, the Body of Christ, but that the word "ekklesia" (church, or assembly), as used in that book, refers to a different Church altogether to that of Paul's prison epistles. This earlier Church is simply an aspect of the kingdom and is not the same as the Body of Christ! **(A church is merely a group of believers. Most people would say that the church started in Acts 2. However, Acts 7:38 tells us that the church existed in the wilderness back in Exodus. Therefore, the church started where there was a group of believers, which was WAY before Acts 2. Do not let Christianity fool you into believing that “the Church” is the same thing as “the Body of Christ.” “The Body of Christ” is a term that refers specifically to all believers in the current dispensation. The term appears four times in scripture (Romans 7:4, I Corinthians 10:16, I Corinthians 12:27, and Ephesians 4:12), and all of those appearances are in Paul’s epistles, because it did not exist until God started it with the apostle Paul. God started the Body of Christ with Paul in Acts 9, as “a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting” (I Timothy 1:16). But, this is not “a different Church altogether.” All believers are part of God’s church and kingdom. Whether a person is part of God’s earthly kingdom or God’s heavenly kingdom depends on the dispensation one is in, but they are all part of God’s “church” or eternal kingdom.)**

Third, it is contended that Paul did not receive his special revelation of the mystery of the Body until his imprisonment in Rome, and that his prison epistles alone reveal this truth and are, strictly speaking, the only portion of the Holy Scriptures given to members of the Body. All of the other epistles of Paul, save those written during his imprisonment and the general

epistles, **(Paul did not write any “general” epistles. Ironside wrongly attributes the writing of the book of Hebrews to Paul.)** are relegated to the earlier dispensation of the book of Acts, and have no permanent value for us, but were for the instruction of the so-called Jewish church of that time. **(This is the Acts 28 position. A mid-Acts position, which I hold, states that all of Paul’s epistles are written to us today. The gospel is not found in the prison epistles (Ephesians – Colossians), because they are advanced doctrine for saved people who have already learned doctrine found in Romans. So, those taking an Acts 28 view do not know how to be saved today.)**

Fourth, the entire book of Revelation has to do with the coming age and has no reference to the Church today. Even the letters to the seven churches in Asia, which are distinctly said to be "the things which are," are, according to this system, to be considered as "the things which are not," and will not be until the Church, the Body of Christ, is removed from this world. Then, it is contended, these seven churches will appear on the earth as Jewish churches in the Great Tribulation. **(The seven churches existed in John’s day, and so they were in existence at the writing of Revelation (near and partial fulfillment). They will also be in existence in the future tribulation (full and complete fulfillment). Revelation 1:1 says the Revelation is for “His servants.” Leviticus 25:55 says, “the children of Israel are servants; they are My servants.” Today, in the dispensation of grace, we are sons. Galatians 4:7 says, “Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son.” Therefore, Revelation is not written to us today, but it is written to Israel for after the rapture of the church.**

**Furthermore, an objective reading of the book of Revelation reveals that it is Jewish in nature. For example, Revelation 7:1-8 specifically lists the 12 tribes of Israel as being sealed. Revelation 21:12 says that new Jerusalem has “the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel” written on it. If it is written to us today, then God is only saving Jews today, and only Jews will be in the New Jerusalem. This goes against what Paul says in Romans 2:11 that “there is no respect of persons with God” in today’s dispensation of grace, because God has broken down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile (Ephesians 2:14). This middle wall of partition is back up in Revelation, which means Revelation must pertain to Israel’s program only, not to us today.)**

Fifth, the Body of Christ is altogether a different company, according to these teachers, from the Bride of the Lamb, the latter being supposed to be Jewish. **(Would not Christ’s body be different from His bride? Even the greatest idiots of our day know that a man’s body is different from a woman’s body. The term “body of Christ” is only found in Paul’s epistles. I Corinthians 12:27 says, “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” “Bride” is in the Bible 14 times, and all occurrences are outside of Paul’s epistles. Furthermore, Revelation 21 clearly states that the bride of the Lamb is New Jerusalem. Since its**

gates have “the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel” (Rev. 21:14), would not this make Israel “the bride of the Lamb”? In fact, Isaiah 62:4 says that God will marry the land of Israel. Therefore, the Biblical evidence supports Christ’s body being different from His bride, and that Christ’s body is comprised of saved people today, while His bride is comprised of saved Israel in Israel’s program.)

Sixth, the Christian ordinances (What are these “Christian ordinances,” and when were they given? I would assume he is referring to water baptism and the Lord’s supper. However, Paul said “Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (I Corinthians 1:17). Why, then, should we baptize when Christ said not to do it today? With regard to the Lord’s Supper, that practice continues today, and I Corinthians 11:17-34 gives rules for it, but we also see the Lord partaking of a supper with His disciples just before His death and He will partake with them again in the kingdom at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb. Therefore, even the Lord has supper with saved people from both dispensations.), having been given before Paul (Since they were both given in the gospels and those gospels, by Ironside’s own admission, belong to a previous dispensation, why would Ironside call them “Christian” and attempt to observe them today? For example, does Ironside obey the Mosaic law when a man was sick and becomes well in his church? Does he inspect the man and then kill a bird and a lamb in his church, among other things, as Jesus instructed the healed leper to have done in Matthew 8:4 in accordance with the law (See Leviticus 14:1-32)?) is supposed to have received his revelation of the mystery in prison, have no real connection with the present economy, and therefore, are relegated to the past, and may again have a place in the future Great Tribulation.\* (By saying that they are not relevant today, Ironside is trying to get his audience outraged at this position, because he is implying that those, who see the mystery dispensation, are saying not to follow what Jesus said. However, we do follow what Jesus said, because what Paul wrote came from the Lord Jesus Christ himself (Galatians 1:12; I Corinthians 14:37), which is even more authoritative than Matthew - John, because Jesus’ words in Paul’s epistles came from Jesus AFTER God had begotten Jesus as His Son (Acts 13:33) and made Him both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36), as opposed to what Jesus said in Matthew - John before He had triumphed over Satan’s forces through the cross (Colossians 2:15).)

\*As to this, these ultra-dispensationalists differ. Most of them reject water baptism entirely for this age. (Good for them!) All of them are not prepared to go so far in connection with the Lord’s Supper, but many of them repudiate it too. (I do not see why they repudiate the Lord’s Supper, in light of I Corinthians 11:17-34, but they certainly should repudiate the cruel mocking of the Lord’s Supper that most churches observe with a bite of cracker and a sip of grape juice. I will say more on this later.)

Besides these six points, there are many other unscriptural things **(By saying “other” unscriptural things, Ironside implies that the first six points are unscriptural, as well. Yet, I have quoted many scriptures to show that my views are backed up by scripture. Where are Ironside’s quotes of scripture to prove his points?)** which are advocated by various disciples who began with these views and have been rapidly throwing overboard other Scriptural teachings. Many Bullingerites boldly advocate the sleep of the soul between death and resurrection, the annihilation of the wicked, or, as we have seen, universal salvation of all men and demons, the denial of the eternal Sonship of the Lord Jesus Christ, and, gravest of all, the personality of the Holy Spirit. **(A mid-Acts position does not support these doctrines, as they are all false. No position should be abandoned just because some people stray from the truth of God’s Word to believe corrupt doctrine. By Ironside’s argument, then, we should abandon the whole Bible, because most churches twist God’s Word to fit their fleshly desires.)** All of these evil doctrines find congenial soil in Bullingerism. Once men take up with this system there is no telling how far they will go, and what their final position will be in regard to the great fundamental truths of Christianity. It is because of this that one needs to be on his guard, for it is as true of systems as it is of teachers, "By their fruits ye shall know them." **(All “systems” of Christianity should be abandoned. Instead, we should follow God and His Word. That way, when a system strays from the truth of God’s Word, we will not be led astray by it. I am a dispensationalist because believing God’s Word requires me to recognize that God gave different instructions to different people for different time periods. In fact, scripture teaches that Jesus was also a dispensationalist. Luke 4:18-19 records Jesus reading Isaiah 61:1-2a, but He closes the book before finishing the rest of verse 2 and all of verse 3, because He recognizes that the latter part of the passage will not be fulfilled until a later time. Therefore, Jesus “rightly divides” between His first and second comings. I use the term “dispensationalist,” because the Bible uses that term, not because some man uses it. I Corinthians 9:17 specifically says, “a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me.” I use the term “the mystery,” because that is also a Bible term, as Romans 16:25 says that Paul preached “the revelation of the mystery.” I do not learn the things of God by reading commentaries, studying the original languages, reading the early church fathers, or using a hermeneutical system. Rather the system I use is the one that God set up. That system is that, once I trusted in the finished work of Christ for eternal life, God gave me the mind of Christ (I Cor. 2:16), and the Holy Spirit, Who teaches me the things of God as I read and believe the scripture (I Corinthians 2:9-14). Since the Holy Spirit is the teacher and, “by their fruits ye shall know them,” the fruit that comes from believing the Bible is “love,” etc. (Galatians 5:22). So, forget Bullingerism and Ironsidism and believe God and His Word instead.)**

Having had most intimate acquaintance with Bullingerism as taught by



many for the last forty years, I have no hesitancy in saying that its fruits are evil. **(I do not defend Bullingerism. I defend God's Word, which is what Ironside is really attacking. Ironside just likes to label his attack as one against Bullingerism. That way, he is attacking a man-made system, rather than attacking God Himself and His Word.)** It has produced a tremendous crop of heresies throughout the length and breadth of this and other lands, it has divided Christians and wrecked churches and assemblies without number; it has lifted up its votaries in intellectual and spiritual pride to an appalling extent, so that they look with supreme contempt upon Christians who do not accept their peculiar views; and in most instances where it has been long tolerated, it has absolutely throttled Gospel effort at home and sown discord on missionary fields abroad **(The Acts 28 position does have its problems, but it is closer to the truth than an Acts 2 position. The Acts 2 position, of which Ironside is a proponent of, does not have a clear, gospel message, because Acts 2:38 says that you must repent and be baptized in order to be saved, yet I Corinthians 1:17 says that Christ did not send Paul to baptize, but to preach the gospel. By putting both Acts 2:38 and I Corinthians 1:17 in the same dispensation, Acts 2 people do not even know how to be saved. They also take the "great commission" of Matthew 28:19-20 to apply to themselves today, so that they have excuses to be missionaries. There are two problems with this: 1) This commission was put on hold by the dispensation of grace, as the apostles of Israel's dispensation readily agree to confine their ministry to saved Jews only (Galatians 2:9), and 2) The gospel of Matthew 28:20 is to teach the Gentiles the Mosaic law. It does not contain the message of Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for sins. Since Acts 2 dispensationalists do not preach a clear, gospel message, they follow the Pharisees by compassing "sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold the child of hell than yourselves" (Matthew 23:15).)** So true are these things of this system that I have no hesitancy in saying it is an absolutely Satanic perversion of the truth. **(As just shown, an Acts 2 position "is an absolutely Satanic perversion of the truth." In fact, Paul says that those preaching it are ministers of Satan (II Corinthians 11:13-15), and they are to be accursed for preaching a false gospel (Galatians 1:6-9).)** Instead of rightly dividing the Word, I shall seek to show that these teachers wrongly divide the Word, and that their propaganda is anything but conducive to spirituality and enlightenment in divine things.



## CHAPTER TWO

### **The Four Gospels and Their Relation to the Church**

HOWEVER they may differ in regard to minor details of their various systems, practically all ultra-dispensationalists are a unit in declaring that the four Gospels must be entirely relegated to a past dispensation (in fact, according to most of them, they are pushed two dispensations back), and, therefore, are not to be considered as in any sense **(A common misconception of right dividers is that, by rightly dividing the Word of truth, we throw away all scripture that does not belong to our current dispensation. That is utterly false! The reason people think this is because Christians, who are not right dividers, do this with everything written outside of Matthew – Acts and Hebrews – Revelation. However, just because scripture is not written directly to us does not mean that we should discard it. II Timothy 3:16-17 says that “ALL scripture is ... profitable.” I Corinthians 10:6 and 10:11 tell us that what happened with Israel in the wilderness is written for our examples and ensamples to learn from, not to directly apply to us today. Therefore, we read the Old Testament and learn from it, but we do not need to follow God’s commands in the Old Testament, because they are not written to us. Christians will immediately object to my last statement. To my objectors I ask, were you saved by building an ark, like Noah was? Of course not, because God did not command you to do so, even though He did command Noah in the Bible to do so.)** applying to this present age. **(If Ironside is applying Matthew – John to today, is he telling everyone to sell what they have (Luke 12:33), keep the law of Moses (Matthew 23:1-3), which includes circumcision for males, an animal sacrifice in the temple for the firstborn son, and the ceremonial purification of a woman after childbirth (Luke 2:21-24), be water baptized for salvation (Mark 16:16), and endure unto the end in order to be saved (Matthew 10:22)? By contrast, Paul says, “ye are not under the law, but under grace” (Romans 6:14), “neither circumcision availeth any thing nor uncircumcision” (Galatians 6:15), and we have now received the atonement (Romans 5:11), instead of receiving it at Jesus’ second coming (Acts 3:19-21). Since ALL of God’s Word is true (John 17:17), we must recognize the distinct ministry given to Paul as being directly applicable today, while not directly applying Matthew – John today. Otherwise, the Bible contradicts itself and is not God’s Word, since God cannot lie (Titus 1:2; Hebrews 6:18).)** It is affirmed with the utmost assurance that the Gospels are wholly Jewish. **(Absolutely! Jesus said, “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 15:24), and “salvation is of the Jews” (John 4:22). Jesus told the 12 apostles, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 10:5-6). Therefore, I have the**

**utmost assurance from the gospels themselves that they are wholly Jewish. By contrast, Ironside presents no scriptural proof that they are not wholly Jewish.)** Inasmuch as we are told in the Epistle to the Romans (15:8), that "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers," the position is taken that the records of the Evangelists deal solely with this phase of things, and that there is nothing even in the utterances of our Lord Himself in those books that has any special place for the present dispensation. **(Note how Ironside goes to Romans for the proof text without mentioning the proof texts I have given from the gospels themselves. If Ironside is correct that we should follow the red letters in Matthew – John, why doesn't he provide a few examples of Jesus' utterances in Matthew – John that apply today? Jesus said, "the meek...shall inherit the earth" (Matthew 5:5). But, Paul said, "our conversation is in heaven" (Philippians 3:20). Jesus talked about God's earthly kingdom, while Paul talks about God's heavenly kingdom. Thus, we need to listen to the instructions Jesus Christ gave us today through the apostle Paul, rather than listening to the instructions Jesus gave to Israel, while on earth. I do not see Christians selling all that they have and having all things in common, as Jesus commanded (Luke 12:33), and as the disciples obeyed (Acts 2:44-47). Did Ironside take the proceeds from his books so that his church members could quit their jobs and live on his wealth? If not, he did not obey Jesus' command of "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven" (Matthew 19:21).)**

Yet a careful consideration of the very passage in which these words are found would seem to negative this entire theory and prove that it is absolutely groundless, for when the apostle is stressing true Christian behavior, he refers the saints back to the life and ministry of our Lord Jesus when here on earth. Notice the opening verses of Romans 15. We are told that the "strong should bear the infirmities of the weak, and not seek to please themselves, but that each one should have in mine the edification of his neighbor," having Christ as our great example, "who pleased not Himself, but of whom it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell on Me." **(Romans 15:1-7 is about the Romans following the example of Christ in that the Romans should have the mind of Christ in bearing the infirmities of the weak to strengthen them. However, Romans 15:8, which is the verse of Jesus Christ being the minister of the circumcision begins a new topic that goes through Romans 15:13. That topic is that, since Jesus Christ confirmed the promises made unto the fathers, then we should "abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost" (Romans 15:13). In other words, because Jesus Christ came and fulfilled God's law covenant with Israel, we, as members of the body of Christ, can have the confident expectation that God will also fulfill the promises made to us today in the dispensation of grace.)**

We are then definitely informed that not only what we have in the four Gospels, but what we have in all the Old Testament is for us, "for whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." **(Absolutely! Those "things were written aforetime...for our LEARNING." It does not say, "for our obedience." "All scripture...is profitable." (II Timothy 3:16) However, just because it is all PROFITABLE does not mean it is all directly APPLICABLE. If everything is directly applicable, I can pick up deadly snakes and drink poison without being harmed! Mark 16:18 "They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." More importantly, I can lay hands on the sick, and they will be healed. I know of no bonafide healer like this today. How, then, can we apply Mark 16:18 to today? And, if Ironside wants us to follow the Old Testament, does he make sure he does not wear clothing with mixed fibers (Leviticus 19:19), that he sacrifices animals (Leviticus 1), that he observes all of the feast days (Leviticus 23), and that he refrains from work on Saturdays (Exodus 20:8-11)? All scripture is profitable and for our learning, but it is not all for our obedience.)** Here there is no setting aside of an earlier revelation as though it had no message for the people of God in a later day simply because dispensations have changed. **(The mid-Acts position does not throw away all of the Bible except Paul's epistles. Rather, it considers what Paul says so that the Lord can give us understanding in the rest of the scripture, just like the Lord commanded us to do in II Timothy 2:7.)** Spiritual principles never change; moral responsibility never changes, **(Really? Then, why did God say to Israel, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them" (Deuteronomy 27:26), but He said to us today that He blotted "out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross" (Colossians 2:14)? Has Ironside built an ark to be saved from a worldwide flood like Noah? Has Ironside gathered up a group of Jews to go fight the Midianites like Gideon? Has Ironside taken a lifelong Nazarite vow to destroy the Philistines like Samson? These are things that God specifically commanded Noah, Gideon, and Samson to do, yet we recognize that they are not written for our obedience today. Why, then, won't Ironside recognize the same for the commandments that Jesus gave in Matthew - John when scriptural evidence says they were only for Israel in their program?)** and the believer who would glorify God in the present age must manifest the grace that was seen in Christ **(God's grace is being given eternal life, spiritual blessings, etc., that you do not deserve. God's grace was NOT seen in Christ's life, because Christ did not need it, since He lived a perfect life. The only thing God gave Christ that He did not deserve was God's wrath, not His grace!)** when He walked here on earth during the age that is gone. It is perfectly true that He came in exact accord with Old Testament prophecy and came under the law, in order that He might deliver those who were under the law from that bondage. **(How did Christ deliver Israel from the law? He told His**

disciples to obey the law (Matthew 23:1-3), and, as late as Acts 21:20, we see “thousands of Jews...which believe; and they are all zealous of the law.” If Jesus had eliminated the law for Israel, as Ironside claims, then they would not be zealous of the law, nor would Jesus have said, “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom” (Matthew 5:18-19). Ironside rightly sees that we are not under the law today based on Paul’s epistles (Romans 6:14), but the information in Matthew – John shows Israel still under the law, even after the cross.) He was in reality a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, not-observe-to fulfil at His first coming the promises made unto the fathers, but to confirm them. This He did by His teaching and His example. (“**The promises made unto the fathers**” was for Israel to rule and reign with Christ from Jerusalem over the Gentiles on earth. Jesus confirmed these promises would come to pass by dying on the cross so that God’s wrath would be poured out on Him, rather than on Israel, so that Israel may have eternal life in the kingdom. Thus, Jesus confirmed the promises made to Israel by His death and resurrection. His teaching and His example only showed His faith in the Father. They did not confirm the promises to Israel. Only the innocent, shed blood of the Lamb of God could do that (John 1:29).) He assures Israel even in setting them to one side, that the promises made beforehand shall yet have their fulfilment. (Wait a minute! Did Ironside just say that God set aside Israel? Ironside must not believe that God did that in Acts 2, because Peter preached in Acts 2 specifically to “ye men of Israel” (Acts 2:22) and gave them a chance for their sins to be remitted (Acts 2:38). When, then, did God set Israel aside? Would it not be in Acts 9 at the calling of Paul?)

But, observe, it is upon this very fact that the apostle bases present grace going out to the Gentiles, (Not so. The Old Testament quotes here are referring to the Gentiles being blessed on earth where Jesus is ruling with Israel over the earth. We see this from Romans 15:12. Paul’s subject is having “hope” (Romans 15:13) in the promises of God to the body of Christ so that they may walk in the Spirit. Thus, Romans 15:9-12 are OT quotes so that we may “abound in hope” (Romans 15:13), believing that God will “present...to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle” (Ephesians 5:27). This belief is based on the scriptural evidence in Israel’s program that was “written for our learning” (Romans 15:4) that God is faithful to complete what He started, as evidenced by the crosswork of Jesus.) for he adds in verse 9:

- "And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy; as it is written: For this cause I will confess to Thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto Thy name. And again He saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people. And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud Him, all ye people. And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a Root of Jesse, and He that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in Him shall the Gentiles trust" (vers. 9-12).

Here, while not for a moment ignoring that revelation of the mystery of which he speaks in the closing chapter, Paul shows that the present work of God in reaching out in grace to the Gentiles, is in full harmony with Old Testament Scripture, while going far beyond anything that the Old Testament prophets ever dreamed of, **(Exactly! That is what the mystery is all about. God promised eternal life in His kingdom on earth to Israel. That is all we see in the Old Testament. What was revealed to Paul, "in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs" (Ephesians 4:5-6). This is God's promise of eternal life in His kingdom in heaven to the body of Christ. This is in full harmony with Old Testament scripture, because God will still fulfill His promises of a kingdom to Israel (we are NOT spiritual Israel today), while it goes far beyond the Old Testament by revealing the mystery that God will also fill the heaven with the body of Christ.)** and then he adds:

- "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost" (ver. 13).

While there is a change of dispensation, there is no rude severing of Old Testament **(By Ironside's definition, Jesus is guilty of "rude severing of Old Testament...revelation" within the same dispensation, as He read Isaiah 61:1-2a and then closed the book before finishing the passage, showing that the first part applied to His first coming, while the second part applies to His second coming (see Luke 4:17-20). Jesus rudely severed Old Testament scripture in mid-sentence!)** or Gospel revelation from that of the present age. The one flows naturally out of the other, and the ways of God are shown to be perfectly harmonious. **(For Daniel's 70 weeks to be true (Daniel 9:24-27), there has to be a severing. The natural flow is no break whatsoever between the Messiah being cut off and the tribulation period beginning. Daniel 9:26-27 says the Messiah will be cut off, then the Antichrist comes, and then he makes a seven-year covenant with Israel, known as the tribulation period. History tells us there is at least a 2,000-year gap between the Messiah's being cut**

off and the Antichrist appearing on the scene. Thus, there must be a severing for God's Word to be true. Since Jesus had no problem stopping His Old Testament reading in mid-sentence, I have no problem with the 2,000-year break in Daniel.) This being so in connection with the Old Testament, how much more does the same principle apply in connection with the four Gospels. (II Timothy 2:7 says, "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." When we understand mystery doctrine given to Paul, we can now understand Old Testament and gospel passages in their full light. There was no way to understand this before the mystery was revealed to Paul. Since both prophecy and mystery programs are part of God's reconciliation plan, it is all connected, which means that, all scripture is connected with each other. That is why the Holy Spirit teaches you the things of God through cross referencing (I Corinthians 2:13). By saying that the gospels are more connected with Paul's epistles than the Old Testament is, Ironside shows that he is NOT connecting all scripture with each other. He cannot make this connection, because he cannot understand scripture, because he has not considered what Paul has said. Therefore, Ironside is guilty of the very thing he accuses his opposition of. At this point, we should also note that, just because man breaks up the Bible between Old and New Testaments, does not mean that is how God wants us to break it up. In fact, the new testament or covenant does not take place for Israel until Jesus' second coming (Jeremiah 31:31-34 and Acts 3:19-21). The way we "rightly divide" is not between Old and New Testaments, as that division has already been made for us, but it is between Paul's epistles and the rest of scripture.) While fully recognizing their dispensational place, and realizing that our Lord is presented in the three Synoptics as offering Himself as King and the kingdom of Heaven as such to Israel, (Matthew shows Jesus as king. Mark shows Him as servant, Luke shows Him as man, and John shows Him as God. Matthew, Mark, and Luke are similar, because they all show Jesus as man. John is so different because it shows Jesus as God.) only to meet with ever-increasing rejection, yet it should be plain to any spiritual mind that the principles of the kingdom which He sets forth are the same principles that should hold authority over the hearts of all who acknowledge the Lordship of Christ. (Mid-Acts dispensationalists are not, BY ANY MEANS, rejecting principles of the kingdom found in Matthew – John. Ironside keeps assuming that mid-Acts dispensationalists throw out the entire Bible except for Paul's epistles, when, in reality, it is Ironside who throws away all of the Old Testament and all of Paul's epistles. As mid-Acts dispensationalists, we recognize the INSTRUCTIONS the Lord Jesus Christ gives us today are found only in Paul's epistles. The same principles apply, but the instructions are different. For example, God commanded Israel to believe and be water baptized to be saved (Mark 16:16), but that does not mean that I am saved by water baptism. I am saved today by believing that God will save me by trusting in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for my sins (I Corinthians 15:3-4). The faith principle is the



**same in Matthew – John as it is today, but the instructions to follow to be saved are different.)** In John's Gospel the case is somewhat different, for there Christ is seen as the rejected One from the very beginning. It is in chapter one that we read, "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." Then based upon that, we have the new and fuller revelation which runs throughout that Gospel of grace, flowing out to all men who have no merit whatever in themselves. **(Where does Ironside come up with the idea that John is a “gospel of grace, flowing out to all men?” The book of John has Jesus saying, “salvation is of the Jews” (John 4:22). Regarding the mystery revelation given to Paul, he said that God has broken down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile (Ephesians 2:14), and that there is no difference between Jew and Gentile today (Romans 10:12).**

But in Matthew, which is preeminently the dispensational Gospel **(So, now Ironside is saying that Matthew is written to Israel for their dispensation, John is written to us today for our dispensation, and Mark and Luke are up for grabs?! So, I guess we can now ignore everything that Jesus said in Matthew, keep the parts of Mark and Luke that we like and discard the others, but be sure to follow John. Isn't this a “rude severing” of the Gospels? I do not think Ironside knows what he believes!),** the Lord is presented as the Son of David first of all. Then when it is evident that Israel will refuse His claims, He is presented in the larger aspect of Son of Abraham in whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed **(So, now Ironside is dividing the book of Matthew into two dispensations? He says that Jesus, as the Son of David, will rule over the nations on the earth, but Jesus, as the Son of Abraham, blesses all the nations, presumably in heaven. Yet, Genesis 12:1-3 says that God will make a great nation of Israel first. Then, the nations of the earth are blessed by blessing Abraham. Thus, the distinction between Israel and the Gentiles is fully seen in Genesis 12:1-3. In fact, we see the nations judged by Jesus Christ in Matthew 25:31-46, according to this standard. How, then, can Ironside apply Genesis 12:1-3 to us today, especially in light of Ephesians 2:14, which says that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile has been severed for us today? This shows a difference in treatment between Matthew and Ephesians. So, Ironside believes that Matthew 1-12 belongs to Israel's dispensation, while Matthew 13-28 belong to us today? I guess Ironside throws out the beloved “Lord's Prayer” and the “Sermon on the Mount,” because those are in the first 12 chapters of Matthew.)** The break with the leaders of the nation comes in chapter twelve, where they definitely ascribe the works of the Holy Spirit to the devil. In doing this, they become guilty of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, the crowning sin of that dispensation, **(Ironside needs to read Matthew 12 a little more carefully. Matthew 12:24 says that the Pharisees attributed the works of “THE SON OF MAN,” i.e., Jesus, to Satan. As such, they spoke “a word against the Son of man” (Matthew 12:32). He then warns them not to blaspheme the Holy Ghost in the**

future, because there is no forgiveness for that (Matthew 12:32). In fact, Jesus says in John 16:7 that He must ascend to the Father before the Holy Ghost is even sent. How could they have blasphemed the Holy Ghost, when He was not even there yet? Rather, the warning of Matthew 12:32 is that, when the Holy Ghost comes in Acts 2, if they reject His works at that time, as they rejected the Son of man's works, Israel will be set aside. So, the Holy Ghost works through the believing remnant of Israel in the first 7 chapters of Acts. Then, when Stephen, being full of the Holy Ghost, is stoned to death, Israel has blasphemed the Holy Ghost. Jesus, then, sets aside Israel's program and begins the dispensation of grace with Paul as "the apostle of the Gentiles" (Romans 11:13) in Acts 9.) which our Lord declares could not be forgiven either in that age or in the one to follow (Not "age", but "world", meaning this heaven and earth versus the new heaven and earth to come (Revelation 21:1). Most Bible scholars like to use the word "age," because it lends credence to the New Age Movement.) In chapter thirteen, we have an altogether new ministry beginning. The Lord for the first time opens up the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, revealing things that had been kept secret from the foundation of the world, namely the strange and unlooked-for form that the kingdom would take here on earth after Israel had rejected the King and He had returned to Heaven. (Jesus does no such thing with His kingdom parables. After all of the instructions Jesus gave His disciples, including the 40 days He spent with them after His resurrection, the last thing the disciples say to Him before His ascension is, "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6). Jesus' response is not: "You guys are a bunch of dolts! Before and after My death and resurrection, I carefully gave you parables to teach you that God's kingdom is not on earth, but is in some strange unlooked-for form in the hearts of men until I come back. And, now, after all of that, you still think the kingdom is going to be restored to Israel?" No, instead Jesus says, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons" (Acts 1:7). Jesus does not address the issue of the kingdom being restored to Israel, because the disciples clearly understand that the kingdom will, in fact, be restored to Israel. He only addresses the issue of when this will take place.) This is set forth in the seven parables of that chapter, and gives us the course of Christendom during all the present age. (These seven parables tell the disciples what the kingdom of heaven is like. In fact, Jesus starts five of the parables by saying, "the kingdom of heaven is like" (Matthew 13:31, 33, 44, 45, and 47). Why would Ironside twist the word of God to say the parables give "the course of Christendom during all the present age," when Jesus plainly says that the parables relate to the kingdom of heaven? Also, the Gospels are entirely Jewish in nature and the dispensation of the gospel of grace is a mystery hidden from the foundation of the world until Paul's day. Paul says, "How that by revelation He made known unto me the mystery; which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men" (Ephesians 3:3,5). Paul also says, "My gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the

revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began” (Romans 16:25). By contrast, what Peter proclaimed in Acts 3 was something “which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began” (Acts 3:21). Therefore, if, in Matthew 13, Christ spoke of the seven stages that Christianity would go through, He never told Peter, because Peter was preaching the same old message that had been preached since the world began. Also, Christ must have lied to Paul, when He said He revealed a mystery to him that was never before revealed to man. Therefore, Matthew 13 does not reveal any stages of Christianity. Rather, Christ is speaking to the kingdom dispensation with its promises of Israel ruling and reigning with Christ in God’s eternal kingdom on earth. In other words, Christ has identified the believing remnant of Israel and is giving them the mysteries of the kingdom “because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but to them it is not given” (Matthew 13:11).

As a rule, the ultra-dispensationalists would ignore all this **(Thank God for that! One would be extremely confused about scripture if they followed Ironside.)** and push these seven parables forward into the tribulation era after the Church, the Body of Christ, has been taken out of this scene. **(These parables make perfect sense in the tribulation period. How does Ironside make them make sense in “the course of Christendom during all the present age?”)** But this is to do violence to the entire Gospel and to ignore utterly the history of the past 1900 years. **(Ironside is doing violence to God’s plan as revealed in scripture by selfishly trying to take God’s kingdom from Israel and give it only to the body of Christ.)** Just as in Revelation two and three we have an outline of the history of the professing Church presented under the similitude of the seven letters, so in Matthew 13 we have the course of Christendom in perfect harmony with the Church letters **(I would like to see Ironside attempt to prove this statement.)**, portrayed in such a way as to make clear the distinction between the Church that man builds and that which is truly of God **(So, what is this clear distinction learned solely from Matthew 13?)**. In chapter sixteen of Matthew's Gospel, the Lord declares for the first time that He is going to build a Church or assembly. **(Acts 7:38 says that “the church” existed in the wilderness with Moses. Wherever there are believers in what God has told them, there is a church. It did not start with Jesus.)** This assembly is to be built upon the Rock, the confession of the apostle Peter that Christ is the Son of the living God. **(The Rock is not Peter’s confession. Rather, the Rock, according to I Corinthians 10:4, is Christ. If the church is built upon “the Rock [of] the confession of the apostle Peter,” then that Rock fell before Jesus’ crucifixion when Peter “confessed” 3 times that He did not know Jesus. Sounds to me more like shifting sand than a rock.)** How utterly vain it is to try to separate this declaration from the statement in the Ephesian Epistle **(We do not have to separate these verses, because God has already separated them by putting them in different books with 8**

**books in between. Also, we can see these are different churches, because Jesus gave Peter the authority to keep people out of the kingdom (“Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven” Matthew 16:19.), while Paul says that the offer of eternal life in the body of Christ is “unto all and upon all them that believe” (Romans 3:22.)** where we read,

- "Now therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (2:19-22). **(The two passages show a different foundation. “This rock” of Matthew 16:18, upon which Christ will build His church, is Christ (I Corinthians 10:4). “The foundation,” in Ephesians 2:20, is the apostles and prophets with Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. This foundation is the doctrine that Jesus Christ gave to the apostle Paul, confirmed by the prophets of his day (I Corinthians 14:37) to be the word of God with Christ’s shed blood and resurrection being the chief corner stone of the building.)**

Here in the preeminent prison epistle of which so much is made by the Bullingerites, you find that the Church then in existence is the Church our Lord spoke of building when He was here in the days of His flesh **(If they are one and the same, then let us not forget the next verse of Matthew 16:19, which says that Peter has the power to forgive sins. If this passage is connected to Ephesians 2, then every pastor of every church has the power to keep people out of God’s kingdom. We see Peter exercising this power when Ananias and Sapphira are struck dead in the church for lying to the Holy Ghost (Acts 5:1-10). If this happened today, most Christians would have been killed by now, starting with the crooked pastors!).** The discipline of that Church is given in Matthew 18:15-20:

- "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to bear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and

whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." **(While the principle for dealing with a habitual sinner remains the same today, the ability to bind and loose in heaven and earth is not given to us today in the mystery dispensation. Jesus told Peter in Matthew 16:18-19, "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Also, today, it does not take 2 or 3 gathered in Christ's name for Him to be with us. He is with us individually at all times with His indwelling Holy Spirit.)**

In Matthew sixteen you have the assembly as a whole, comprising all believers during the present dispensation. Here in chapter eighteen, you have the local assembly in the position of responsibility on earth, and its authority to deal with evil-doers in corrective discipline. The complete setting aside of Israel for the present age is given us in chapter 23:37-39, **(This is not "the setting aside of Israel for the present age." Just before His ascension, Jesus instructed His disciples to "be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). He did not say, "Just go to the Gentiles. I'm not going to save Israel any more." In Acts 2, Peter addresses his crowd as "ye men of Judaea" (Acts 2:14), "ye men of Israel" (Acts 2:22), and "let all the house of Israel know assuredly" (Acts 2:36). In reference to Israel, Paul asks the question, "Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid" (Romans 11:11). Romans 9:32-33 tells us that Israel stumbled at the cross. They fell at the stoning of Stephen. Then, God started the dispensation of grace with Paul, but God still had not set Israel aside, as God commissioned Paul to also preach to Israel: "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear My name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). Israel is not completely set aside by God until Acts 28. Israel stumbled at the cross, fell at the stoning of Stephen, and diminished away until Acts 28 (Romans 11:12) when Paul gave the proclamation: "Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it" (Acts 28:28). Yet, Ironside says "the complete setting aside of Israel" was done in Matthew 23 before the cross. Israel had not even stumbled at that point!)**

- "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killst the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy

children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

In the light of the words, "Your house is left unto you desolate," how amazing the presumption that would lead any to declare, as practically all these extreme dispensationalists do declare, that Israel is being given a second trial throughout all the book of Acts, **(Jesus said from the cross "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34). In saying this, Jesus is acknowledging that Israel crucified their Messiah out of ignorance (Acts 3:17). As such, they should get a second chance. Luke 13:6-9 tells of this second chance that Israel would get. This was for one year from Acts 2-7. If Israel was set aside at the cross, why would Jesus, AFTER the cross, instruct His disciples to be "witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea" (Acts 1:8)? Why would Peter tell Israel that they could be saved by repenting and being water baptized (Acts 2:38)? Instead, he would have said, "Too late. So sorry, so sad!" Also, we would not see thousands of Jews being saved in early Acts (Acts 2:41). Their house being left desolate simply means that Jesus has swept it clean by casting out the evil spirit that is there (Matthew 12:28-29). However, because of their unbelief, more wicked spirits will enter Israel (Matthew 12:43-45), culminating in the Antichrist sitting in the temple, declaring himself to be God (II Thessalonians 2:3-4).)** and that their real setting aside does not take place until Paul's meeting with the elders of the Jews after his imprisonment in Rome, as recorded in the last chapter of Acts. **(That is the Acts 28 position. I hold to an Acts 9 position. Israel's one-year grace period (Luke 13:6-9) ends with the stoning of Stephen. Psalm 110:1 says that Jesus would sit at His Father's right hand "UNTIL" God makes Jesus' enemies His footstool. Acts 7:55 says that Stephen saw Jesus STANDING at the right hand of God. This shows that He was standing to judge Israel (Isaiah 3:13). However, since Acts 7:60 says, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge," God extends grace to Israel again. God does put Israel's prophecy program on hold, beginning in Acts 9, with the call of apostle Paul, but Paul is supposed to go to the Jews, as well, with the new, mystery gospel (Acts 9:15; Romans 2:11). Israel stumbled at the cross and fell at the stoning of Stephen. They then diminished away from Acts 9 through 28 (Romans 11:11-12), during the dispensation of grace. Therefore, Israel's program is set aside with the stoning of Stephen in Acts 7, but Israel, as a whole, is not set aside until they reject the gospel of grace, given by the apostle Paul, for the final time in Acts 28:25-28. However, we should be careful to note that the mystery gospel began with the call of Paul in Acts 9, and it was the rejection of that gospel in Acts 28 that caused Paul to go to the Gentiles from then on. As such, no new dispensation began after Acts**

28.) The fact of the matter is that the book of Acts opens with the setting aside of Israel until the day when they shall say, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." **(Again, if this were the case, Jesus would not have told His apostles to go to Israel in Acts 1:8, and He would not have told Paul to go to Israel in Acts 9:15. Throughout Paul's ministry in the book of Acts, we see him go to the Jew first and then to the Greek. There would be no mention of going to the Jews if Israel had been set aside at the beginning of the book of Acts. Jesus' statement that Israel's house is left unto them desolate (Matthew 23:38) means that apostate Israel, which would be all those believing in the whole Jewish religious system of Jesus' day, will not be in the kingdom. They are the "generation of vipers" that cannot "escape the damnation of hell" (Matthew 23:33). However, the believers in Israel are called the little flock, and Jesus says of them: "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12:32).)** That is His second glorious coming. In the interval, God is saving out of Israel as well as of the Gentiles, all who turn to Him in repentance. **(Again, that dispensation did not start until the call of Paul in Acts 9. Regardless, I would use the term "faith," rather than repentance. Faith in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ is what brings salvation in the current dispensation of grace. "Repentance" is true, also, because it means a change of mind. However, most people think of it as turning from your sins, which is an impossible task for man to do, as Romans 7:18 says, "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing." So, instead of turning from your sins, "God commendeth His love toward us, in that, WHILE WE WERE YET SINNERS, Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8).)**

In Matthew twenty-four, we are carried on to the days immediately preceding that time when the Son of Man shall appear in glory, and we find the people of Israel in great distress, but a remnant called His "elect" shall be saved in that day.

I pass purposely over chapter twenty-five as having no particular bearing on the outline, **(Perhaps Ironside does not want you to see the judgment of the Gentiles in Israel's program in Matthew 25:31-46. Otherwise, you may see that there are two programs of God: 1) Israel (prophecy), and 2) Body of Christ (mystery). Or, maybe he does not want you to see the two parables about the kingdom of heaven in Matthew 25:1-30 and wonder, "How do these parables fit in with the seven parables about the kingdom of heaven in Matthew 13? Are there really nine stages in the course of Christendom in the present age, instead of seven?")** because a careful consideration of it would take more time and space than is here available. **(How is Ironside limited by space? Seems like a pastor of a megachurch, such as his, would be able to afford supplying him with enough paper to complete his writing.)** The closing chapters give us the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and then the commission of His apostles. People who have never investigated Bullingerism and its

kindred systems will hardly believe me when I say that even the great commission upon which the Church has acted for 1900 years, and which is still our authority for world-wide missions, is, according to these teachers, a commission with which we have nothing whatever to do, that has no reference to the Church at all, and that the work there predicted will not begin until taken up by the remnant of Israel in the days of the Great Tribulation. **(Not just “according to these teachers,” but according to the Word of God, as well. As mentioned previously, Jesus commissioned His disciples to spread the gospel in Israel first (Acts 1:8). Since “ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come” (Matthew 10:23), Jesus Himself tells us in the pages of scripture that they were not to reach the Gentiles with the gospel until after Jesus’ second coming. When Jesus interrupted this program and started a new program, the 12 apostles recognized this and said that they would confine their ministry to “the circumcision,” while Paul goes to everyone else with the gospel of grace (Galatians 2:9). If the church has followed the commission of Matthew 28:19-20 for the last 1,900 years, then they followed Satan’s lie program, because the truth of God’s Word says that that commission has been put on hold. Besides, who would want to follow that commission when God has given us a better commission in the dispensation of grace? The Matthew passage has the disciples teaching the Gentiles to obey the law, which only teaches people to fear God. Today, we skip that step and go right into the gospel to reconcile men to God (II Corinthians 5:18-20). Thus, today, we have a GREATER commission than Matthew 28:19-20, because people receive eternal life with our commission, while the 12 disciples were only given a step toward that in trying to get the Gentiles to obey God’s law in the millennial reign. Why, then, would we even want to follow a weaker commission? If people believe we should follow the commission of Matthew 28:19-20, they have been bamboozled by the Christian religion into rejecting the testimony of the Word of God. And, just because the church has followed it for 1,900 years, does not mean we should follow it today. Our authority is the Word of God, not church history!)** Yet such is actually the teaching. In view of this, let us carefully read the closing verses of the Gospel:

- "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen" (28: 16-20).



According to the Bullingeristic interpretation of this passage, we should have to paraphrase it somewhat as follows: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth, and after two entire dispensations have rolled by, I command that the remnant of Israel who shall be living two thousand or more years later, shall go out and teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them in that day to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, but from which I absolve all believers between the present hour and that coming age, and lo, I will be with that remnant until the close of Daniel's seventieth week." **(Such an addition should not be made because Jesus told His disciples that it is not for them to know when His kingdom will come (Acts 1:7 "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power.")). The addition by Ironside is a mystery that was not revealed until Paul came along (Ephesians 3:5). Such an addition, then, would make Paul incorrect in saying it was a mystery, perverting the Word of God. That is why Jesus did not tell them these things, even though they are true (for the most part). But, the Great Commission also applied to the 11 apostles, not just to the future remnant of Israel.)** Can anything be more absurd, more grotesque-and I might add, more wicked-than thus to twist and misuse the words of our Lord Jesus Christ? **(Ironside is the one who has changed the scripture, not me. He has failed to recognize the principle of progressive revelation found in the Bible.)**

In view of all this, may I direct my reader's careful attention to the solemn statement of the apostle Paul, which is found in I Timothy, chapter 6. After having given a great many practical exhortations to Timothy as to the instruction he was to give to the churches for their guidance during all the present age, the apostle says,

- "If any man teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ' and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself" (I Tim. 6:3-5). **(The warning is of Judaizers who insisted that salvation was kept by works. Why? Because that is how it was kept before the dispensational change that came with Paul's call. Paul says that anyone preaching the previous gospel of salvation plus works was to be accursed (Galatians 1:8-9). Pride**

**is in works, not in grace. This false gospel has continued from Paul's day until now.)**

One would almost think that this was a direct command to Timothy to beware of Bullingerism! **(Actually, it is a command to beware of people who do not rightly divide the word of truth, which includes Ironside.)** Notice, Timothy is to withdraw himself from, that is, to have no fellowship with, those who refuse the present authority of the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. Where do you get those actual words? Certainly in the four Gospels. **(Certainly not! What are "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ?" The phrase "Lord Jesus Christ" is found 81 times in scripture. The first time it is ever recorded is in Acts 11:17. That is because Jesus was not made "both Lord and Christ" until after His resurrection (Acts 2:36). Therefore, the words of Jesus in Matthew – John are NOT the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. Rather, they are the words of Jesus that the Father gave Him to speak (John 12:49-50). The words of our Lord Jesus Christ are the words that He gave to Paul. Therefore, the warning Paul gave Timothy is not to listen to those who would follow Jesus' words in Matthew – John. These people would be preaching "another Jesus" and "another gospel" by "another spirit" (II Corinthians 11:4). Instead, they should follow "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," which are found in Paul's epistles.)** There are very few actual words of the Lord Jesus Christ scattered throughout the rest of the New Testament. **(John 1:1 says that Jesus Christ is the Word. Therefore, the entire Bible are His Words. Just because man has put Jesus' words in Matthew – John in red does not mean they are any more important than any of the other words of His throughout the entire Bible.)** Of course there is a sense in which all the New Testament is from Him, but the apostle is clearly referring here to the actual spoken words of our Saviour, **(How is that? The term "Lord Jesus Christ" specifically refers to the words He spoke AFTER His ascension into heaven. This shows that the apostle is clearly referring here to the actual spoken words of our Saviour by revelation to the apostle Paul. Furthermore, "The doctrine which is according to godliness" (I Timothy 6:3) pertains to Jesus' death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, according to I Timothy 3:16, which is why the word "godliness" is not even mentioned in scripture until I Timothy. Therefore, it has to refer to words spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ after His ascension. In fact, Jesus did not even let His disciples know of His death until Matthew 16:21, and they were sent out "preaching the gospel" a little while before that (Luke 9:6), which shows that Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection were not even part of the gospel message that Jesus told His disciples to preach!)** which have been recorded for the benefit of the saints, and which set forth the teaching that is in accordance with godliness or practical piety. If a man refuses these words, whether on the plea that they do not apply to our dispensation, or for any other reason, the Spirit of God declares it is an evidence of intellectual

or spiritual pride. **(Yes, it is very prideful to follow Jesus' words in Matthew – John, instead of the Lord Jesus Christ's words to us today in Romans - Philemon. Those, who believe God and His Word, will be directed by the Holy Spirit to ignore Jesus' instructions in Matthew – John.)** Such men ordinarily think they know much more than others, and they look down from their fancied heights of superior Scriptural understanding with a certain contempt, **(Nah, what God is saying in I Timothy 6:3-5 is that these people are proud that they figured out a way to cheat people out of money by using God to do it. That's why the passage goes on to say that, "the love of money is the root of all evil" (I Timothy 6:10).)** often not untinged with scornful amusement, upon godly men and women who are simply seeking to take the words of the Lord Jesus as the guide for their lives.

But here we are told that such "know nothing," but are really in their spiritual dotage, "doting about questions and strifes of words." **(Yes, Christianity today is full of people who like to re-define words with the original languages or with different Bible translations, rather than getting the full meaning behind the passage. Hmmm, didn't Ironside do that earlier with the word "dispensation", only to violate his own definition when it suited his argument to do so?)** The dotard is generally characterized by frequent repetition of similar expressions. We know how marked this symptom is in those who have entered upon a state of physical and intellectual senility. Spiritual dotage may be discerned in the same way. A constant dwelling upon certain expressions as though these were all important, to the ignoring of the great body of truth, is an outstanding symptom. The margin, it will be observed, substitutes the word "sick" for "doting;" "word-sickness" is an apt expression. The word-sick man over-estimates altogether the importance of terms. He babbles continually about expressions which many of his brethren scarcely understand. He is given to misplaced emphasis, making far more of fine doctrinal distinctions than of practical godly living. **(Paul is merely saying that the "dotard" nitpicks over fine points and word definitions so that he does not have to address the bigger issues. It is what Jesus meant when He told the Pharisees that they, "strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel" (Matthew 23:24). Such are people like Ironside, who re-define words, instead of just letting the words say what they say. Then, they use their re-definitions to change sound doctrine into a lie, while not addressing the surrounding context, which makes clear the meaning.)** As a result, his influence is generally baneful instead of helpful, leading to strife and disputation instead of binding the hearts of the people of God together in the unity of the Spirit.

The well-known passage in the closing chapter of Mark's Gospel, which gives us another aspect of the great commission, having to do particularly with the apostles, **(How did Ironside determine that only this part of the Great Commission applies particularly to the apostles? He just got through criticizing ultradispensationalists for saying the Great**

**Commission does not apply today, and now he is himself selectively not applying part of it today, saying that the miracle portion of the commission only applied to the 11 apostles there! He does not have the liberty to pick and choose what he wants to apply today just because his lack of rightly dividing the Word of truth precludes him from adequately explaining the Great Commission!)** is a favorite battleground with the ultra-dispensationalists. Ignoring again the entire connection, they insist that the commission given in verses fifteen and eighteen could only apply during the days of the book of Acts, inasmuch as certain signs were to follow them that believe. As the commission in Matthew has been relegated by them to the Great Tribulation after the Christian age has closed, this one is supposed to have had its fulfillment before the present mystery dispensation began, and so has no real force now. **(Regardless of the gospel book, signs and miracles apply during the book of Acts and in the still-future tribulation period. This is not an arbitrary distinction to fit a belief system. Rather, it is the recognition that physical miracles are a distinction of Israel's program only. I Corinthians 1:22 says, "For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom." Since God made Jews to desire signs, God gives them signs in their dispensation. The healing of the sick, casting out devils, taking up deadly things, and drinking poison of Mark 16, then, are signs for Israel to believe the gospel of the kingdom and be saved. When God starts the dispensation of grace with Paul in Acts 9, the sign gifts continue "for to provoke them to jealousy" (Romans 11:11). In other words, although the dispensation has changed, God still wants Israel to be saved in the dispensation of grace. Therefore, He continues physical miracles during the diminishing away period of Israel, which is Acts 9-28. Once Israel is completely set aside at the end of Acts 28, the sign gifts cease. This view makes sense in light of scripture, and it is also what we observe. For example, in Acts 19:11-12, in the dispensation of grace, many people are healed by the hands of Paul. Yet, after Acts 28, we see Paul saying, "But Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick" (II Timothy 4:20). Since we are on the subject of the Great Commission, I mentioned earlier that Matthew shows Jesus as king, Mark shows Jesus as servant, Luke shows Jesus as man, and John shows Jesus as God. The commissions given by Jesus to His disciples in those books show the exact same thing of the believing remnant of Israel. Matthew 28:19-20 shows them as king of the world, teaching the nations the law of Moses. Mark 16:15-18 shows them as servants, healing people. Luke 24:47-49 shows the little flock preaching "repentance and remission of sins" after they receive "power from on high," just like Jesus, as the perfect man, preached repentance and remission of sins after He received the Holy Ghost. John 20:21-23 shows the little flock forgiving or retaining sins, which Jesus did as God. Therefore, the Great Commission is merely an extension of Jesus' ministry to the believing remnant through the power of the Holy Ghost, and the different aspects of the Great Commission are given in the four gospels, according to the emphasis of each gospel writer.)** They point out, what to

them seems conclusive, that in this commission, as of course that in Matthew, water baptism is evidently linked with a profession of faith in Christ. They are perfectly hydrophobic as to this. The very thought of water sets them foaming with indignation. There must on no account be any recognition of water baptism during the present age. It must be gotten rid of at all costs. **(That was God's doing—not Bullinger's doing. God tells us today that Paul was not sent to baptize people (I Corinthians 1:17). So, why would we do something Christ has not sent us to do today?)** So here where we read that our Lord said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16: 15,16), which would seem to indicate world-wide evangelism, looking out to the proclamation of the glad glorious Gospel of God to lost men everywhere, this commission must nevertheless be gotten rid of somehow. **(The commission was gotten rid of by Jesus Christ in Acts 9, and the apostles acknowledged this in Acts 15, according to Paul's account in Galatians 2:7-9. We are just following what the Lord Jesus Christ said. We are not looking for excuses to get out of things. Besides, as I mentioned earlier, God replaced the Great Commission with an even Greater Commission. Why would I want to preach the law of Moses, when I can preach reconciliation to God through the blood of Christ? The law has no power to save; the power is in the blood. Water baptism cleansed the flesh, so that the priest could approach God, but it did not cleanse the soul. By being reconciled to God through the blood of Christ, I am spiritually baptized into Christ's death (Colossians 2:12), which destroys the body of sin (Romans 6:3-6). Why, then, would I go backward from a spiritual cleansing to a fleshly cleansing?)** The way they do it is this: The Lord declares that certain signs shall follow when this Gospel is proclaimed. These signs evidently followed in the days of the Acts. They declare they have never followed since. Therefore, it is evident that water baptism is only to go on so long as the signs follow. **(No. That's not true. Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38 say that water baptism is required for salvation. It is part of the gospel. Then, we see, in I Corinthians 1:17, that Christ sent Paul not to baptize but to preach the gospel. This tells us that water baptism is not part of the gospel today, when it was part of the gospel in Israel's dispensation; therefore, it should not be followed today. This has nothing to do with signs. Signs continued until Acts 28, but water baptism FOR SALVATION stopped when the Lord Jesus Christ revealed new information to Paul in Acts 9.)** If the signs have ceased, then water baptism ceases. The signs are not here now, therefore no water baptism. How amazingly clear (!!), though, as we shall see in a moment, absolutely illogical. The signs accompanied preaching the Gospel. **(The reason signs accompanied preaching the gospel is because "the Jews require a sign" (I Corinthians 1:22). Since Paul stopped going to the Jews after Acts 28, the signs stopped at the end of Acts, but the gospel of grace for today continues.)** Why continue to preach if such signs are not now manifest?

The Matthew commission makes it plain that baptism in the name of the Trinity is to go on to the end of the age, **(How is that? The Matthew commission says that Jesus will be with the disciples unto the end of the world. It does not say they are to water baptize people until the end of the world. If it does, then they are also to teach the law until the end of the world, because Matthew 28:20 says, “teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,” and Matthew 23:1-3 tells us that those things are the law of Moses. Yet, Romans 6:14 says we are no longer under the law, since it has been blotted out (Colossians 2:14). Therefore, the information in Paul’s epistles tells us that God has changed instructions with the change in dispensations at Acts 9.)** and that age has not come to an end yet, whatever changes of dispensation may have come in. **(If Ironside wants to use that logic, we can also quote OT passages that God says Israel will do forever and also try to apply those to us today. So, you cannot eat any meat with fat in it, due to Leviticus 3:17, and you must be put to death for working on the Sabbath, according to Exodus 31:15-16.)** Now what of this commission in Mark? Observe first of all that our Lord is not declaring that the signs shall follow believers in the Gospel which is to be proclaimed by the Lord's messengers. The signs were to follow those of the apostles who believed, and they did. **(Mark 16:15 tells the 11 apostles to “go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel.” Mark 16:16 then says, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Mark 16:17 then says, “These signs shall follow them that believe.” Following the flow of the passage, then, all those, who believe, would perform the signs. At first, this is the 11, and we see from Mark 16:20 that signs did follow them, but this would also include those who believe the gospel preached by the 11.)** There were some of them who did not believe. See verse eleven: "And they, when they had heard that He was alive and had been seen of her, believed not." Then again, notice verse thirteen: "They went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them." And in the verse that follows, we read: "Afterward He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen." Now our Lord commissions the eleven, sends them forth to go to the ends of the earth preaching the Gospel to every creature. There is nothing limited here. It is not a Jewish commission. It has nothing to do with the restoration of the kingdom to Israel. **(That is not what Jesus told His disciples. In Matthew 10, Jesus gives the apostles a summary of how they are to fulfill the Great Commission. Jesus said, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles,...but go rather unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 10:5-6). The message they would be preaching is that “the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” If that message was accepted, Jesus would have restored the kingdom to Israel, but, since it was rejected, the mystery dispensation began. However, note that the apostles ask Jesus “Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” (Acts 1:6). In Jesus’ answer, He commissions them to go to Jerusalem, Judaea, Samaria, and the uttermost part of the earth (Acts 1:8). The commission in Acts**

**1:8 is the same as it is in Matthew – John, and this commission is in response to the question of restoring the kingdom to Israel. Therefore, this commission has everything to do with the restoration of the kingdom to Israel.)** It is a world-wide commission to go to all the Gentiles, and to go forth preaching the Word. Responsibility rests upon those who hear. They are to believe and be baptized. Those who do are recognized among the saved. On the other hand, He does not say, "He that is not baptized shall be damned," because baptism was simply an outward confession of their faith, but He does say, "He that believeth not shall be damned." **(Belief and baptism went together. You needed both for salvation. Without belief, baptism was irrelevant. Therefore, those who believed were baptized and were saved, while those who did not believe were damned, regardless of if they were baptized or not. If baptism was not required for salvation, Jesus would have said, "He that believe shall be saved and should get baptized." Instead, He says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Belief is the issue. All believers would be water baptized because they believed. If they did not believe the gospel, then they would not get baptized. Therefore, baptism is not mentioned among unbelievers.)**

Then in verses seventeen and eighteen, we have what Paul later called "the signs of an apostle." **("An apostle" is a "sent one." Thus, it is not limited to "the 12". "The signs of an apostle" could also be wrought through all those who believed and were water baptized when they heard the gospel of the kingdom.)**

- "These signs shall follow them that believe: In My name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

During all the period of the book of Acts, these signs did follow the apostles. **(Signs continued until the Bible was completed, as I Corinthians 13:10 tells us: "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away with." "That which is perfect" is the Bible, while "that which is in part" are the gifts of the Spirit mentioned in the previous chapter. These signs were for the Jews, and so they continued after Acts 7, because the Jews were given the chance to believe the gospel of the grace of God through the end of Acts. These signs happened among the Gentiles in Acts 9-28 "to provoke [Israel] to jealousy" (Romans 11:11).)** More than that, if we can place the least reliance upon early Church history, the same signs frequently followed other servants of Christ, as they went forth in obedience to this commission, and this long after the imprisonment of the apostle Paul. **(I do not place the least reliance upon early church history, but I place every reliance upon the 100% true Word of God (John 17:17). Trophimus traveled**

**with Paul in proclaiming the gospel of the grace of God (Acts 20:4), yet Paul left Trophimus sick in Miletum (II Timothy 4:20). If physical healings were still going on at that time, Paul would have healed Trophimus so he could help him in the ministry. The fact that he did not heal him shows that physical healings had ceased by then, regardless of what church history says.)** We should expect this from the closing verses of Mark:

- "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word with signs following" (Mark 16:19,20).

In this last verse, Mark covers the evangelization of the world (not merely a message going out to the Jews), **(If they went to the world at this time, then God is a liar, because He told them to go only "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 10:6), and that "ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come" (Matthew 10:23). Since Jesus' second coming has not taken place yet, their preaching every where (Mark 16:20) must have been confined to everywhere in Israel.)** during all the years that followed until the last of the apostles, John himself, had disappeared from the scene. **(Why would the signs stop then, since Mark 16:17 says "these signs shall follow them that believe," which certainly would have included people saved by the ministry of the 11 apostles (Mark 16:16)?)** I do not mean to intimate that Mark knew this, but I do mean that the Spirit of God caused him so to write this closing verse as to cover complete apostolic testimony right on to its consummation. **(If the signs ceased after the last of the 11 apostles died, then Paul would not have had the signs, since they were limited to the 11, and the Great Commission would have ceased at that time, as well. Mark 16:20 says "confirming the word with signs following." If the signs cease and the commission continues, then the word has no confirmation, and no one believes it. Therefore, Ironside's argument that the signs ceased, but the commission continued, is faulty. One cannot be separated from the other, because Jesus does not separate the one from the other.)** They preached everywhere, not simply in connection with Israel. **(Where is the evidence for this before Acts 9? Even when there was a great persecution of the church in Acts 8, we are told "they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles" (Acts 8:1). The reason the apostles stayed in Jerusalem is because the Great Commission said, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). The apostles understood this order and knew that they had not fully reached Jerusalem yet. Therefore, they stayed in Jerusalem. And, even**



**those who were scattered still stayed within Israel. Therefore, we do not see the little flock of Israel going to anyone outside of Israel with the gospel until the dispensational change in Acts 9.)** Yet in the face of this, the statement has been made over and over again by these ultradispensationalists, that the twelve never went to the Gentiles, excepting in the case of the apostle Peter and a few similar instances. **(Where is the proof that they went to the Gentiles? Acts 8:1 says that the 12 apostles stayed in Jerusalem, and in Galatians 2:9, they specifically agreed that they would go only “unto the circumcision.” I guess Ironside believes his own philosophies over the Word of God.)** The statement has also been made that all miracles ceased with Paul's imprisonment, that there were no miracles afterwards. **(There are far more miracles today than there were in Jesus' day. A saved soul spiritually is far greater than a physical healing. Thus, millions of miracles have taken place in the grace dispensation. Of course, much like the Jews of Jesus' day, we tend to focus on the physical over the spiritual. Therefore, when referring to miracles, Ironside is talking about physical miracles. Where is his evidence that physical miracles are happening today? I am not talking about people being cured of a headache, backache, or of cancer. There are heathen unbelievers who make similar claims of those ailments going away. I am talking about the physical miracles that happened in Jesus' day. Where are the people with no legs, who magically grow legs and start walking? Where are the people who have been blind from birth, verified by at least two, independent witnesses, who have magically received their sight? If physical miracles were occurring today, we would see this, because it would be proof positive that a miracle occurred, rather than the so-called physical miracles we see today.)** What superb ignorance of Church history is here indicated, and what an absurd position a man puts himself in who commits himself to negatives like these! **(Where is your proof, Ironside?)** An eminent logician has well said, "Never commit yourself to a negative, for that supposes that you are in possession of all the facts." **(I AM in possession of all facts. I have the Word of God, and God cannot lie (Titus 1:2). Since He said that miracles would cease once the Bible is complete, I believe it! It is the 100% accuracy of God's Word and the low accuracy of the church history that causes me to disregard church history in favor of God's Word. I can confidently commit to a negative when God has said the negative is so.)** If a man says there were no miracles wrought in the Church after the imprisonment of the apostle Peter, it means, if that statement is true, that he has thorough knowledge of all that has taken place in every land on earth where the Gospel has been preached, in all the centuries since the days of Paul's imprisonment, and knows all the work that every servant of Christ has ever done. Otherwise he could not logically and rationally make such a statement. **(God said that physical miracles have ceased today. That's all the evidence I need. “Without faith it is impossible to please [God]” (Hebrews 11:6). This is not some pie-in-the-sky faith. Faith is believing what God has said. Instead, Ironside is relying upon what man has said. By Ironside's**

**argument, no one could ever state that God created the earth, because no one was there to see it. However, I know God created the earth, because He said He created the earth. End of discussion. More importantly, no one today could ever receive eternal life apart from faith.)**

What then is the conclusion? It is wrongly dividing **(If I “wrongly divide” the Word of truth, then how does Ironside rightly divide it? If it is merely Old and New Testament, there is no dividing done, because it is already divided into those areas for us.)** the Word of Truth to seek to rob Christians of the precious instruction given by our Lord Jesus in the four Gospels, **(Ironside’s arguments wrongly divide the Word of Truth to rob Christians of the precious instructions given by our Lord Jesus Christ to us today in Paul’s epistles. II Corinthians 4:3-4 says, “But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, Who is the image of God, should shine unto them.” Most Christians do not rightly divide the Word of Truth because they have allowed Satan to blind them with unbelief in God’s Word.)** though fully recognizing their dispensational place. It is an offense against Christian missions everywhere to try to set aside the great commission for the entire present age. **(I am glad I am offending “Christian missions everywhere”, because nearly all Christian missions do not present a clear gospel message, which makes people more settled in the lake of fire, instead of giving them life in Christ in heaven (Matthew 23:15 “For ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.”.)** It is not true that a definite limit is placed in Scripture upon the manifestation of sign gifts, and that such gifts have never appeared since the days of the apostles. **(The purpose of the sign gifts is a shadow of the spiritual things to come (Colossians 2:17) so that people may believe the gospel and have eternal life. Since the Word of God is now complete, we have the “fulness of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13). Therefore, God discarded the shadow for the real deal.)**

## CHAPTER THREE

### **The Transitional Period Is the Church of The Acts the Body of Christ?**

HERE is perhaps nothing about which the ultradispensationalists are more certain, according to their own expressions, than that the book of the Acts covers a transitional period, coming in between the age of the law and the present age in which the dispensation of the mystery has been revealed. **(Acts is a transitional period in which the prophecy dispensation is set aside at Acts 7, and God begins the mystery dispensation with Paul in Acts 9. It is a book to Israel covering both programs. Acts 1-7 covers the fall of Israel in their program, and Acts 9-28 covers the diminishing away of Israel in the grace program.)** They do not always agree as to the name of this intervening period. Some call it the Kingdom Church; others the Jewish Church; and there are those who prefer the term Pentecostal Dispensation. **(Genesis 12 – Acts 7 is the prophecy dispensation. Acts 9 – Philemon covers the mystery dispensation, with the instructions for us today found in Romans – Philemon. Hebrews – Revelation covers the resumption of the prophecy dispensation after the rapture of the body of Christ.)** The general teaching is about as follows: It is affirmed that the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost and His baptizing the one hundred and twenty and those who afterwards believed, did not have anything to do with the formation of the Church, the Body of Christ. **(It did not have anything to do with forming the body of Christ, because it was in Paul “first [that] Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting” (I Timothy 1:16).)** On the contrary, they insist that the Church throughout all of the book of Acts up to Paul's imprisonment was of an altogether lower order than that of the Epistle to the Ephesians. **(The church of God in Israel's program is not of a lower order than today's church. It is all of God. Also, the Body of Christ started in Acts 9 with Paul, not at the end of Acts. Paul says in I Timothy 1:16 “that in me FIRST Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a PATTERN to them which should HEREAFTER believe on him to everlasting life.” Therefore, God clearly started something new with Paul.)** Assemblies in Judea, Samaria, and the various Gentile countries, were simply groups of believers who were waiting for the manifestation of the kingdom, and had not yet come into the full liberty of grace. **(This does not make them a lower order. It just means that they had not received the atonement yet (Acts 3:19-21) like we have today (Romans 5:11), but they will receive the new covenant at Jesus' second coming, which is not any lower than our positions in heavenly places as part of the Body of Christ today. The people in early Acts are in an earlier stage of their dispensation than we are today. They had been placed under the law of Moses, which did not go away**

**with the cross of Christ. "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall IN NO WISE pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18). By contrast, the body of Christ is "not under the law, but under grace" (Romans 6:14.)** The ordinances of the Lord's Supper and of baptism were linked with these companies and were to continue only until Israel had definitely and finally refused the Gospel message **(Not so. Water baptism for salvation was done away with at the stoning of Stephen. There are water baptisms after that, but they were done so as not to offend others. There was no spiritual significance behind water baptism any more. The Lord's Supper has continued in today's dispensation, as Paul mentions how it should be done. Therefore, it is for both dispensations after the cross.)**, after which the full revelation of the mystery is supposed to have been given to the apostle Paul when he was imprisoned at Rome. **(In Acts 26:16, Paul mentions that Jesus told him that he would be "a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee." In II Corinthians 12:1, Paul says, "I WILL come to visions and revelations of the Lord." Thus, Jesus told Paul that the mystery would not be revealed to him all at once. In Colossians 1:25, Paul says that the mystery was given to him "to fulfil the word of God." Therefore, it is scripture itself that tells us that there is a progressive revelation of the mystery, and that the full revelation of the mystery had been given to Paul by the time he wrote Colossians, which was after Acts 28.)** From that time on a new dispensation began. **(Acts 28 dispensationalists do not understand that the miracles, water baptism, and spiritual gifts found in Acts 9-28 are related to the diminishing away of Israel during the dispensation of grace (Romans 11:12). Their going away after Acts 28 shows that Israel had diminished away, and that the word of God was completed. It does not signal a dispensational change.)** Surely this is wrongly confounding the Word of Truth. How any rational and spiritually-minded person could ever come to such a conclusion after a careful reading of the book of Acts, and with it the various epistles addressed to the churches and peoples mentioned in that book, is more than some of us can comprehend. Let us see what the facts actually are. **(How can "any rational and spiritually-minded person" not see, by reading these books, that Paul was given a new and distinct gospel and message known as the mystery?)**

In the first place, it is perfectly plain that the Church, the Body of Christ, was formed by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Very definitely **("Very definitely?" Does Ironside think such confident terms will cause us to ignore the evidence of God's Word? "The Body of Christ" is only used four times in scripture and all by Paul (Romans 7:4; I Corinthians 10:16; I Corinthians 12:27; and Ephesians 4:12). How then is it "perfectly plain" that the body of Christ started in Acts 2, when you would never even know that term if not for Paul's epistles?)** this term is used of that great event which took place at Pentecost and was repeated in measure in Cornelius' household. In each instance the same exact expression is used. Referring to Pentecost, our Lord says, "Ye shall be

baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1:5). **(Being baptized with the Holy Ghost" is different from "for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (I Corinthians 12:13). The baptism with the Holy Ghost in Acts 1 is defined as power to be witnesses unto Christ in Jerusalem, Judaea, etc. (Acts 1:8). The baptism by one Spirit into Christ's body has to do with our spiritual circumcision at salvation, being spiritually baptized into Christ's death, such that the body of sins is destroyed, and we are risen to life in Christ (Colossians 2:10-14).)** Referring to the event that took place in Cornelius' household, Peter says:

- "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?" (Acts 11:16,17). **(In saying "them" and "us", Peter is referring to a dispensational change. Peter said to Cornelius, "of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10:34). This is different from what Jesus told him before Acts 9, when He said, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles,... but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 10:5-6). Jesus Himself would not even acknowledge a Gentile woman, who was pleading for mercy, because "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 15:23-24). After the dispensational change in Acts 9, Peter understands that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile has been taken down in the mystery dispensation (Ephesians 2:14). The dispensational change can also be seen in that "the Holy Ghost fell on them" as Peter "began to speak" (Acts 11:15). Before Acts 9, Peter said that they had to repent and be water baptized before they received the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:38). Now, in Acts 11, we see that only believing the mystery gospel is required to receive the Holy Ghost. Now, it is true that the Holy Ghost fell in Acts 11 as it did in Acts 2, but that does not mean there was not a dispensational change, as we have pointed out a couple of doctrinal changes already seen after Acts 8. The reason the Holy Ghost fell in Acts 11 as it did in Acts 2 is "to provoke [Israel] to jealousy" (Romans 11:11). God's will is for "all men to be saved" (I Timothy 2:4). Since "the Jews require a sign" (I Corinthians 1:22), God gave the sign of the Holy Ghost falling upon saved Gentiles in the mystery dispensation, so that Israel may also believe the gospel and be saved. Therefore, just because God gave the Holy Ghost in Acts 11, as He did in Acts 2, it does not mean that a dispensational change did not occur. The fact that doctrine changed shows that a change occurred.)**

In 1 Corinthians 12:12, 13, we read:

- "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

Here we are distinctly informed as to the way in which the Body has been brought into existence, and this is exactly what took place at Pentecost. Individual believers were that day baptized into one Body, and from then on the Lord added to the Church daily such as were saved. **(How is that? I Corinthians 12 is the passage that talks about believers being baptized into one body, not Acts 2. In Acts 2, the middle wall of partition is still up between Jew and Gentile. In fact, in Acts 2:14, 22, and 36, Peter specifically addresses Jews with: "Ye men of Judea," "Ye men of Israel," and "the house of Israel," respectively. Therefore, his audience was Jewish. Acts 2:41 says they were baptized. It says nothing about the Spirit baptizing them into one body. Acts 2:47 says that the Lord added to the church. It says nothing about them becoming members of the body of Christ. Ironside claims that the church started in Acts 2, yet Acts 7:38 says that Israel in the wilderness under Moses was "the church in the wilderness." Therefore, the church of God had been in existence for over 1,000 years before Acts 2, and the church's existence continued in Acts 2. Ironside does not say that, since the church was in existence in Moses' day, that Israel back then was part of the body of Christ. That is because the body of Christ is ONLY mentioned by Paul. How, then, can Ironside read the body of Christ back into Peter's message in Acts 2?)** It is a significant fact that if you omit this definite passage in I Corinthians, there is no other verse in any epistle that tells us in plain words just how the Body is formed; although we might deduce this from Ephesians 4:4, where we read: "There is one Body and one Spirit." Undoubtedly this refers to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, by which the Body is formed, in contradistinction to water baptism in the next verse. **(What? Ephesians 4:5 says that there is only "one baptism," yet Ironside says there is a baptism of the Holy Spirit in Ephesians 4:4, and a water baptism in Ephesians 4:5. As such, Ironside does not believe God's Word.)** But this is simply interpretation, **(This is more than interpretation. It is changing the truth of God into a lie.)** and all might not agree as to it. But there can surely be no question as to the application of the passage in 1 Corinthians 12:13. Yet, singularly enough, the very people who insist that the Body is formed by the Spirit's baptism, declare that these Corinthians were not members of the Body, nor did that Body come into existence until at least four or five years afterwards. **(Yes, that does not make any sense. Ironside is criticizing the Acts-28 position. The only explanation that fits is a mid-Acts position. Such a position**

allows us to see the Corinthians as part of the body of Christ, because the body started in Acts 9 with Paul FIRST, not after Acts 28, while recognizing that those saved in Acts 2 were not part of the body, since it had not started yet.)

A careful reading of the book of Acts shows us the gradual manner in which the truth of the new dispensation was introduced, (**"The truth of the new dispensation?" In Acts?? What is Ironside talking about? He seems to be contradicting himself. (Perhaps I need to rightly divide his paper to understand what he is saying. ha ha) He just finished arguing that the Gospels apply today. Now, he says that they are of a previous dispensation, since a new dispensation started with the book of Acts. So, which is it? If the previous argument is his position, a new dispensation began with Matthew 1. If what he is saying now is his true position, the new dispensation began with Acts 1, and his former point of the gospels applying today is no longer valid. So, the gospels really do not apply today. Or maybe they do? Oh, that's right, John applies, Matthew does not, and Mark and Luke apply if you feel like it. Are you confused yet? Yet, Ironside claims that right dividers are the ones confused. And, how could the new dispensation begin in Acts 1, when Jesus and His disciples were still talking about Israel becoming a kingdom of priests to the Gentiles to reconcile the earth back to God (see Acts 1:6-8)?**) and this is what has led some to speak of this book as covering a transitional period. (**If Ironside would just recognize that the transitional period is in Acts 9-28, rather than the whole book of Acts, he would be right on and his whole doctrinal outlook would completely change.**) Personally, I have no objection to the term "transitional period," if it be understood that the transition was in the minds of men and not in the mind of God. (**The problem with this statement is that Romans 11:12 refers to "the diminishing" of Israel. Since Israel gradually was taken off the scene, then a transitional period is in the mind of God, as well.**) According to God, the new dispensation, that in which we now live, the dispensation of the grace of God, otherwise called the dispensation of the mystery, began the moment the Spirit descended at Pentecost. (**This view contradicts scripture. In Acts 3:21, Peter says that what he was preaching hath been spoken by God "by the mouth of all His holy prophets SINCE the world began."** In Romans 16:25-26, Paul says that "the revelation of the mystery ... was kept SECRET since the world began, But NOW is made manifest." Therefore, if Peter preached prophecy in Acts 3 and the mystery was given to Paul directly by Jesus Christ no earlier than Acts 9 (Ephesians 3:3) since Paul was a blasphemer before then (I Timothy 1:13), it is impossible for the dispensation of the mystery to have begun in Acts 2. If you want to know what the Spirit descending at Pentecost meant, read what the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of Peter, says it is: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel" (Acts 2:16) in Joel 2:28-32. Joel 2:27-28a says, "And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and none else: and My people shall never be

ashamed. And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My spirit upon all flesh.” Therefore, the pouring out of the Spirit in Acts 2 means that God is in the midst of Israel, and He will now come upon all people in Israel, not just the Levites. The subject, then, is Israel and has nothing to do with the body of Christ, where there is no distinction between Jew and Greek (Galatians 3:28.) That moment the one Body came into existence, though at the beginning it was composed entirely of believers taken out from the Jewish people. But in the minds even of the disciples, there was a long period before they all fully entered into the special work that God had begun to do. **(That is because the “special work” of the mystery dispensation did not begin until Acts 9. That is why those scattered abroad in Acts 8:1 preached the word only to the Jews (Acts 11:19).)** Many of them, in fact, probably never did apprehend the true character of this dispensation, as we shall see further on. **(Those saved in Israel’s program remained in Israel’s program. That is why, as late as Acts 21, we see James saying that the Jews, saved in Israel’s program, were still “all zealous of the law” (Acts 21:20). By then, they understood the mystery program, but they followed the instructions God gave them to follow in their program.)**

The position is often taken that the twelve apostles were very ignorant of what the Lord was really doing, and that their entire ministry was toward Israel. Have not such teachers forgotten that during the forty days that the Lord appeared to His disciples before ascending to Heaven, He taught them exactly what His program was, and the part they were to have in it? In Acts 1: 3, 4, we read:

- "He also showed Himself alive after His passion by many in fallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of Me." **(Has Ironside forgotten that the book of Acts does not stop at Acts 1:4? Has he not read Acts 1:6, where the apostles ask Jesus the question, “Wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to ISRAEL?” After Jesus spent 40 days with them “speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God,” they would have been clear on what God was doing, which is why they were going to Israel. If they were wrong in that thinking, Jesus would have cleared that up right away. However, Jesus did not correct their thinking. Rather, He just told them that “it is not for you to know the times or the seasons” (Acts 1:7). He did not say, “O ye of little faith, have ye not heard what I have told you the last 40 days that the kingdom of God is for everyone, not just Israel?” No, Jesus specifically taught them that God was restoring the kingdom to ISRAEL. Jesus commissioned them to**



**go to ISRAEL. Therefore, their ministry was only to ISRAEL. They just did not know WHEN the kingdom would be restored.)**

And it was then that He distinctly told them of the coming baptism of the Holy Spirit. According to the divine plan, the Gospel message was first to be proclaimed in Jerusalem, then Judea, then Samaria, and then unto the uttermost parts of the earth. **(Yes! They were to go to Israel first, but, according to Matthew 10:23, they would not go “unto the uttermost parts of the earth,” i.e, the Gentiles, until AFTER Jesus’ second coming. Therefore, even when saved Israel was scattered due to persecution, the apostles stayed in Jerusalem (Acts 8:1) in obedience to Jesus’ instructions, since Jerusalem, as a whole, was not saved yet.).** This is exactly what we find in the book of Acts. The earlier chapters give us the proclamation in Jerusalem and Judea. Then we have Philip going down to Samaria, followed by John and Peter. **(That happened after Jesus put Israel’s program on hold in Acts 7:55, and Samaria was the capital city of the northern territory of Israel. Therefore, Philip was still going to the Jews only. Note that Jesus Himself, commissioned by God the Father to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel only (Matthew 15:24), also went to Samaria (John 4).)** Later Peter goes to the house of Cornelius, and he and his household, believing the Gospel, are baptized by the same Spirit into the same Body. **(This did not happen until Acts 10, which is after God gave a new commission to Paul in Acts 9:15 which put on hold the old commission in Acts 1:8. Again, where is the term “body” in Acts 10? We are just told that Cornelius was water baptized (Acts 10:48).)** The conversion of Saul of Tarsus prepares the way for a world-wide ministry, he being specifically chosen of God for that testimony. **(If Acts 9:15 is a continuation of Acts 1:8 and the Jews have already been taken care of by the other apostles, as Ironside implies, Jesus would have sent Paul to the Gentiles only. Instead, Acts 9:15 says that Paul would go “the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel.” The fact that Paul goes to Israel, as well as to the Gentiles, shows that God starting something new with Paul.)**

But before Saul's conversion, there were churches of God in many cities, and these churches of God together formed the Church of God; churches signifying local companies, but the Church of God taking in all believers. **(Yes, it was the church of God. That just means that there were groups of believers found in all the territories. It does not mean that God started the body of Christ in Acts 2. In fact, Acts 2:5 says that there were “dwelling at JERUSALEM Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven” (Acts 2:5). The reason is because Israel’s program was still going on at the time, and they were in Jerusalem, waiting for God to establish His eternal kingdom there soon, since the 70 weeks of Daniel had almost come to a close by then. 3,000 of these devout Jews (Acts 2:41) repented and were water baptized as part of the gospel of**

**the kingdom for Israel (Acts 2:38). Then, when they were scattered abroad in Judaea and Samaria in Acts 8:1, they would have established local churches in those regions, as Acts 9:31 indicates.)** Years afterwards, Paul writes, "I persecuted the Church of God and wasted it" (Gal. 1:13). **(Yes, all believers in Israel's program would be considered the church of God. That is not a term that is exclusive to the current dispensation.)** And again, "For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God" (I Cor. 15:9). The Church of God was to him one whole. **(Yes, the church of God consists of all believers from all dispensations. The body of Christ, however, is only for the current dispensation and did not begin until Acts 9. You do not even see the term "body of Christ" mentioned in the book of Acts.)** It was exactly the same Church of God as that of which he speaks in 1 Timothy 3:15, when, writing to the younger preacher, he says: "That thou mightest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself 'in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." In the meantime he had been cast into prison and had written all the rest of the so-called prison epistles, with the exception, of course, of Titus, which was written while he was at liberty, between his imprisonments, and 2 Timothy, which was written during his second imprisonment.\*

(\* I make this statement on the supposition that the note at the end of I Timothy is correct, namely that the epistle was written from Laodicea, a place not visited by Paul before his first imprisonment. If written earlier the argument does not apply, except to show that Paul ever recognized the Church of God as one and undivided.) **(Yes, the Church of God is one and undivided. Praise the Lord for the unity that is in Christ Jesus our Lord.)**

There is no hint of any difference having come in to distinguish the Church of God which he says he persecuted, from the Church of God in which Timothy was recognized as a minister of the Word. It is one and the same Church throughout. **(Yes, all those saved in all dispensations are part of the one, Church of God. However, there is a distinction made between the two programs. Galatians 2:9 says that the leaders of both programs agreed that Paul and Barnabas would go to the heathen, while the apostles of Israel's program would confine their ministry to the circumcision. The heathen includes all unsaved Jews, because we see Paul going to the Jew first throughout the book of Acts, and we see that Jesus specifically commissioned him to go to the children of Israel, as well as the Gentiles (Acts 9:15). The circumcision, then, would be only the Jews saved in Israel's program. Therefore, it is the same church, but it is different parts of the church due to different dispensations. God reconciles the earth back to Himself in Israel's program (Exodus 19:5-6), and He reconciles the heaven back to Himself in today's mystery program (Ephesians 1:20-22; 2:6).)**

Going back to Acts then, we notice that after his conversion, Paul is

definitely set apart as the apostle to the Gentiles, and yet everywhere he goes, he first seeks out his Jewish brethren after the flesh, because it was God's purpose that the Gospel should be made known to the Jew first, and then to the Gentile. **(Yes, even though the Jews rejected the kingdom message, they are still given the grace message first before the Gentiles are. That is part of the "diminishing" away of Israel (Romans 11:12).)** In practically every city, the same results follow. A few of the Jews receive the message; the bulk of them reject it. Then Paul turns from the Jews to the Gentiles, and thus the message goes out to the whole world. Throughout all of this period, covered by the ministries of Peter and Paul particularly, both baptism in water and the breaking of bread have their place. **(Water baptism is part of the gospel that Peter preached for salvation (Acts 2:38). Paul said that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel (I Corinthians 1:17). Therefore, the place of water baptism changes from Peter's ministry to Paul's ministry. The only reason Paul did baptize some people was so as not to offend Jewish brethren saved under the kingdom dispensation. With Peter, Acts 2:41 says that all 3,000 people saved at that time were water baptized. Peter did not say, "Look. There are only 120 of us, of which only 12 are apostles, and there are 3,000 of you, we will baptize you as we get around to it." No! Peter knew they did not have eternal life until they were water baptized (Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38). Therefore, all 3,000 were baptized that day (Acts 2:41). On the other hand, when people were saved under Paul in the Corinthian church, and it was, no doubt, less than 3,000, who were saved, Paul says that he baptized only a handful and is not sure about the others (I Corinthians 1:14-17). This shows that the importance of water baptism completely changed from Acts 2 to Acts 9. "Breaking of bread" is found in every dispensation, because everyone has to eat, regardless of dispensation! Therefore, it would have continued with the change in dispensation.)** The signs of an apostle follow the ministry, God authenticating His Word as His servants go forth in His Name. However, it is perfectly plain that the nearer we get to the close of the Acts, the less we have in the way of signs and wonders. **(Because the Word of God was being written and could be relied upon for authenticating the gospel message, rather than signs.)** This is to be expected. **(Yes. Mark 16:20 shows the Lord "confirming the words with signs following." Ephesians 4:13 says that the gifts were given "TILL we all come in the unity of the faith." The mystery doctrine was given to Paul "to fulfil the Word of God" (Colossians 1:25). Once it was fulfilled, the Word of God confirms the gospel, not signs. Therefore, the signs continue until Acts 28. Since Ironside does not believe this, why would he expect the signs to be done away with at the end of Acts? Jesus commissioned the disciples to "go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15), and the gospel was confirmed "with signs following" (Mark 16:20). If there is no change in dispensation, the signs would have continued at least until Jesus' second coming, since Jesus said, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come" (Matthew 10:23). Why would they stop at the end of Acts? If you**

**do not recognize the mystery dispensation, you have no way of explaining the cessation of the sign gifts, which is why Ironside offers no explanation as to why he expected the signs would be done away with.)** In the meantime various books of the New Testament had been written, particularly Paul's letters to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, and the Romans. In all likelihood, the Epistle of James had also been produced, though we cannot definitely locate the time of its writing. The Epistles of Peter and of John come afterward. They were not part of the earlier written ministry.

Everywhere that Paul goes, he preaches the kingdom as the Lord Himself has commanded **(That's right. He preaches the gospel given to him by direct revelation of Jesus Christ (Galatians 1:11-12). He did not preach the same message that Peter preached, as Galatians 2:7 says that two, different gospels were committed to Peter and Paul.)**, and finally he reached Rome a prisoner. There, following his usual custom, though not having the same liberty as in other places, he gets in touch first with the leaders of the Jewish people, gives them his message, and then tells them that even though they reject it, yet the purpose of God must be carried out, and the salvation of God sent to the Gentiles. This is supposed by many to be a dispensational break, **(As I have stated before, the dispensational break is at Acts 9. The end of Acts signals the end of the mystery gospel going to the Jews. If the rejection by the Jews does not change something, then why does the book of Acts end where it does? It would have at least continued until the end of Paul's life. But, the book of Acts records God's dealings with Israel only. Therefore, when God stops dealing with Israel, the book of Acts stops.)** but we have exactly the same thing in the thirteenth chapter of Acts. There we read from verse 44 on, how the Jews in Antioch of Pisidia withstood the Word spoken by Paul, and Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said:

- "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set Thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that Thou shouldest be or salvation unto the ends of the earth."

I ask any thoughtful reader: What difference is there between this account of Paul's dealing with the Jews, the proclamation of grace going out to the Gentiles, and that found in chapter 28 of this same book? **(The difference is that the rejection in Acts 28 ends the book of Acts, which shows God is finished with the nation of Israel at that time. Another proof of this is the cessation of the sign gifts at that time. In early Acts, Israel rejects the gospel of the kingdom multiple times before Jesus puts the program on hold at the stoning of Stephen. Similarly, in Acts 9-28,**

**Israel rejects the mystery gospel multiple times before God has Paul go exclusively to the Gentiles at the end of Acts.)** In the light of these two passages, may we not say that if Paul was given liberty, as we know he was, to preach for several years after his first imprisonment, he undoubtedly still followed exactly the same method of proclaiming the Gospel to the Jew first, and then to the Gentiles? **(Nope. God must have told him to stop going to the Jew. Otherwise, the book of Acts would have continued until Paul's death and so would have the sign gifts.)** It is passing strange that these ultra-dispensationalists can overlook a passage like Acts 13, and then read so much into the similar portion in chapter 28. **(We have not overlooked Acts 13. We just notice that Paul continues going to the Jew first after Acts 13. Therefore, no change had been made. However, at Acts 28, we see that Paul does not go to the Jew any more. Therefore, we can conclude that the diminishing away of Israel has occurred. It is all about what happens as a result of the event, not the event itself.)** According to them, as we have pointed out, the dispensational break occurred at this latter time, after which Paul's ministry, they tell us, took an entirely different form. It was then that the dispensation of the mystery was revealed to him, they say, which he embodied in his prison epistles. He was no longer a preacher of the kingdom, but now a minister of the Body. **(Not true. Paul's gospel and his doctrine did not change. The only things that changed were that his audience was only Gentile now, and that Paul received further revelation of the mystery that he shared in Ephesians – Colossians.)** The theory sounds very plausible until one examines the text of Scripture itself.

Let us look at the last two verses of Acts 28:

- "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

Now observe in chapter one, verse three, our Lord is said to have spoken to His disciples during the forty days of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." In the very last verse of the book, after Paul's supposed later revelation, he is still "preaching the kingdom of God;" **(“The kingdom of God,” like “the church of God,” is a generic term. God’s kingdom will be on the earth with Israel ruling and in heaven with the body of Christ ruling. Both heaven and earth belong to God’s kingdom. Therefore, Peter could preach the kingdom of God in Acts 2 and be referring to God’s kingdom on earth, while Paul could preach the kingdom of God in Acts 28 and be referring God’s kingdom in heaven.)** certainly the next phrase, "teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ," implies continuance in exactly the same type of ministry in which he had

been engaged before. There is no hint here of something new. **(Acts 1:3 says that Jesus only shared with the believing remnant of Israel the things concerning the kingdom of God. There is no mention of teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ. That is because, in Acts 1:3, they kept teaching the law, while Paul, beginning in Acts 9, taught grace. The term “the Lord Jesus Christ” occurs first in scripture in Acts 11:17. It was not until Jesus’ ascension to heaven that He was made “both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:36).)**

Now let us go back a little. In chapter 20 of the book of Acts, we find the apostle Paul at Miletus on his way to Jerusalem. From there he sent to Ephesus for the elders of the church. We have a very touching account of his last interview with them. Among other things, he says to them:

- "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood" (Acts 20:27,28).

And then he commends these elders in view of the coming apostasy, not to some new revelation yet to be given, but "to God and the word of His grace, which is able to build you up and give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified." Note particularly the breadth of the statement found in verse 27. "All the counsel of God" had already been made known through Paul to the Ephesian elders before he went up to Jerusalem for the last time. There is not a hint of a partial revelation, not a hint of a transitional period, but they already had everything they needed to keep them until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. **(“All the counsel of God” must refer to all that had been revealed to Paul already. If it was everything that would be revealed, there would have been no need to write the same Ephesian church a 6-chapter epistle after Acts 28. He wrote that epistle because he had new information that he did not have at the time that he spoke to the Ephesians in Acts 20. He wrote to the Ephesian church of the heavenly positions that they would occupy. There is no mention of this in his epistles written before Acts 28. Also, since Ironside has brought up Acts 20, Paul told the Ephesians in this same passage that he testified to them of “the gospel of the grace of God” (Acts 20:24). Contrast this with Matthew 24:14, where Jesus said that, “this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world.” This shows that Paul preached a different gospel than the 12 apostles preached.)**

I venture to say that the better one is acquainted with the book of Acts, the clearer all this will become. **(II Timothy 2:7 “Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.” God contradicts Ironside**

**by saying that, the better one is acquainted with Paul's epistles, the clearer all this will become.)** It is truly absurd to attempt to make two Churches out of the redeemed company between Pentecost and the Lord's return. The Church is one and indivisible. **(No one is making two churches here. They are all in the church of God, but those saved before Acts 9 are part of the bride of Christ, and those saved after Paul are part of the body of Christ. If you make both one, then there is no bride for Christ to marry, yet He does have a wife, according to Revelation 21:9, and He has a body, according to I Corinthians 12:27).** It is the Church that Christ built upon the rock, namely the truth that He is the Son of the living God. It is the Church of God which He purchased with the blood of His own Son. That Church of God, Saul in his ignorance, persecuted. Of that same Church of God, he afterwards became a member through the Spirit's baptism. In that Church of God, Timothy was a recognized minister, not only before, but after Paul's imprisonment. **(Jesus said in Matthew 12:31-32 that the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven. Acts 7:55 says that Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost when they stoned him to death. Acts 8:1 says that Paul consented to his death. Paul says in I Timothy 1:13 that he "was before a blasphemer." Putting all these verses together, I think it is safe to say that Paul blasphemed the Holy Ghost. Yet, Jesus said he would not be forgiven if he did so. The way he was forgiven was because God started a new program with Paul. Jesus said that the sin of the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost "shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (Matthew 12:32). This eliminates forgiveness in Israel's program, but it does not eliminate forgiveness in the mystery program. If you believe Ironside, there is no getting around Paul going to the lake of fire.)**

In regard to the statement so frequently made that God was giving Israel a second chance throughout the book of Acts, it is evident that there is no foundation whatever for such a statement. **(That is not true! In Acts 7:60, Stephen says, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." In Acts 9:15, Paul is sent to both Gentiles and Jews. In Romans 11:12, Acts 9-28 is described as a diminishing away of the Jews. In Luke 13:6-9, Jesus asks for and receives a one-year grace period for Israel in Acts 1-7. Therefore, Israel gets a second chance under their program in Acts 1-7, and they get a third chance under the mystery program in Acts 9-28.)** Our Lord definitely declared the setting aside of Israel for this entire age when He said, "Your house is left unto you desolate. Ye shall not see Me again until ye say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord!" **(We have already gone over this. Why would Jesus set aside Israel in Matthew 23:38, only to tell His disciples in Acts 1:8 to go to Israel first? Also, why would He tell the disciples that they will spend the entire tribulation period going to the cities of Israel (Matthew 10:23), when Israel has been completely set aside? Obviously, these scriptures tell us that the Lord did not set aside Israel with His statement in Matthew 23:38.)** It was after that house was left desolate that the glorious

proclamation at Pentecost was given through the power of the Holy Spirit, offering salvation by grace to any in Israel who repented, **(Peter said, “Repent, and be baptized...for the remission of sins” in Acts 2:38. Therefore, salvation was by faith plus works, as James says in James 2:24: “By works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” Contrast this with Romans 3:28, where Paul tells us today, “A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” As such, the gospel of grace was NOT offered to Israel in Acts 2.)** and to as many as the Lord our God shall call, which, of course, includes the whole Gentile world. Not once in any of the sermons recorded of Peter and of Paul do we have a hint that the nation of Israel is still on trial, and that God is waiting for that nation to repent in this age. **(How about “repent, and be baptized” (Acts 2:38), which was spoken to “ye men of Israel” (Acts 2:22), or “Repent ye therefore” (Acts 3:19), which was spoken to “ye men of Israel” (Acts 3:12)? How about “To day if ye will hear His voice” (Hebrews 3:15; 4:7) with the warning of “Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief” (Hebrews 4:11) and “Exhort one another daily, WHILE IT IS CALLED To day” (Hebrews 3:13)? God is telling Israel that they must be saved “To day!”)** On the contrary, the very fact that believers are called upon to "save themselves from that untoward generation" is evidence of the complete setting aside of Israel nationally, and the calling out of a select company of those who acknowledge the claims of the Lord Jesus Christ. **(No, saving themselves from that untoward generation (Acts 2:40) means that the physical nation of Israel is being replaced with “a nation” of Israel that has faith in God. Matthew 21:43 says, “The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to A NATION bringing forth the fruits thereof.” If this included Gentiles, Jesus would have said “nations,” not “nation.” Numbers 23:9 says that Israel “shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.” Therefore, this “nation,” must be Israel. Also, Jesus said, “salvation is of the Jews” (John 4:22).)** By their baptism, they outwardly severed the link that bound them to the unbelieving nation, and thus came over onto Christian ground. **(Wrong again. They severed the link and came over to “a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof” (Matthew 21:43). The first time the word “Christian” is used is in Acts 11:26. The reason is because we follow Christ’s doctrine given to us today by the apostle Paul, while, in Israel’s dispensation, they followed the Mosaic law. Therefore, there was no “Christian ground” for anyone to come over onto until it was established with Paul by Christ from heaven in Acts 9.)** To this company, Gentile believers were later added, and these two together constitute the Body of Christ. **(Again, the term “Body of Christ” is only used by Paul in his epistles and cannot be applied to those saved before Acts 9.)** It is perfectly true that the Body as such is not mentioned in the book of Acts, and that for a very good reason. In this book, we have the record of the beginning of the evangelization of the world, **(Really? For the most part, only Jews are mentioned in Acts. Paul’s ministry to the Gentiles is not mentioned much, even though he had written most of his epistles**



**before the end of Acts. That is because Luke's purpose in writing Acts was to record the fall and diminishing away of Israel. Furthermore, Ironside's argument makes no sense. The body of Christ is a place where "there is neither Jew nor Greek" (Galatians 3:28). Therefore, recording "the beginning of the evangelization of the world" is an argument FOR mentioning the body of Christ, not AGAINST it! If Acts really recorded this evangelization, the body of Christ would have been mentioned.)** which involves, of course, not the revelation of the truth of the Body, but the proclamation of the kingdom of God, which none can enter apart from the new birth. **(Ironside has terms confused again. Being "born again" (John 3:3) is a term that identifies specifically with Israel. Israel was God's firstborn (Exodus 4:22), but, due to sin, it became Satan's lawful captive (Isaiah 49:24-25). It was then up to each Jew to decide to be "born again" and become part of the nation God was forming as a kingdom of priests to reconcile the Gentiles back to God. In the dispensation of grace, the term "born again" is never used. Rather, we are "a new creature" in Christ (II Corinthians 5:17).)**

A careful study of the epistles, taking particular note of the times at which, and the persons to whom, they were written will only serve to make these things clearer. **(Yes, Ironside should do a careful study of Paul's epistles in order to understand the differences between Israel's program and the mystery program.)**



## CHAPTER FOUR

### **When Was the Revelation of the Mystery of the One Body Given?**

IT IS contended by Bullingerites, and others of like ilk, that Paul did not receive the revelation of the mystery of the one Body until he was imprisoned in Rome, 63 A. D. Generally, too, the ground is taken that this revelation was given to him alone, and that the twelve knew nothing of it. Let us see if these assertions will stand the test of Holy Scripture.

We shall turn, first of all, directly to the writings of the apostle Paul, and examine the passages in which he refers to this subject. The first one is found in the Epistle to the Romans which was written, according to the best authorities, in the year A. D. 60, at least three years before Paul's imprisonment, and certainly some time before he reached Rome, as in that letter he tells the Romans that he is contemplating the visit to them, and asks them to pray that it might be a prosperous one. It might seem as though his prayer was not answered inasmuch as he reached Rome in chains, a prisoner for the Gospel's sake. But God's ways are not ours, and we can be sure that in the light of eternity, we shall see that this was indeed one of the most prosperous voyages that anyone ever made. Now in closing this epistle to the Romans, the apostle says in chapter 16, verses 25 to 27:

- "Now to Him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, **(Note that it is "my gospel." Paul uses that term in Romans 2:16, Romans 16:25, and II Timothy 2:8. No one else uses that term in scripture.)** and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith: to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen."

Here we have the plain statement that Paul's preaching throughout the years had been in accordance with the revelation of the mystery previously kept secret, but at that time made manifest. **(Yes. The mystery was revealed to Paul in Acts 9. In Galatians 1:11-12, Paul says that the gospel he preached "is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Paul also says in I Corinthians 9:17 that, "a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me." Paul also says in I Timothy 1:16 that "in me FIRST Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting." Therefore, we can conclude that Paul preached a gospel not previously**

**revealed to anyone else, and that that gospel came directly from Jesus Christ.)** Moreover, he intimates that it had been already published abroad in writing, for he says, "It is made manifest (not exactly by the Scriptures of the prophets, as though he referred to Old Testament prophets, but) by prophetic writings," that is, his own and others. **(Paul says in I Corinthians 14:37 that "if any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Therefore, "the scriptures of the prophets" refers to writings confirmed by prophets as scripture. Since only Paul wrote about the mystery, the specific scriptures Paul is referring to would have to be his writings alone.)** And this proclamation of the mystery had been made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.

Does anyone ask, How can any ultra-dispensationalist dare to say in the face of such a Scripture as this, that the mystery had not been made known and had not been previously preached before Paul was imprisoned at Rome? **(The mystery was made known in Acts 9, not after Acts 28.)** If a simple believing Christian, he will probably be amazed at the answer. Dr. Bullinger and others who follow him suggest that in all likelihood the last three verses of the Epistle to the Romans were not written by Paul when he sent the letter from some distant Gentile city, but that they were appended to the letter after he reached Rome and received the new revelation. **(That cannot be true, because there is no note in the epistle that this is so. Without that note, it makes God out to be a liar, by saying that Paul wrote the entire epistle, when he did not. Furthermore, if someone did add three verses to the end of Romans, they would have deleted verse 24 so that you would not know that they had added the verses. This is man trying to discredit God's Word. The reason Paul adds these three verses at the end is to mention the mystery, so that you will be familiar with that term when you read more advanced mystery doctrine in Ephesians.)** Is this unbelievable? Nevertheless, it is exactly what these men teach. It is higher criticism of the worst type and impugns the perfection of the Word of God. **(Yes, it goes against scripture to believe an Acts 28 position.)** For, even supposing their contentions were true, how absurd it would be for Paul to add these words after he reached Rome, to an epistle purporting to be written before he got there! And how senseless it would be for him to speak while he was in prison, of a Gospel and a revelation which he was supposed to have preached in all the world, if he had never yet begun that proclamation. Needless to say, the contention of Dr. Bullinger is an absolute fabrication. It is the special pleading of a hard-driven controversialist, bound to maintain his unscriptural system at all costs, even to destroying the unity of the Word of God. **(Ironside uses these same tactics in this paper.)**

Error is never consistent, and even the astute Bullinger has overlooked the fact that earlier in this very epistle, Paul declares the truth of the one Body just as clearly and definitely as he does in Ephesians or any later letter.

Notice particularly Romans 12:4, 5:

- "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and everyone members one of another."

Could we have a clearer declaration than this of the truth of the mystery? **(This is part of the mystery.)** What ultra-dispensationalist will dare to say that this passage is an interpolation added in after years in order to make Romans fit with Ephesians? God's Word is perfect and always exact. These unspiritual theorists invariably overlook something that completely destroys their unscriptural hypotheses.

When then did Paul get this revelation of the truth of the one Body? He tells us he had been preaching it throughout the world among all nations. The answer clearly is, he received it at the time of his conversion, when he cried in amazement, "Who art Thou, Lord?" and the glorified Saviour answered, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." This was the revelation of the mystery. **(Ironside just said that the Body of Christ is the mystery. Now, he says that the mystery is that Jesus is Lord. Make up your mind, Ironside! By the time we get to Acts 9, there is nothing mysterious about Jesus being Lord. Peter said, in Acts 2:36, that God had made Jesus "both Lord and Christ." The result of the gospel, given in Acts 2:38, was that 3,000 souls were saved (Acts 2:41). Therefore, there are thousands of people, who know that Jesus is Lord, before that truth was revealed to Paul in Acts 9. Paul says "that in me FIRST Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering" (I Timothy 1:16). Paul was not saved until one year after Acts 2. Therefore, the mystery cannot be that Jesus is Lord. This verse in Acts 9 is just the revelation to Paul that Jesus is Lord. It is not the mystery. The mystery is that all people, both Jews and Gentiles, may receive God's gift of eternal life through grace by simply trusting in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for sins. DO NOT try to say that this is the message that Peter preached. Peter preached Jesus' death, all right, but he preached it as BAD news, not GOOD news. Peter said, "Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23). "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, Whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). Peter said that wicked Israel crucified the Lord. That is bad news to Israel. The good news is to "repent, and be baptized...for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). It is not, "trust in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection for the remission of sins." Also, let us be careful to say that believing that Jesus is Lord is NOT the gospel. James 2:19 says, "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble." Revelation 6:16-17 says that the world says, "Hide us from the face of Him that**

sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: For the great day of His wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

Understanding that Jesus is Lord is a good thing, but you must trust in His death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for your sins in order to have eternal life. Now, regarding "the truth of the one Body," we do not know when Paul received it, but he must have received it before he wrote Romans, which was written, as Ironside mentions, before the end of Acts. That is a problem for the Acts 28 dispensationalists, but not for us mid-Acts dispensationalists. **The Acts 28 position is just as wrong as the Acts 2 position is.)** In that announcement our Lord declared that every Christian on earth is so indissolubly linked up with Him as the glorified Head in Heaven, that everything done against one of them is felt by the Head. **(Jesus said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these MY BRETHREN, ye have done it unto Me" (Matthew 25:40). Therefore, Jesus identifies the little flock of Israel as His brothers, not His body. Since the body of Christ is for the mystery dispensation only, it is only in Paul's writings where we see the link between the head and the body. For example, Colossians 2:19 says, "not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." The little flock of Israel and Jesus do not have this body/head relationship.)** This is, the mystery-members of His Body, of His flesh, and of His bones. **(If the mystery is the body of Christ, as Ironside claims, and the mystery was not revealed until Paul, then how were Peter and all those saved between Acts 2-7 part of the body of Christ?)**

And moreover, this is in exact accord with certain statements elsewhere made in the book of Acts. For instance, in chapter 5, verse 14, we read:

- "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women." **(Believers were "added to the Lord" in the Old Testament, too. That does not mean they are part of His body. Upon marriage, the bride (Israel) becomes one flesh with the bridegroom. Therefore, Israel can be joined to the Lord as part of the bride, without being His body.)**

This was before Paul's conversion. Observe it does not simply say that they were added to the company of believers, nor even added to the assembly alone, but they were added to the Lord. This is only by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. **(That is not true. If that is the case, then all believers before Acts 2 will go to the lake of fire, because the baptism of the Holy Spirit did not occur until Acts 2. Sorry, Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc., you were born too early to have eternal life. Ironside says you cannot be added to the Lord, even though God says you have eternal life, because you did not receive the baptism of the**

**Holy Spirit! Obviously, then, the baptism of the Holy Spirit is not required for someone to have eternal life. In fact, Old Testament prophecy specifically says that it is not until the last days that “I will pour out My spirit upon all flesh” (Joel 2:28).** Quite in keeping with this, when we turn to chapter 11:22-24, we read concerning the character and ministry of Barnabas that,

- "He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith: and much people were added unto the Lord." **(In the mystery dispensation, saved individuals are the body of Christ. In the prophecy dispensation, saved Israel is the bride of Christ. When a husband and wife are married, the two become one flesh (Ephesians 5:31). As such, whether you are part of the body or the bride, you are part of the Lord. Again, the Body of Christ is only mentioned by Paul in his letters, because it is only part of the mystery dispensation (Romans 7:4; I Corinthians 10:16, 12:27; Ephesians 4:12).)**

Now no one was ever added to the Lord in any other way than by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. **(Again, how does Ironside come to this conclusion? Genesis 15:6 says that “[Abram] believed in the Lord; and [God] counted it to him for righteousness.” Yet, we are never told of Abram receiving the Holy Spirit. So, I guess he is lost forever! See how ridiculous Ironside’s statement is?!)** So that clearly we have the Body of Christ here in the Acts, although the term itself is not used. **(Someone can be added to the Lord as His bride without being added to the Lord as His body.)**

When we turn to 1 Corinthians, the only epistle which gives us divine order for the regulation of the affairs of the churches of God here on earth, **(Where does Ironside come up with that idea? I & II Timothy and Titus are the epistles of Paul, specifically written for church order. I Corinthians corrects bad behavior as a result of not following Romans doctrine. I & II Timothy and Titus talk about bishops, deacons, widows, young men, old men, young women, and old women. You do not find any of this in I Corinthians.)** we have the plain statement of this mystery as we have already seen, in chapter 12:12-14.

- "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many."

It is absurd to say, as these ecclesiastical hobby-riders do, that the Body referred to here is not the same thing as the Body of Ephesians and Colossians. It is a Body made up of those who formerly were Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, but are now all one in Christ. And this Body has been formed by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In no other way was the Body of Christ brought into existence. **(Yes, that is what the passage says. If you believe that the body of Christ started with Paul in Acts 9, there will not be two bodies, and everything becomes clear.)** Objection has been raised that when the apostle goes on to apply practically the truth of our responsibility as members of the Body in our relation to each other, he uses the illustration of the eye and ear as members of the head, which, they tell us, he could not use if he thought of Christ as the Head of the Body, and was thinking of believers as one Body with Him. **(The eye and ear are just used as illustrations of body parts we can relate better to. It does not mean that believers are the head. Only Christ is the head.)** But he tells us distinctly in the previous chapter that the Head of every man is Christ. This could only be said of those who were linked with Him in this hallowed fellowship and members of this divine organism. The great difference, of course, between the Body as presented in Corinthians and as in Ephesians is this: the Body in Ephesians embraces all saints living or dead as to the flesh, from Pentecost to the Rapture, whereas the Body in Corinthians embraces all saints upon the earth at any given time. **(Huh? Ironside continues to make statements of belief without providing any scriptural support for his statements. He just criticized Acts 28ers for believing there are two bodies of Christ, and then Ironside turns right around and states that he believes there are two bodies of Christ! How ridiculous is that! Both I Corinthians 12:13 and Ephesians 4:4 state that there is "one body." But, according to Ironside, I am in both bodies of Christ, because I was born between Pentecost and the Rapture, while Old Testament saints are only in one body of Christ!)** Seen thus in the place of responsibility, it is quite in keeping that the apostle should use the illustration that he does. It is in vain for these ultra-dispensationalists to fight against responsibility. **(There is no fighting against responsibility by right dividers. Israel is one flesh with Christ, due to being His bride. The body of Christ is one flesh with Christ, due to being His body. Both are responsible to Christ.)**

Recently I overheard a leader among them make this statement: "Whenever you get commandments of any kind, you are on Jewish ground, and you have given up grace." Yet in every epistle of the New Testament, we have commandments and exhortations insisting upon the believer's responsibility to recognize the government of God in this way. **(Scripture does not agree with this statement. I Corinthians 14:37 says that Paul's epistles are "the commandments of the Lord." In Israel's dispensation, they are under the law. Today, we are not under the law, but under grace (Romans 6:14). Today, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2). Thus, we**



**are under the law of the Spirit, rather than the law of the flesh. Therefore, commandments today are of a different nature than the Mosaic law, but we still have commandments.)** Grace and government are not opposing principles, but are intimately linked together. **(Grace and works are mutually exclusive, not grace and government. “And, if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work” (Romans 11:6). With regard to grace and government, Ephesians 2:8 says we are saved by grace, and Ephesians 1:20-23 talks about Christ using the body of Christ to fill the governmental structure in heaven. Therefore, they are not opposing principles. Ironside fails to recognize that government and commandments are two, different things.)** He who refuses the truth of responsibility does not thereby magnify grace, but rather is in danger of turning the grace of God into lasciviousness and becomes practically an antinomian, throwing off all restraint, professing to be saved by grace, but refusing to recognize the claims of Christ. **(Those, who put themselves back under the law, are the ones refusing the truth of responsibility. Galatians 4:7 says, “Thou art no more a servant, but a son.” As adult sons, God has given us the responsibility to read God’s Word ourselves and let the Holy Spirit teach it to us, using the mind of Christ as a guide, rather than our flesh (I Corinthians 2:9-16). Ironside expects us to be guided by the hand by God as a child would be. The difference is akin to the difference between college and high school. In college, you learn more and use it to work for a living. In high school, you learn less. College professors treat you like an adult. If you do not show up for class or do not study, they will give you an “F,” and have no problem doing so. High school teachers make sure you are in class and spoon feed you what you need to know. There is more responsibility in a college class because you have to have your own motivation to do the work. Similarly, when you are under the law, God spoon feeds you what you can and cannot do. Under grace, it is up to you to read the Bible, believe it, and allow the Holy Spirit to work through your life. You can choose not to do this and suffer the adverse consequences, or you can follow this growth plan and come into the knowledge of the truth (I Timothy 2:4). The fact that God treats you like an adult in grace, instead of a child under the law, shows that there is more responsibility in grace than there is in law, just like there is more responsibility in college than there is in high school.)**

Coming back then to consider the passage in I Corinthians, we have the truth of the Body clearly set forth, and are shown how it was brought into existence in a letter written at least four years before Paul's imprisonment; and he writes that letter to a group of believers who had been brought to a knowledge of Christ through his preaching some years before. To them he says in verses 26, 27:

- "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular."

Verse 26 only emphasizes what we have referred to above, that here we have the Body in the place of responsibility on earth. Members in Heaven do not suffer. All members on earth do. But it is objected again that in the Greek there is no definite article before the word "body," and therefore the passage should simply read, "Now ye are a Body of Christ," and so we are told this refers only to a local church. **(No. There is only "one body" of Christ (Ephesians 4:4). It includes all people saved during the mystery dispensation, which begins with Paul in Acts 9.)** This does not touch the question. Every local church in apostolic days was the Body of Christ representatively in that place. It would be so today if it were not for the fact that so many unsaved people have been received into the membership of the local churches. According to the Word of God, there was only the one Body, and in any city where the Gospel had been preached and believed, that Body could be found as a local company. **(That is true, provided that the church is part of the dispensation of grace. If saved before then, they are part of the bride of Christ.)**

When we pass on to 2 Corinthians, we find the same precious truth ministered by the apostle long before he was imprisoned at Rome. He tells us, in chapter 5:16,17:

- "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature (or literally, this is a new creation): old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

Could words more plainly set forth the truth of the mystery than these? Old relationships ended and every believer brought into a new place altogether before God, and a new condition, so that Christ is now his Head, and he a member of the new creation. **(First, being a new creature does speak of the body of Christ. I find it interesting that Ironside, who is trying to say this is referring to the body of Christ, would change "creature" to "creation," which leads one away from recognizing the body here. Second, if Ironside is emphasizing the "new place altogether before God," he is emphasizing something that Israel, as born-again believers, have, as well. In other words, the new creature is distinctly mystery doctrine, while a right standing before God is possible in all dispensations. However, this is not what the passage is talking about. Rather, it is talking about how we, as new creatures in Christ, are to view others spiritually, rather than physically.)** And this was part of the

preaching that the apostle had been declaring wherever he went during all the years of his ministry.

We turn next to Galatians, a letter written, according to the best authority we have, a year earlier than Corinthians, and the ultra-dispensationalists are very sure that when Paul speaks of being baptized into Christ in this letter, there can be no reference to water baptism, but that he refers solely to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. **(Being baptized into Christ means being baptized with the Holy Spirit. Only a spiritual baptism could baptize us into Christ, as salvation does not come by water, even though it was a condition of the previous dispensation. If one could “put on Christ” by being water “baptized into Christ”, salvation is by the work of baptism, not by the work of Jesus’ death and resurrection. In I Corinthians 12:13, Paul says, “by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.” Earlier in that epistle, he said, “I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius” (I Corinthians 1:14). If water baptism is the baptism of the Holy Spirit into Christ’s body, then Paul would not have thanked God that he only baptized a few of them. He would have been baptizing everyone! Romans 6:3-4 explains that we are baptized into Christ’s death, meaning that, once we are saved, the Holy Spirit baptizes us into the death of Christ so that we may be raised to life in His resurrection (Romans 6:5). Since Ephesians 4:5 says that there is only “one baptism” today, we must conclude that God does not recognize water baptism today.)** I am not in agreement with them on this; but allowing for the moment that they are correct, then notice where it puts their theory. Note carefully chapter 3: 26-29:

- "For ye are all the children (sons) of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Here again we are distinctly told that all the children of faith, Abraham's seed spiritually, are sons of God, and that all such as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, nor any of the other distinctions according to nature, but all are one in Him. **(Unknowingly, Ironside has just proven that the baptism of Galatians 3:27 must be spirit baptism, not water baptism. Since “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female” (Galatians 3:28) for those who have been baptized into Christ, if this is water baptism, then these distinctions must be done away with physically. Yet, we clearly see that Christians are still male and female in the flesh. Therefore, this must be a spirit**

**baptism, not a fleshly baptism.)** Is there anything in the revelation of the mystery as given in Ephesians or Colossians that goes beyond this? **(There is advanced doctrine in Ephesians and Colossians, but what is said in Galatians is also true of the body of Christ today.)** It is a clear definite statement of the absolute unity in Christ of those who before their conversion occupied different positions here on earth, some being Jews, some Gentiles, some free men, some slaves, some men, some women, but every distinction now obliterated in the new creation. **(That is true, spiritually speaking only. Why, then, does Ironside think that water baptism, which pertains only to the flesh, would accomplish the doing away of these spiritual distinctions? Also, note that Israel is not told that they are part of the “new creature.” Rather, they are “born again” (John 3:3). They are “born again” as Christ’s bride, rather than being part of the “new creature,” which is the body of Christ.)**

If any are foolish enough to object, as some have, that Abraham's seed is altogether different from the Body of Christ, **(Abraham’s seed is not only “the body of Christ.” God tells us that Abraham’s seed is Christ (Galatians 3:16). This includes both His bride (Israel) and His body (mystery gospel believers).)** then we turn to Ephesians itself, the epistle which they claim, above all others supports their unscriptural theory, and find their entire position is there completely disallowed. In the first chapter of this glorious epistle, the apostle reminds the Ephesians of things that they have learned through his ministry in days gone by. There is no hint that he is opening up to them something new, but he simply puts down in writing for permanent use, precious things already dear to them. **(In Ephesians 1:18, Paul prays that “the eyes of your understanding being enlightened.” He does want them to learn some new information. This new information is of the governmental structure in heaven that the body of Christ will fill (Ephesians 1:20-23), because they are in Christ, seated together with Him in heavenly places (Ephesians 2:5-6). If the information is not new, then why is he writing it to them? We do not learn about the body of Christ occupying positions in heavenly places until we get to Ephesians 1.)** He reminds them that they have been blessed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ; that they have been chosen in Him before the foundation of the world in order that they might be holy and without blame before Him; that in love, He has predestinated them unto the place of sons by Christ Jesus, having taken them into favor in the Beloved. Theirs is redemption through His blood, sins all forgiven according to the riches of His grace, and to them He has abounded in all wisdom and prudence, having made known the mystery of His will according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself (see vers. 3-9). **(Reminds them? Much of this information is new to them.)** He points them on to the full consummation of this mystery when in the administration **(Not administration, but dispensation. “The dispensation of the fulness of times” (Ephesians 1:10) is when God dispenses “the exceeding riches of His grace” (Ephesians 2:7) to all believers in heavenly and earthly realms by having all of those things**

**being gathered in Christ. Thus, it is not just an administration, but a dispensing.)** of the completed seasons, that is, the last dispensation, He will head up in one all things in Christ, both heavenly and earthly, and He reminds them that we have already obtained an inheritance in Him, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things according to the counsel of His own will. We need to notice the pronouns used in verses 12 and 13. He first speaks of converts from Israel, when he says, "That we should be to the praise of His glory, who first trusted in Christ." Then he refers to the Gentiles, such as these Ephesians had been, when in the next verse he says **(There is no mention of Jews or Gentiles in these verses. Rather, it mentions that there were people in the body of Christ before the Ephesians. These would have been both Jew and Gentile, especially in light of the fact that Ephesians 2:14 says that "the middle wall of partition between" Jew and Gentile has been broken down.):**

- "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory."

Now observe carefully, he is far from intimating that he is at this time unveiling something of which they had never heard before. He carries them back in memory to the hour of their conversion, and declares that these things were true of them then. **(Yes, these things were true of them in "the hour of their conversion." Paul is building the foundation of who they are in Christ so that they will understand the new information given to them, beginning in 1:18, that Christ will fill the heavenly places with the church, the body of Christ.)** And, because of this, he prays that they may have deeper understanding, not of new truth about to be revealed, but of blessed and wonderful things already made known. **(Obviously, the Ephesians did not know these truths. Otherwise, Paul would not have prayed "that ye MAY know" (Ephesians 1:18). Paul is giving them new information about the heavenly places so that they may know who they are in Christ so that they will serve Christ in that manner.)** In the second chapter, he deals specifically with the new creation, reminding them in verse 12 that they in time past were Gentiles who were called uncircumcision, and were in themselves without Christ and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and literally atheists in the world. **(Paul does not say that the Ephesians were atheists. "Without God in the world" (Ephesians 2:12) just means that they did not have eternal life yet. It does not mean that they thought that God does not exist!)** But now they have been made nigh by the blood of Christ. The result is that they became

members of that same Body into which their converted Jewish brethren had already been assimilated. **(What Ironside is doing is that he is saying that Ephesians 1:12 refers to Jews so that he can say that the body of Christ started in Acts 2 because that is when Jews began to be converted. The problem with this argument is that, in Ephesians 1:12, Paul uses the word “we,” which means Paul is included. But, back in Acts 2, Paul was “a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious” (I Timothy 1:13). Paul is “the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because [he] persecuted the church of God” (I Corinthians 15:9). When God called Paul in Acts 9, Paul was called so that “in [him] FIRST Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting” (I Timothy 1:16). Therefore, by Paul saying “we” in Ephesians 1:12, he is referring to the group he belongs to, which is are the believers in the body of Christ, who were ALL saved in Acts 9 and after.)** Notice carefully verses 14-18:

- "For He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us: having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

The distinction between Jew and Gentile was abolished in the cross, not after Paul's imprisonment in Rome. **(“The middle wall of partition” (Ephesians 2:14) is the wall between Jew and Gentile. It is not the veil in the temple that was torn in two when Christ died (Matthew 27:51). The middle wall was broken down when God stopped treating Israel with favored nation status, which we have already seen occurred with the call of Paul in Acts 9. If it was abolished at the cross, the little flock would not have gone to Israel alone before Acts 9.)** From that time on all who believed were brought into the Body of Christ through the one Spirit of verse 18. What were the means used to effect this? **(The answer is in Ephesians 2:8 that “by grace are ye saved through faith.” They received this faith of Christ by believing the gospel that Jesus died, was buried, and rose again, as mentioned in I Corinthians 15:3-4. Jesus did not tell the 11 apostles to teach that gospel. He told them to teach “them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matthew 28:20). These “things” would include the Mosaic law, as Matthew 23:2-3 says, “The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.” Therefore, the body of Christ could not have started before Acts 9,**

**because a different gospel was being taught that did not have the power to bring people into the body of Christ, even if they believed it!) The preaching recorded in the book of Acts, for it is only that to which he can possibly refer, when he says (verses 16,17): (Paul said that he received the gospel that he preached “by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:12). Paul said that what he preached “was kept secret since the world began” (Romans 16:25). By contrast, Peter said that the message he preached, “God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began” (Acts 3:21). Therefore, we must be careful to note that Paul is only referring to HIS preaching in Acts, not to PETER’S preaching.)**

- "That He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby, and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh."

It was necessary that the message should first go to them that were nigh, as it did in the early chapters of Acts, **(First, we must note that Romans 3:2 tells us that the Jews had the oracles of God. Therefore, Ironside is correct in saying that the Jews were “nigh,” while the Gentiles were “afar off.” However, he is NOT correct in saying that the gospel of grace went to Jews in Acts 1-7. In fact, Peter preaches a message of “repent and be baptized...for the remission of sins” (Acts 2:38). The gospel of grace was not revealed until given to the apostle Paul in Acts 9. Therefore, the gospel of grace going “to them that were nigh” did not take place in the first seven chapters of Acts. It only took place through Paul’s ministry. This is clear, when we read Acts 9-28, because those chapters show Paul giving the mystery gospel to the Jews first and then to the Gentiles. If the early chapters of Acts took care of the ministry to the Jews, Paul never would have gone to the Jews in his ministry, but Jesus specifically commissioned Paul to: “Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel” (Acts 9:15).)** and then to those that were afar off; but the result of that preaching was that all who believed were reconciled to God in one Body.

In the last four verses of the chapter he shows the unity of the Church from the beginning. The Church is the household of God. It is also a great building, and he declares:

- "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (New Testament prophets, of course), **(Not “New Testament prophets”, Ironside, but “body of Christ” prophets. Ephesians 4:11 specifically says that**

**AFTER His ascension to heaven, Jesus gave “some, apostles; and some, prophets.” They were given “TILL we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13). These are body of Christ prophets that were given until the Word of God was completed with Paul’s writings.)** Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth (note the tense; it is not yet completed, it is still in process of construction, but it is growing) **(That’s because people are still being saved.)** unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

How blind must he be who can see in such a passage as this, disassociation of the Ephesian saints from the work which God began at Pentecost! **(Since the mystery was made known to Paul by Jesus Christ (Ephesians 3:1-3) and it was not made known in other ages (Ephesians 3:5), how blind Ironside must be in not seeing these verses and trying to include early Acts believers in a program that no man knew would even exist! Also, why does Ironside disassociate the work at Pentecost with the work of God before that, especially since, when the Holy Ghost comes, Peter says, “This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel” (Acts 2:16)? Does not this one statement confirm that God did not start something new at Pentecost, but that He was continuing the prophecy program, and that program was now entering a new phase, as prophesied in Joel? Therefore, the reason there is a disassociation with Paul’s ministry is because it was something new, “which was kept secret since the world began” (Romans 16:25), while there is no disassociation between Acts 2 and the previous scriptures, because what Peter preached was merely a continuation of the prophecy program, “which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began” (Acts 3:21).)** They are builded into the same temple and rest upon the same foundation. **(Even Ironside says that Paul, in Ephesians 2:20, is speaking of “New Testament prophets.” Therefore, by Ironside’s own admission, he believes that the foundation of Acts – Revelation is on New Testament prophets, completely disassociating with the Old Testament prophets. Ironside provides no basis for making such an assertion. Yet, I have given scripture that shows that God started a new program with the apostle Paul, and yet Ironside expects us to believe him, instead of believing God’s Word!)**

This is made even clearer in the next chapter, where Paul gives us probably the fullest information concerning the one Body that we have anywhere in the New Testament, and, therefore, we must devote considerable time and space to it. First, he tells us that he was a prisoner of Jesus Christ because of the Gentiles, and he explains that in the next few verses. It was his



devotion to the revelation of the mystery which is part of the dispensation of the grace of God, that resulted in his imprisonment. **(Paul is “the prisoner OF Jesus Christ FOR you Gentiles.” That does not mean that Paul was imprisoned in a physical prison by Gentiles. Acts records that Jews were the cause of his imprisonments. Rather, “a dispensation of the gospel” has been committed unto him, and he is obligated by Jesus Christ to preach it (I Corinthians 9:16-17). As such, he is the spiritual prisoner OF Jesus Christ to preach the gospel of the grace of God to the Gentiles, as “the apostle of the Gentiles” (Romans 11:13).)** He did not get this dispensation after he was in prison. Then he insists that this revelation was not made in previous ages unto the sons of men, that is, it was not made known in Old Testament times. But he tells us it is "now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." **(Again, there goes Ironside, creating a separation between the Old and New Testaments that is not there. We have already seen that the term “apostles and prophets,” in Ephesians 2:20, is defined by Paul in Ephesians 4:8-13 as those given by the Lord Jesus Christ to His body for this dispensation. This would have to be after Acts 8, since the mystery was revealed to Paul first, and Paul was a blasphemer before Acts 9. Therefore, “His holy apostles and prophets” have to be those of the mystery dispensation, which would not include the apostles and prophets in the New Testament before then.)** Now if I believed in over-emphasis as some do, I should like to print these words in very bold type, **(He should have put the scripture in bold. Then, maybe his readers would believe God’s Word, instead of Ironside’s false doctrine.)** but to do so would be an insult to the intelligence of my readers. I simply desire to ask their most careful attention to these words. **(It is because of our careful attention to these words that we recognize that God started something new with the apostle Paul because we carefully note the words “which in other ages was not made known” (Ephesians 3:5).)** The Bullingerites tell us that the mystery was only made known to the apostle Paul, not to other apostles. **(The mystery was made known to Paul FIRST, since he received his gospel “by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:12), and he specifically calls it “my gospel” (Romans 16:25). However, other apostles in the mystery dispensation received the mystery after him. We need to get out of the mindset that God only chose 12 apostles, because Ephesians 4:8-14 specifically says that Jesus Christ gave the body of Christ “apostles” AFTER His ascension to heaven.)** The apostle himself tells us here that "it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets." Note not only the plural, but that others besides apostles had this revelation. How utterly absurd would words like these be if he were referring to something that had just been secretly made known to him! But is it true that other apostles and prophets had already known the mystery? It is. This he declares in these words. **(No. Paul said that it is “now revealed” to others. It does not say that they heard the mystery before Paul did. If they did, then why did Jesus Christ have to give it to Paul by a special revelation? Why didn’t Ananias tell it to him when he came in Acts 9 to heal Paul’s blind eyes, especially when God**

now wants “all men” to “see what is the fellowship of the mystery” (Ephesians 3:9?) What is that mystery? Verse six is the answer.

- "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same Body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel." **(So, if the mystery is the body of Christ and it was not revealed until given to Paul, then how could early-Acts believers be part of the body of Christ?)**

Thus they too become Abraham's seed, because they are children of faith.

The mystery then is not simply centered in the term "Body," but whatever expression may be used, the mystery is that during the present age all distinction between believing Jews and believing Gentiles is done away in Christ. **(Yes, this is part of the mystery. What Ironside is missing is that the present dispensation did not start until Paul in Acts 9 for Peter clearly said that, the information that he spoke, “God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began” (Acts 3:21). Therefore, we must conclude that Peter’s message belongs to a previous dispensation, in which the distinction between believing Jews and believing Gentiles is NOT done away with. That is why Jesus said that “salvation is of the Jews” (John 4:22). That is also why “these twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 10:5-6). Clearly, Jesus still made a distinction between the Jews and Gentiles, and this distinction was carried out by the 12 apostles in early Acts until God began a new dispensation with Paul in Acts 9.)** Was this mystery made known by other servants besides the apostle Paul? It was. The apostle John makes it known in his account of our Lord's ministry as given in the tenth chapter of his Gospel. There we read that the Lord Jesus, as the Good Shepherd, entered into the sheepfold of Judaism to lead His own out into glorious liberty. And cryptically He adds,

- "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold. Them also I must bring, and there shall be one flock and one Shepherd."

This is perhaps the earliest intimation of the mystery that we have. **(What? In John 4, Jesus went to the Samaritans. They were Jews, but not of “this fold.” In John 7:35, we are told of Jews “dispersed among the Gentiles.” Therefore, the “other sheep” are those Jews. Jesus calls them “the LOST sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 15:24). Since they are lost, they are not of this fold. God said in Leviticus 26:33 that**

He would scatter Israel among the heathen if they disobeyed the law. He then said in Ezekiel 34:11-16 that He would “search My sheep, and seek them out,...and I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land....I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be....I will feed My flock....I will seek that which was lost.” Since both Ezekiel 34 and John 10 show Jesus as the Good Shepherd, the one flock and one Shepherd of John 10:16 must be referring to the fulfillment of the regathering of Israel into the land, as stated in Ezekiel 34:11-16, and not to the mystery, which God was still keeping secret (Romans 16:25) at the time of John 10:16. Since Peter said that the information that he preached had been revealed ever since the world began and Peter stated that in Acts 3, which was after John 10, we must conclude that the mystery had not begun yet in John 10, which means that Jesus could not have revealed the mystery then, because Jesus was “the Son of man,” and Ephesians 3:5 says that the mystery “was not made known unto the sons of men.” That means that Jesus, as the Son of man, not only did not reveal the mystery to the 12 apostles in John 10, but He did not even know it Himself, as the Son of man!) It was not committed to writing, of course, until some years after the epistle to the Ephesians was written. **(Ironside is saying that John was written after Paul’s epistles. However, Colossians 1:25 says that Paul’s epistles were written “to fulfil the Word of God.” Therefore, the gospel of John must have been written before Paul wrote about the mystery and not after, as liberal scholars claim so that they can deny the supernatural aspects of Matthew – John.)** But it shows us that John, as an apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, had received the revelation of the mystery even before the apostle Paul did. **(If that were the case, Peter and John would have been preaching the mystery in early Acts, yet we see them continuing Israel’s prophecy program.)**

Then what of the apostle Peter? We dare to say this same mystery was made known to him on the housetop of Simon's residence in Joppa, when he had the vision of the descending sheet from Heaven and saw in it all manner of beasts and creeping things, and heard the word from Heaven, **(Peter heard Jesus’ statement at John 10:16 at the same time that John did. If John knew the mystery then, why would Peter have to wait 1-2 years later in Acts 10 before God revealed the mystery to him, and why did John keep the mystery a secret from Peter? Also, why didn’t John speak up in Acts 3:12-26 and preach the cross as good news, instead of letting Peter preach it as bad news? Obviously, John, Peter, and the rest of the apostles did not know the mystery in early Acts.)**

- "What God hath cleansed call thou not common," or unclean. **(This statement comes from Acts 10:15. The mystery was revealed to Paul in Acts 9. Therefore, Paul had already received the**

**revelation of the mystery before it was revealed to Peter in Acts 10. God started the mystery dispensation with Paul in Acts 9, and Peter needed to know about this change, too. Therefore, God gave Peter the vision of the sheet of meat in Acts 10.)**

This was to him an intimation that in Christ the distinction between Jew and Gentile was henceforth **(Yes, “HENCEFORTH” is correct. Not at the cross, as Ironside previously said, or at Acts 2. Rather, the distinction between Jew and Gentile was eliminated with the revelation of the mystery to Paul in Acts 9.)** to be done away, and he makes it perfectly clear that this was his conviction when he stood up to preach in the household of Cornelius (Acts 10:34 to end). Moreover, his epistles emphasize the same fact, though not in the full way that those of the apostle Paul do. **(Where in Peter’s epistles does he talk about Jews and Gentiles being equal in God’s eyes? I do not see it. In Deuteronomy 7:6, God says, in reference to Israel, “For thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth” (Deuteronomy 7:6). God also says in Exodus 19:6 that, “ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” According to Ironside, God lied in those passages, and Jews and Gentiles are really equal now. Surely, then, God has learned from His previous mistake and will guide Peter into showing Jews and Gentiles equal in writing his epistles in the New Testament. Yet, I Peter 2:9 says, “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of Him Who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light.” In continuing the writing, Peter says, in I Peter 2:12, that they are to have their “conversation honest among the Gentiles.” This shows that Peter’s audience was Jews. Therefore, Israel was placed by God on a pedestal above the Gentiles in the Old Testament, and they are still on that pedestal in Israel’s program in Peter’s epistles. Why, then, does Ironside think that Peter’s epistles emphasize that Jews and Gentiles are on the same level even after the cross?)** John and Peter are apostles. Are there any prophets who give evidence of having in measure at least understood this truth? The greatest of all the New Testament prophets is Luke himself, **(That’s funny, because Jesus said in Matthew 11:11,13 that “there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist,” because “all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.” Since Ironside elevates Jesus’ words in Matthew – John above the rest of the Bible, why would he say Luke is the greatest prophet, since Jesus never even mentioned Luke’s name?)** and in his book of the Acts, the mystery is plainly made known, though not taught doctrinally. **(Yes, Luke did understand the mystery, and even went with Paul on his apostolic journeys to spread the mystery, but he did not know the mystery before Paul did. The reason the mystery can be seen in Acts is that Luke wrote to Israel, and the mystery gospel**

**went to Israel in Acts 9-28.)** We see God working in grace to unite Jew and Gentile into one Body.

Turning back to Ephesians three, we find in verse seven that the apostle tells us that he was made a minister according to the gift of the grace of God for the very purpose of making known this mystery. He says in verses eight and nine,

- "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ."

This had been his great responsibility throughout the years. Because of this, he had suffered bitter persecution, on account of which he was even then in prison, but he is the more concerned that after his death there should be left on record such a full statement of this truth that no one could lose sight of it. **(That is because “a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto [Paul]” (I Corinthians 9:17) as “the apostle of the Gentiles” (Romans 11:13). God gave to Paul, AND PAUL ALONE, the job of recording mystery doctrine for us to learn today as we read God’s Word. It is significant to note that the word “mystery” appears 22 times in scripture—once in Mark, 4 times in Revelation, and 17 times in Paul’s epistles. Of the five references outside of Paul’s epistles, all five are defined in those verses as talking about a different mystery than what was revealed to Paul. If, then, Peter, John, and the other apostles wrote of the mystery, why do they never even mention it?)**



## CHAPTER FIVE

### Further Examination of the Epistles

PASSING over for the present the Apostle Paul's presentation of the sevenfold unity of Christianity in Ephesians 4, and his identification of the Body and the Bride in chapter 5, **(Paul does not mention the bride of Christ in Ephesians 5. The Bride is Israel and is not the same as the Body of Christ, which is us today.)** which we shall discuss later, we turn now to others of the prison epistles to see if we can find the slightest intimation of a new revelation given after Paul reached Rome.

Unquestionably, Philippians was written during the Roman imprisonment. But we search its four precious chapters in vain for the least suggestion that he has received anything new to unfold. In chapter 1, where he presents Christ as the believer's life, he shows how thoroughly the evangelistic spirit had taken possession of him, **(It was not "the evangelistic spirit" that got hold of Paul. Rather, the Lord said of Paul, "he is a chosen vessel unto Me, to bear My name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). Paul said, "For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" (I Corinthians 9:16). Therefore, Paul did not just get caught up in "the evangelistic spirit." Rather, Paul was doing what the Lord Jesus Christ told him to do, which is why he was "the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles" (Ephesians 3:1.)** so that even in his prison-cell he was rejoicing that Christ was being preached whether in pretence or in truth, and his own desire is that this same Christ may ever be magnified in his body, whether in life or in death. He urges the saints to stand fast in one spirit contending for the very faith which he had already made known to them. There is not a hint that he has now something new to reveal; that is, that the old dispensation to which they had hitherto belonged had come to a close, and that a new one had begun. **(The dispensational break is in Acts 9—not here in Philippians.)** In chapter 2 he dwells on Christ as our Example, **(Paul does not say that Christ is our example. Rather, he says that we should allow the MIND of Christ to lead us (Philippians 2:5), which he told the Corinthians that we have (I Corinthians 2:16). Rather, Paul tells the Philippians that they should follow Paul, and that they have Paul and Timothy as their ensamples, not Christ (Philippians 3:17), simply because we are not "minister[s] of the circumcision" as Jesus was (Romans 15:6.)** and shows how he himself and Timothy and Epaphroditus during the years had sought to follow in Christ's steps, and this is still before his soul. **(They are doing the work of Christ (Philippians 2:30), rather than following in Christ's steps. Paul specifically tells them "brethren, be followers together of me" (Philippians 3:17). He never tells them to follow Christ.)** In the third chapter he recounts his past experiences and self-confidence in the old days

before he was saved, and then shows how the change was brought about by a sight of the risen Christ. **(The change was not “brought about by a sight of the risen Christ. He told the Corinthians that “we walk by faith, not by sight” (II Corinthians 5:7), and that “though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more” (II Corinthians 5:16). Rather, the change was brought about by “the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ” (Colossians 2:11). In other words, upon salvation, Christ gave Paul (and all believers since, for that matter) the ability to set aside the lusts of the flesh and walk in the Spirit (Galatians 5:16). This change was made possible, not “by a sight of the risen Christ,” but by Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection, so that we may now “live by the faith of the Son of God” (Galatians 2:20), rather than by sight.)** From that moment on, he counted all things as loss for the One who had won his heart, **(“Won his heart” sounds like an emotional response, which was not the case. Paul made a distinctive “counting” as a new creature in Christ, recognizing that the things he gained by the Jewish religion paled in comparison to “the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord” (Philippians 3:8). Therefore, Paul used the mind of Christ (I Corinthians 2:16) to make his decision to “know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings” (Philippians 3:10), rather than following his “won heart.”)** and he was pressing on toward the mark for the prize of the calling of God on high in Christ Jesus. He calls upon them whom he designates as "perfect" to be thus minded. "Perfect" here means "mature," or we might even say well-rounded, or well-balanced. **(“Perfect” means complete in Christ. All members of the body of Christ are complete in Christ (Colossians 2:10). We have all been given the mind of Christ, even the immature and carnal among us, as Paul calls the Corinthians “carnal” in the very next verse after he says that they have the mind of Christ (I Corinthians 2:16 – 3:1). Therefore, Paul’s call is for all members of the body of Christ to be “thus minded” (Philippians 3:15), not just the “well-rounded” ones. And, by the way, what does “well-rounded, or well-balanced” mean?)** Nothing is needed to give them this perfection in addition to what they already had. Surely, if anywhere, this was the place to show them that hitherto they were but babes, and had only received an initial revelation, but that now he had something for them of an altogether new character which would perfect them in Christ. **(Yes, they are already complete in Christ. However, this is based on the revelation of the mystery given to Paul in Romans – Galatians. It is not based on the books of Matthew and forward, as Ironside implies.)** But there is no word of any such added truth. Nor yet in the last chapter where he exhorts to unity and peace among themselves. May we not say that Paul is singularly remiss in not sharing with his old converts at Philippi the new revelation he had received, if such a thing were really true? **(Ephesians – Colossians gives further revelation of mystery doctrine that is not found in Romans – Galatians. This new doctrine is of our position in heavenly places. For example, Philippians 3:20-21 says that our lifestyle should**



**be representative of someone, who is already in heaven, because, as far as God is concerned, we are already there. Romans – Galatians did not go into this detail. Matthew – John’s focus is on the earth, as we see Jesus telling His disciples to pray for God’s kingdom to come to earth and for God’s will to be done on earth, as it is in heaven (see Matthew 6:10). Therefore, if Ironside tries to lump Paul’s epistles in with what Jesus said in Matthew – John, he will not even see our position in heavenly places. Sadly, mainstream Christianity is in the same ignorance as Ironside is in.)**

But it was not true; all the reasoning of the ultra-dispensationalists to the contrary notwithstanding; for when we turn over to Colossians we find him once more reiterating the same truths he had proclaimed for a generation. **(Again, this is not true. Colossians 1:5 says that our hope is laid up for us in heaven, not on earth. Colossians 1:16-20 talks about how Jesus is the head of the body and will reconcile all things to Himself through His cross work. It also gives the governmental structure of heaven. This information is not found before Ephesians. If Paul was just rehashing old doctrine, the books of Ephesians – Colossians would serve no purpose and, thus, would be omitted from the Bible.)** He shows that two ministries had been committed to him from the first. **(Wait a minute! The Acts 28 crowd says that Paul had two ministries—one from Acts 9-28 and one afterward. The Acts 9 position says he only had one. Is Ironside now agreeing with the Acts 28 crowd that Paul had two ministries?)** He had been made a minister of the Gospel. **(What gospel? Not the “gospel of the kingdom” that Jesus committed to the 12 apostles (Matthew 24:14), but the “gospel of the grace of God” (Acts 20:24). The 12 apostles recognized that Peter was given a different gospel than Paul was (Galatians 2:7). Why won’t Ironside make this same recognition?)** That Gospel has been preached in all the creation which is under heaven. **(According to Romans 1:20, the gospel “preached in all creation” is that there is a Godhead, Who we should worship, due to His eternal power seen in creation. Revelation 14:6-7 calls this “the everlasting gospel.” The gospel for today is different, which is to trust in Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for your sins (I Corinthians 15:3-4). Therefore, by his statement, Ironside is not even recognizing the gospel of the kingdom or the gospel of the grace of God as today’s gospel.)** He had also been made a minister of "the mystery which hath been hidden from ages and generations, but now," he says, "is made manifest to His saints: to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in (or, among) **(By adding “(or, among)”, Ironside shows he does not believe that we have the mind of Christ, even though I Corinthians 2:16 says that we do!)** you, the hope of glory: whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: whereunto I also labor, striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily" (Col. 1: 26-29).

Let it be carefully observed that he is here covering his entire ministry. **(Ironside says that Paul has two ministries: 1) Preaching the everlasting gospel, and 2) Preaching the mystery. Thus, Ironside says that there is no salvation in the mystery, which is not true, because the mystery includes the gospel of the grace of God. But, now Ironside says that the mystery covers "his entire ministry." So, which is it? Does Paul have two ministries or one?)** He had no such opportunity to preach to multitudes while he was in his Roman, or as some think, his Caesarean prison at the time he wrote this epistle. But he tells us what had characterized his ministry throughout the years. Other saints there were whom he had not met personally, as well as those at Colosse. He thinks of the Laodicean believers, and he longs that they all may be brought into the knowledge of this mystery. But it is not something new. **(As mentioned before, Colossians is progressive revelation of the mystery, rather than being something completely new. However, it is still new information that is revealed in Romans – Colossians. The scripture Ironside quotes says that these epistles are how "God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles." Therefore, while the Colossians would already be familiar with mystery doctrine from reading Romans – Galatians, the epistle to them expounds upon "the riches of the glory of this mystery.")** It is that which has ever characterized his teaching.

The Epistle of Titus is not of course a prison epistle at all, but it was written later than any of those that are so designated, excepting Second Timothy. In this letter Paul instructs the younger preacher, Titus, as to the divine order for local churches, the work of a true pastor, and the testimony committed to the servants of God. Surely here, if anywhere, we should expect him to put before Titus the fact that the "transitional period" has now come to an end and Titus must ring the changes as the ultra-dispensationalists do to-day, on "body truth," "closed doors," "Jewish Gospels," "Kingdom Age," etc., etc., ad nauseam. But, no; none of these terms so frequently used and played upon until one is wearied, are suggested to Titus. He is simply to go on preaching and teaching the very same things that have been taught during his earlier association with the Apostle Paul. **(Yes. The epistle to Titus is concerned with "holding fast the faithful word" (Titus 1:9) of the mystery. However, just because there is no new dispensation beginning with Paul after Acts 28, it does not mean that there was no new dispensation beginning with Paul in Acts 9.)**

The brief letter to Philemon we may pass over, as we would hardly expect to find anything doctrinal in it; and yet even here if Paul's heart were throbbing with the joy of some absolutely new opening up of truth, we would almost wonder how he could help saying a word about it, at least to his friend Philemon.

Hebrews was undoubtedly written very shortly before the apostle's

martyrdom, granting that it is from the pen of Paul. **(Hebrews was written to the Hebrews. Paul is “the apostle of the Gentiles” (Romans 11:13). As such, Paul could not have written it. Furthermore, Hebrews had to have been written before Acts 7, because Hebrews 3:15 says, “To day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation,” and Hebrews 3:13 tells them to “exhort one another daily, while it is called To day.” This “To day” period ended with the stoning of Stephen. We also see conditional salvation in Hebrews, which is characteristic of Israel’s program. For example, Hebrews 6:4-6 says that “it is impossible for those who were once enlightened...if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.” Contrast this with Romans 5:9 which says, “Much more then, being NOW justified by His blood, we SHALL be saved from wrath through Him.”)** That this is so, I have tried to make clear in my book on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and I shall not attempt to go into it now. But in any case, it was undoubtedly written very shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, **(It was undoubtedly NOT written then, for Israel’s program had not been set aside when the book of Hebrews was written.)** and here if anywhere, one might expect these Hebrew believers to be told that the "kingdom age" is now over, "the transition period" has now been finished, and it is for them to accept the new revelation of "body truth." But we search in vain for anything of the kind. It is simply a normal presentation of the precious things of Christ, showing how completely Old Testament types have had their fulfilment in Him and His finished work, and that all who believe now come under the blessings of the new covenant. **(Hebrews is a Jewish book, showing the necessity of what Jesus did and how it will bring about a new covenant for Israel. How could Ironside say that the new covenant is in effect now and is for “all who believe,” when Jeremiah 31:31 clearly says, “I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah”? Furthermore, Hebrews 8:13 says, “Now that which decayeth and waxeth old IS READY to vanish away.” Therefore, at the time of the writing of Hebrews, the new covenant had not been put in place yet.)**

Probably later than Hebrews is the second letter to Timothy. It was penned during Paul's second imprisonment, very shortly before his death. As this occurred in A. D. 66 or 67, we may see how far along we have come and still no mention of any new revelation. So far as the truth that is dealt with is concerned, Second Timothy might have been written any time before the first imprisonment. It is in perfect harmony with all the apostle's previous ministry. **(The purpose of II Timothy is not to impart new doctrine. Rather, it is to tell Timothy not to stray from the mystery doctrine he already knows. “Hold fast the form of sound words” (II Timothy 1:13). “Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things” (II Timothy 2:7). “Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings.” (II Timothy 2:15-16). “Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned” (II Timothy**

**3:14). “Preach the word” (II Timothy 4:2). These exhortations are given in light of the fact that most people, who believed the mystery doctrine, have since gone away from it. Paul says, “this thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me” (II Timothy 1:15). Therefore, II Timothy is written to exhort Timothy to continue in mystery doctrine, in spite of the fact that most people have turned away from it. The same is true today. We should not follow the Christian crowd into apostasy.)**

But now there are other Epistles to be considered. We have already seen that Paul makes no claim to being the sole depository of the revelation of the mystery. He says it was made known to Christ's holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, and so we turn to consider the writings of other apostles and prophets asking, "Have we in them any intimation of a new revelation after Paul went to Rome?" **(AFTER Jesus ascended to the Father (Ephesians 4:8) is when “He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets” (Ephesians 4:11). Therefore, apart from the 12 apostles in Matthew – John and the prophets in Israel, Jesus gave apostles and prophets to the body of Christ exclusively, and those apostles and prophets continued “Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God” (Ephesians 4:13). In other words, the apostles and prophets would last until all of God’s Word to the Body of Christ was completed. Galatians 2:7 says that the 12 apostles of Israel’s program recognized that they were given a different gospel than what was given to Paul for the mystery program. Based on that, Galatians 2:9 says that the 12 apostles would confine their ministry to the circumcision only, meaning the saved Jews in Israel’s dispensation. Therefore, Hebrews – Revelation are books written to Israel in their dispensation only. Thus, these books are not directly applicable to the Body of Christ today. Therefore, there will not be found any mystery doctrine in these books, even though the apostles of Israel’s dispensation were familiar with mystery doctrine after it was revealed to Paul.)**

We may dismiss the Epistle of James as not touching on this question. It is addressed definitely to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, and is God's last word, as it were, to those of Israel who were still more or less linked in spirit to the synagogue. **(Ironside is saying that James is written to Israel, but he refuses to identify the change in dispensations. Therefore, he comes up with this idea that James was written to “those of Israel who were still more or less linked in spirit to the synagogue.” Exactly who are these people if they are not saved Israel in Israel’s dispensation? And, since Ironside recognizes that James is written to Israel, why does he not recognize that Hebrews is written to the Hebrews, I Peter is written to scattered Israel (I Peter 1:1), and all of the other epistles through Revelation were also written to Israel only?)** Bullingerites generally tell us that James was the first epistle to be written but this is absurd on the face of it. It is quite evident that James is a corrective epistle. **(Yes, James is a corrective epistle based on a bad application of Hebrews’ doctrine.**

**It has nothing to do with Paul's writings, because they are in a different dispensation.)** It must have been written after the doctrine of justification by faith, as proclaimed by Paul, had been widely preached, for James writes to check those who were abusing that doctrine and using it as an occasion for the flesh. No one can read chapter 2 thoughtfully without seeing that it is based upon, and has in view throughout, Paul's teaching in Romans 4. **(How is that? Paul says in Romans 3:28 that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." James says in James 2:24 that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Paul uses Abraham as an example of justification by faith alone, because he says, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness" (Romans 4:3). James, on the other hand, uses Abraham as an example of justification by faith plus works, because he says, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" (James 2:21). James 2 uses Abraham to show justification by faith plus works. Romans 4 uses Abraham to show justification by faith alone. James does not build upon Romans. Rather, it uses a different argument to come to a different conclusion for a different dispensation.)** James does not contradict Paul in the slightest degree, **(I just cited Romans 3:28 that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," and James 2:24 that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." How do these verses NOT contradict each other, since they state two, different ways of being justified?!)** but he does show that there is another justification than that of which Paul speaks. The great apostle to the Gentiles deals particularly with justification by faith before God. James, the apostle to the twelve tribes, emphasizes justification by works before men. **(First, James says justification is by faith plus works, not works alone (James 2:24). Second, where does Ironside get the idea that James is talking about "justification by works before men?" The first example James uses is of Abraham offering his son on the altar. The only person around to see this work would have been Isaac, who certainly would not have justified his son for trying to kill him! Nor would any other man say, "Ya' know that Abraham. I thought he was an evil person, but, now that I see that he almost made a human sacrifice out of his son, he is a just man in my book!" That very thought is absurd! The second example James uses is of Rahab being justified by keeping the spies from Israel safe (James 2:25). Rather than justifying her, the men around her would have had her killed for helping the enemy. No resident of Jericho would have said, "That harlot, Rahab, was an evil person, but she is justified in my eyes now, because she lied to her fellow countrymen to allow the enemy to come and destroy us." Again, this is an absurd thought. Furthermore, even if James was talking about justification before men, who cares about that? Michael Jackson was justified by works before men in that over 1 million people wanted to attend his funeral, but that does not mean he has eternal life in Christ, because "it is God that justifieth" (Romans 8:33), not man.)**

First Peter was probably written before Paul's second imprisonment. Second Peter was certainly written afterwards, and all of Paul's letters were already in circulation when this epistle was penned. Note Peter's own words: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction" (2 Pet. 3: 15, 16). It is impossible to understand these verses excepting in the light of the fact that all the Epistles of Paul were already in circulation. **(At least some of Paul's epistles had to be in circulation at this time, not necessarily all of them. Most "scholars" put the dates of the Hebrew epistles (Hebrews – Revelation) a lot later than they really were written, because they do not rightly divide the word of truth. Note that Peter says that Paul wrote "ACCORDING TO THE WISDOM GIVEN UNTO HIM." Thus, Peter confirms that what Paul wrote was "a dispensation of the gospel" that was "committed unto" him (I Corinthians 9:17) that came to him "by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Galatians 1:12). If Paul's revelation was not different from what Peter wrote, Peter would not say that Paul's epistles contain "some things hard to be understood.")** Does Peter then tell us that a new dispensation had come in, and that the middle wall between Jew and Gentile having now for the first time been broken down and the one Body formed, the believers to whom he writes, **(Peter does not write to the body of Christ. He writes to the "little flock" (Luke 12:32) of Israel. With the dispensational change at Acts 9, Peter recognized that he was to go only to the "circumcision," while Paul went to the "heathen" (Galatians 2:9). The circumcision, in this context, must refer only to saved Jews as part of Israel's program, because the "heathen" is defined in Acts 9:15 as "Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). Therefore, Peter only wrote to saved Jews, who are part of Israel's program. He did not write to the body of Christ. This is evident by Peter's statement that Paul wrote "according to the wisdom given unto HIM" (II Peter 3:15). As such, Peter did not need to explain mystery doctrine to them. They could go to Paul's epistles for that.)** who were of Jewish extraction, are to recognize this new revelation? Not at all. Peter has never heard of any such thing. **(WHAT?! Peter had never heard that the middle wall between Jew and Gentile had been broken down? Ironside, himself, just a few pages prior, stated, with regard to Peter: "This was to him an intimation that in Christ the distinction between Jew and Gentile was henceforth to be done away, and he makes it perfectly clear that this was his conviction when he stood up to preach in the household of Cornelius (Acts 10:34 to end). Moreover, his epistles emphasize the same fact, though not in the full way that those of the apostle Paul do." So, Ironside says that Peter recognizes in his epistles that the distinction between Jew and Gentile has gone away, then, just a few pages later, Ironside states that "Peter has never heard of any such thing"!)** He puts Paul's writings on the same plane as the other

Scriptures, **(This shows that Paul's epistles are just as much a part of the Word of God as the "red letters" of Jesus in Matthew – John.)** but warns against the danger of misunderstanding, and so wresting them. **(Peter said, "They that are unlearned and unstable wrest [Paul's scriptures], as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction" (II Peter 3:16). That is EXACTLY what Ironside, and all of mainstream Christianity, do with Paul. Instead of considering Paul's writings so that the Lord will give them understanding in all things (II Timothy 2:7), they fail to recognize the new dispensation that the Lord Jesus Christ started with Paul. Therefore, they do not rightly divide the word of truth (II Timothy 2:15). Therefore, they are "unlearned and unstable," resulting in them wresting Paul's scriptures, as well as the rest of the Bible, trying to make it all fit into their religion instead of resting in the simplicity that is in Christ (II Corinthians 11:3) by just believing what God says in His Word. It really is that simple!)**

Long years after all the other apostles had gone home to heaven, we find the aged John still preserved in life and caring for the churches of God. **(Revelation 1:3 says that "the time is at hand" for the events in Revelation. That means that Revelation had to have been written before Acts 7, because, once Jesus stood up and judged Israel in Acts 7:55, the time was no longer at hand. I know Christians say that Revelation was written at the end of John's life and was the last book of the Bible written, but that is based on faulty church history and a lack of rightly dividing the word of truth. I would much rather believe God's Word over what man says. Since God's Word says "the time is at hand" at the writing of the book, Revelation must have been written before Acts 7.)** According to apparently reliable Church History, **(Church history would have you believe that the books of the New Testament were not considered scripture until the Council of Nicaea in 325 AD declared them to be so. Yet, Peter calls Paul's epistles "scripture" in II Peter 3:16 before the Bible was even completed! Church history, therefore, is highly unreliable.)** he made his home in Ephesus, and moved about in old age among the other churches mentioned in the first three chapters of the Book of the Revelation, those churches which the Bullingerites declare never existed in the past but are still to arise as Jewish Assemblies in the Great Tribulation! **(These churches existed in the past and will exist in the future tribulation period, as well. Most prophecy has a near-fulfillment and a future, complete fulfillment. Such is the case with the seven churches. It is funny that Ironside tries to get his audience not to believe Acts 28ers because they say the Jewish assemblies will exist in the future, when Ironside himself says that these churches never existed at all—past, present, or future! Rather, Ironside says they represent seven, church ages over the last 2,000 years. Therefore, it is Ironside who twists God's Word here, not the Acts 28ers.)** Could anything be much more grotesque? **(Yes, Ironside's views, that side with man and discard what God's Word says, are much more grotesque than what Acts 28ers say here.)**

John's Epistles were written, according to the very best authority we have, some time in the last decade of the first century of the Christian era. **(No, “the very best authority we have” is God’s Word, not “Biblical” scholars. God’s Word says that Revelation was written around 30 AD, because it says that the time of the tribulation period was in its “at hand” phase when the book was written. Liberal, “Biblical” scholars set dates for New Testament books way too late in time so as to make their theories plausible. For example, with the four gospels, these scholars like to say that they were written a generation or two after Jesus by people not named Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John. That way, they can say that the gospel writers copied each other, made errors, made Jesus into God when He was not, the miracles never happened, etc. As such, it is best not to trust what these scholars say.)** Weigh this well. Paul had been in heaven for nearly thirty years. **(Says who?)** John was an inspired apostle, **(God’s Word is inspired (II Timothy 3:16), not the men who wrote it. John merely wrote what the Holy Ghost told him to write down (II Peter 1:21).)** and surely would know, if any one did, of the new revelation and its importance. But we search his letters in vain for the least reference to anything of the kind. **(That is because John wrote down “the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass” (Revelation 1:1). Therefore, John was given a different revelation for a different group of people than what Paul was given from the Lord Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the mystery had not even been revealed yet.)** In fact, we find the very opposite. False teaching had come in, and he writes to garrison the hearts of the saints against it. **(False teaching creeps in almost immediately wherever truth is found, regardless of dispensation. Paul told the Galatians that he marveled that they were so soon removed “unto another gospel: Which is not another” (Galatians 1:6-7).)** In order to do this, he refers them back to that which was from the beginning, namely, to the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself and His apostles, as a careful reading of his first Epistle makes abundantly clear. There is not the slightest basis for the thought that a fuller unfolding of truth had been vouchsafed to Paul and others about thirty years after Christ's ascension. **(First, the mystery was revealed to Paul about one year after Christ’s ascension. Second, Revelation was before that time. Therefore, John could not have spoken of the mystery at that time. Third, the fact that the teaching of Jesus in His earthly ministry is pertinent shows that the Revelation is written to Israel in their program. It has nothing to do with the mystery dispensation, committed unto Paul.)** It is the message that they had heard from the beginning which he again commends to them. **(Because they are still in the kingdom dispensation.)**

Let us imagine the late Dr. Bullinger, or some of his lesser satellites, living, not in the twentieth century, but in the closing days of the first century of the Christian era. Filled with their ideas of a new revelation given to Paul in



prison, can you by any stretch of the imagination think of them writing epistles or treatises in which no reference whatever is made to the supposedly new doctrines? **(First, Paul's writings "fulfil the word of God" (Colossians 1:25). As such and contrary to popular belief, nearly all of the New Testament writings, outside of Paul, were written before the mystery was given to Paul. Therefore, Ironside's analogy is incorrect from the start. Second, the new doctrines of the mystery dispensation were not for the people in Israel's program to follow. Even after the 12 apostles of Israel's program understood the mystery, they agreed that Paul would go to all unbelievers with mystery doctrine, while the 12 would continue with doctrine for Israel's program among the believing remnant of Israel only (Galatians 2:9). Therefore, even in their later writings, the 12 apostles would not mention the mystery. Third, if a new revelation had not been given to Paul, then God is lying, because God's Word specifically says that Paul taught what he learned "by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Galatians 1:12). Ironside and fundamental Christianity make two errors here. 1) They think that the "apostles and prophets" that Paul refers to would be those from Jesus' days on earth. However, that cannot be the case. Otherwise, Paul would have been taught the new doctrine by Ananias, rather than by Jesus Christ. Since Paul says that, "a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me" (I Corinthians 9:17) and "that in me FIRST Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting" (I Timothy 1:16), we must conclude that the apostles and prophets of Ephesians 2:20 must be the ones that came after Paul, which makes sense in light of the fact that Jesus Christ gave apostles and prophets to the body of Christ AFTER His ascension (Ephesians 4:8-13). 2) They assume that the New Testament was all written after Paul received the mystery in Acts 9. Therefore, they conclude that Paul is just another apostle. However, the scripture I have shown proves that man's philosophy is wrong in this case. Scripture supports the idea that most of the New Testament, outside of Paul's epistles, was written before Acts 7, and the apostles and prophets in Paul's epistles being ones given specifically to the body of Christ after the mystery was revealed to Paul in Acts 9.)** The fact of the matter is that these men today can scarcely open their mouths without speaking of these things. **(Since eternal life and sanctification today only come about by believing the gospel found only in Paul's epistles, it is of the utmost importance that we focus on Paul's epistles. Similarly, we can say that mainstream Christianity can scarcely open their mouths without speaking of Jesus' words in Matthew – John. They put Jesus' words in red, and almost every sermon is centered around a New Testament passage outside of Paul's epistles. Why do they ignore Paul? Why do they ignore the Old Testament? Because they want to twist the scripture to say that our works are involved in our salvation and in our sanctification, so that they can glory in the flesh, rather than in the cross of Christ. "As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer**

**persecution for the cross of Christ....[They] desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh” (Galatians 6:12-13.)** No matter what text they begin to expound, they almost invariably wind up with something about their system of rightly dividing the Word of Truth (**First, it is not “THEIR system;” it is God’s system. He is the One Who said to rightly divide the Word of truth (II Timothy 2:15), and He is the One Who said that we learn how to do this by considering what Paul said (II Timothy 2:7) as our apostle today (Romans 11:13). Second, God specifically tells us in II Timothy 2:15 that if we are to be “approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,” we must “study” God’s Word by “rightly dividing the word of truth.” Therefore, rightly dividing the word of truth is how we obey the commandment of the Lord, shewing to others that we have been approved unto God and not being ashamed of our beliefs in the midst of the “profane and vain babblings” of man (II Timothy 2:16). In short, we make a big deal out of right division, because God makes a big deal out of right division.**), and the importance of making the fine distinctions which they imagine they see in the Word. (**As shown in my comments, these are far from being “fine distinctions” which are imagined. Rather, these are clear differences that even the 12 apostles in Acts 15 were forced to see before Paul had even written down any of the mystery as scripture. How much clearer, then, are these distinctions now that the full mystery has been revealed in God’s written, inspired Word, and we have the Holy Spirit to teach us the things of God (I Corinthians 2:9-16)?**) Yet inspired men like Peter and John, (**Again, Peter and John were NOT inspired. God’s Word is inspired (II Timothy 3:16), not the writers. Peter and John merely wrote down what God told them to write down (II Peter 1:21). They were not inspired to write their own words. The Lord Jesus Christ IS the Word of God (John 1:1.)**) and without particularly going into it, we may add Jude, can expound and apply the Truth of God in the fullest possible way (**This is blasphemy to say that God’s Holy Word is not His Word, but is the words of the writers as they “expound and apply the Truth of God.” Epistles in scripture are not man’s commentary on God’s Word. Rather, they ARE God’s Word, on an equal level with the rest of scripture, including Jesus’ precious words in red!**) without any reference to anything of the kind. (**The Old Testament writers applied the truth of God without ever mentioning that Jesus would die on a cross and it is also probably impossible to figure out, from Old Testament writings alone, that He would rise from the dead. That is because, according to Hebrews 9:8, “the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.” This is true for the first 4,000 years of man’s history, even though Jesus’ death and resurrection are absolutely essential for the salvation of those who lived during those 4,000 years. Fundamental Christianity refuses to accept this as fact, because it ruins their theory that there is only one gospel throughout all dispensations. However, not believing this is calling God a liar in Hebrews 9:8, and God cannot lie, according to Titus 1:2. Furthermore, trusting in Jesus’ death, burial, and**

**resurrection as atonement for your sins is ONLY revealed in Paul's epistles. Granted, Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection are in the Hebrew epistles, but trusting in that for salvation is not found there. How could this be missing from the Hebrew epistles? Because it is only for the mystery program and not for Israel's program. Therefore, it should be expected that the mystery would not be revealed in scripture outside of Paul's epistles.)** What is the only legitimate conclusion? It is that this whole ultra-dispensational system is an idle dream unsupported by the testimony of the inspired writings. **(This is an illegitimate conclusion, because it fails to recognize the truth of the mystery as revealed in Paul's epistles alone and the lack of this same information being in any other part of the Bible. The rest of the Bible is just as true as Paul's epistles are, but the rest of the Bible has truth pertaining to God's kingdom on earth, while Paul's epistles have truth pertaining to God's kingdom in heaven.)**

Error is never consistent. **(No, error is always consistent, i.e., it is consistently wrong, as Ironside's paper proves. A more accurate statement is that error is always wrong, and God's Word is always right. I have shown many scriptures that prove that Ironside's paper is in error.)** It always over-emphasizes some point generally unimportant and fails to recognize other things of great importance. **(Yes, that is exactly what fundamental Christianity does. It overemphasizes the red letters of the Bible, which are not to be followed today, while failing to recognize the change in programs by the Lord Jesus Christ in Acts 9, which is of great importance, because you cannot even have eternal life today without the gospel found ONLY in Paul's epistles.)** Heresy is simply a school of opinion in which something is particularly pressed out of proportion to its logical place. **(Yes, that is why Christianity says that they cannot understand the Bible, because they are propagating a school of opinion that is not supported by scripture as a whole. They must be taught by seminaries and by pastors how to change God's Word to fit their heretical views, instead of resting in "the simplicity that is in Christ" (II Corinthians 11:3) by just believing what the Bible says.)** Who would dare to say that this system we have been attempting to refute is not therefore heretical? **(It is only heretical to those who have been blinded to the truth by the god of this world (II Corinthians 4:4). The only way fundamental Christianity succeeds in convincing people that they are standing on the truth of God's Word, while right dividers are following a heretical system, is by "dishonesty," "walking in craftiness," and "handling the word of God deceitfully" (II Corinthians 4:2).)** Mark, I do not mean to class it with what Peter calls "damnable heresies," but it is certainly schismatic, and its votaries constitute a special school of opinion within the professed Church of God, a school that attaches great importance to something which after all is not evident to the vast majority of devoted and godly believers. **(Regarding the mystery, even before Paul died, he said, "All they which are in Asia be turned away from me" (II Timothy 1:15). He also said, "At my first answer no man**

stood with me, but all men forsook me” (II Timothy 4:16). Now, we know that Paul was giving us mystery truth for today, or else his writings would not be in scripture, since he says: “that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord” (I Corinthians 14:37). Since the vast majority of believers forsook truths for today for Jesus’ red letters while Paul was still alive, we should expect even more Christians to do the same nearly 2,000 years later.) That the effect of this can only be division and harmful, is not only self-evident, but has been abundantly manifest in many places. **(The effect of NOT accepting God’s Word rightly divided is harmful, because it keeps you from doing God’s will, which is for you “to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth” (I Timothy 2:4).)** The Holy Spirit says, "A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself" (Titus 3:10, 11). **(Therefore, the Acts 2 position should be rejected, recognizing that those believing it are condemned of themselves.)** This is as certainly the Word of God as anything else revealed in the Scripture of Truth. **(So, Ironside only puts Paul’s epistles on the same level as other scripture when it benefits him. But, when Paul says he received the revelation of the mystery directly from Jesus Christ (Galatians 1:11-12), a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto Paul (I Corinthians 9:17), Paul has his own gospel (Romans 2:16), Paul is the apostle of the Gentiles (Romans 11:13), Paul was the first one saved under the mystery gospel (I Timothy 1:15-16), etc., suddenly, Paul’s epistles are not authoritative scripture and must be changed to fit Ironside’s heretical views.)**

## CHAPTER SIX

### Is the Church the Bride of the Lamb?

ONE of the first positions generally taken by the ultra-dispensationalists is that it is unthinkable that the Church should be the Body of Christ, and yet at the same time be identified with the Bride of the Lamb. They insist that there is a mixing of figures here which is utterly untenable. How, they ask with scorn, could the Church be both the Bride and a part of the Body of the Bridegroom? **(The issue is not that God COULD NOT make us both, although it would not make sense if He did. The issue is that God DID NOT make us both. The term “body of Christ” is found four times in scripture, and they are all in Paul’s epistles and they only apply to us today (Romans 7:4, I Corinthians 10:16, I Corinthians 12:27, and Ephesians 4:12). With regard to Israel being the bride, the entire book of Song of Solomon shows Israel as the bride. The parable of Matthew 25:1-13 shows Israel as the bride and Jesus as the groom. John referred to Jesus as the groom and Israel as the bride in John 3:29. Revelation 19:7-9 refers to Jesus marrying Israel. Revelation 21:9 calls Jerusalem “the bride, the Lamb’s wife.” Revelation 22:17 refers to Israel as the bride. Isaiah 62:1-5 says that Israel’s name will be changed to married when God rejoices over her. Even when Paul likens the body of Christ to Christ’s wife, he never calls us Christ’s wife. He says, “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and He is the Saviour of the BODY” (Ephesians 5:23). If ever we were called Christ’s wife, it would be in that passage, but we are still called the body, even in the context of marriage. Therefore, the scriptural evidence leads us to conclude that Israel is the bride of Christ, and we today are the body of Christ. This is not a distinction that ultra-dispensationalists made up. Rather, it is a distinction that God makes in His holy Word.)** Some even go farther and suggest that Christians who all down through the centuries have had no difficulty as to the two figures (recognizing the fact that they are figures, **(Since the Bible never tells us that they are figures, I disagree about them being figures. Again, Ironside relies upon man’s church history as being authoritative above the word of God. Basically, Ironside is saying that all of the scripture I cited is wrong, while man is right.)** and therefore that there need be no confusion in thought when it comes to harmonizing both), are actually guilty of charging Deity with spiritual polygamy! **(“Spiritual polygamy?” I think Ironside’s parents failed to explain what marriage is. Marriage is between one man and one woman, as defined by God in Genesis 2:22-25. The “body of Christ,” since it is His body, is part of Christ, the bridegroom. The “Lamb’s wife,” since it is His wife, is His bride. That is one man and one woman getting married. It is NOT one man marrying multiple women. This would be so much easier for Ironside if he would just believe what God’s Word says!)** I would not put

such an abominable thought in writing, **(You just did!)** but it is their own expression which I have heard again and again. **(There is nothing abominable about a man (Christ) marrying a woman (Israel). Rather, marriage is a divine institution ordained by God.)** They point out, what all Bible students readily admit, that in the Old Testament, Israel is called the bride and the wife of Jehovah. "Then," they exclaim, "how can the Lord have two wives without being guilty of the very thing that He Himself condemns in His creatures here on earth?" **(The problem is that Ironside brings up an argument by his opponent that is flawed, instead of the argument that the body of Christ is not the wife of Christ; it is the body. Also, Ironside makes it sound like the body of Christ is made up by his opponents to avoid the "spiritual polygamy" view, which is weird because Ironside has been arguing for a body of Christ that starts in Acts 2. Quite simply, God has told us in His Word that Israel is the bride, and that we, as the body of Christ, are part of the bridegroom. There is nothing made up by right dividers to make their theory work. Our view is 100% consistent with the truth of God's Word.)**

In view of such absurd deductions, it will be necessary to examine with some care just how these figures are used. **(Fundamental Christianity will say that certain things are to be taken only spiritually or certain things are only figures. If the Bible does not specifically tell you this, then you do not know this. If the body of Christ is a figure, then maybe salvation by the blood of Christ is a figure. Then, I do not believe in His blood as atonement for my sins, and I go to hell for all eternity. This shows the danger of thinking that things are figures. Whenever man takes what the Bible actually says and makes it a figure, he is just changing scripture to fit his view, unless we are told in scripture that it is a figure. Since the bride of Christ and the body of Christ are never specifically identified as figures, we should not take them as such. They are both literal.)** In the first place, we find God using a number of different figurative expressions in speaking of Israel. He declares Himself to be their Father, that is, the Father of the nation, and Israel is called His son. "Out of Egypt have I called My son" (Hosea 11:1), and, "Let My son go, that he may serve Me" (Exod. 4:23). **(Again, this is not a figure. God called Abram and started the nation of Israel (Genesis 12:1-3). God promised that He would give Abraham a son of Sarah's womb (Genesis 17:16). Isaac was born, and he was born after both Abraham and Sarah did not have the natural ability to have children. The way that Isaac was born was that "the Lord visited Sarah...for Sarah conceived, and bare Abraham a son in his old age, at the set time of which God had spoken to him" (Genesis 21:1-2). Romans 4:19-21 describes this in easier-to-understand terms by saying: "And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sara's womb: He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; And being fully persuaded that, what He had promised, He was able also to perform." It was God Who PERFORMED the birth of**

**Isaac, which means that Israel was birthed of God, making Israel “God’s son,” which is NOT a figure. It literally happened!**) In other places similar expressions are used, and yet the prophets again and again speak of Israel as the wife of Jehovah, **(Yes, Israel is also Jehovah’s wife because God entered into a covenant relationship with her, which is what marriage is.)** and the later prophets depict her as a divorced wife because of her unfaithfulness, **(God divorced Israel due to them being apostate. Deuteronomy 32:21 says, “They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities: and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.”** Jesus gives more detail on this by saying, **“The kingdom of God shall be taken from you [apostate Israel], and given to a nation [believing Israel] bringing forth the fruits thereof” (Matthew 21:43).** Then, Luke 12:32 says, **“Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”** Putting these three verses together, we learn that God divorced Israel, and He will marry the little flock of Israel in the future, who are all believers from Israel throughout their dispensation. **This group of believers is called “the Israel of God” (Galatians 6:16).**) some day to be received back again, when she has been purged from her sins. But it is important to see that a divorced wife can never again be a bride, **(And, apostate Israel will never be God’s bride again. God divorced unbelieving Israel, while staying true to believing Israel, with the official marriage supper being held after Jesus’ second coming (Revelation 19:7-9).** Jesus told apostate Israel, **“Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?” (Matthew 23:33).** The answer is that they cannot. In summary, God married all of Israel and then divorced apostate Israel. In the tribulation period, **“He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years” (Malachi 3:3-4).** So, God marries Israel, they become apostate, and He divorces the apostates. Then, He purifies the little flock so that **“His wife hath made herself ready” (Revelation 19:7)** for the marriage supper of the Lamb. Therefore, the divorced wife does not become God’s bride again. Rather, God takes the scarlet sins of believing Israel and makes them white as snow (Isaiah 1:18) so that they may **“dwell in the house of the Lord for ever” (Psalm 23:6).**) even though she may be forgiven and restored to her wifely estate. **(So, is Ironside saying that the blood of Christ forgives her sins but does not atone for her sins, because she can never be better than what she was before her sins? This is completely inconsistent with scripture! Today, if you have trusted in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ as atonement for your sins, you are a saint, “blessed...with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (Ephesians 1:3).** This is something that Adam never had before he sinned. God not only restores us through the blood of Christ, but He

puts us in a better position than what we are in before sin came, because we are made spiritually alive in Christ (Ephesians 2:1). How dare Ironside blaspheme God and His provision through Christ by saying that Israel is a worse situation under the new covenant than under the old covenant! **The book of Hebrews teaches just the opposite.)** What incongruity do we have here if we are to interpret Scripture on the principle of the Bullingerites. Here is a son who is also a wife. **(I am both a son and a husband. There is nothing strange about that. I just have different roles with different people. The Godhead has three members—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. When God calls Israel His son, He speaks as God the Father. When God calls Israel His bride, He speaks as God the Son. The difference in gender also should not be an issue. God made Adam a complete human being. He then took a rib out of Adam’s side and made another human being, called a woman, taking some of Adam’s characteristics out of him and giving them to the woman. The woman, then, is just like the man, except that she has different characteristics than the man does. However, in the body of Christ, (Galatians 3:28) there is no male or female because we are all made complete in Christ (Colossians 2:10). In other words, the characteristics from both genders are to be embodied in each member of the body of Christ, such that the distinction between man and woman is done away. Similarly, in Israel’s program, Jesus said, “In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven” (Matthew 22:30), meaning that there is also no male or female in the bride of Christ, Israel. Thus, Israel can be both male and female, son and bride, and there be nothing strange about it. In fact, it would be strange if Israel was NOT called both son and bride by God.)** What utter absurdity!

Then again we have Israel depicted as a vine. "God brought a vine out of Egypt" (Ps. 80: 8), and, "Israel is an empty vine; he bringeth forth fruit for himself" (Hosea 10: 1). In many other places, the same figure is used. **(We can deduce from reading Genesis 1-3 and Judges 9:7-15 that a vine, in the scripture, represents a nation. Numbers 23:9 states that Israel “shall not be reckoned among the nations.” Therefore, when God calls Israel a vine, He is referring to them being a nation apart from other nations.)** Elsewhere we have this favored nation **(Ah ha! Ironside recognizes Israel’s favored nation status, as well.)** spoken of as the priests of the Lord, occupying a special position throughout all the millennium, as though they were intermediaries between the Gentiles and Jehovah Himself. **(Not “as though they were intermediaries,” but Israel IS the intermediary between the Gentiles and God. God said, “Ye shall be a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel” (Exodus 19:6). Isaiah 61:6 says to Israel, “ye shall be named the Priests of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles.” Since they are intermediaries, they are called to “Go ye therefore and teach all nations” (Matthew 28:19). That is why**



**Zechariah 8:23 says, "that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you." If you say this is a figure, you must change the very clear words of the Bible. You must say, "Well, the Jews are not really priests. God does not really mean for them to teach all nations. They are not really Jews going to the Gentiles." You have to change the scripture in multiple places to believe the Jews, being called "Priests," is a figure.)** Other similitudes are used, but these are enough to show that there is no attempt made in Scripture to harmonize every figure. **(I just explained each so-called figure that Ironside mentioned is true, and God uses the different terms because they mean different things that Israel will be. A similar thing can be said about Jesus Christ. He is called many names by God. Would Ironside say, "These are just figures. Jesus is not really 'Wonderful, Counseller, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.'" (Isaiah 9:6)? These names are all accurate descriptions of the roles Jesus Christ will fill in God's everlasting kingdom on earth. The same holds true, then, for the many names God has given Israel, but, if you discard things because they do not agree with your religious beliefs, you miss the richness of the blessings Israel has in Christ, the richness of Who Christ is for Israel, and, for us, "the exceeding riches of [God's] grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Ephesians 2:7). These words in Paul's epistles are not platitudes. They actually mean what they say, but Christians have no idea that this is the case, because unbelievers, like Ironside, tell them they are just figures!)** Each one is used as suits God's purpose for the moment. So the nation which at one time is viewed as a son is seen on another occasion as a vine, and elsewhere as a wife, and again as a nation of priests. **(And, I have explained how Israel fits into each of these roles.)**

This being so in connection with Israel, why need we be surprised if a similar diversity of terms is used in connection with the Church? **(Yes, if God blesses Israel with multiple roles, He will bless the body of Christ with multiple roles, as well.)** When our Lord first introduces the subject of the new order, He speaks of the Church as a building: "Upon this rock I will build My Church" (Matt. 16:18). **(There is no new order spoken of here. Jesus is still speaking to the nation of Israel. In fact, in the previous chapter, Jesus said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 15:24). The church that Christ speaks of here is the same church that was in the wilderness in Moses' day (Acts 7:38).)** The apostle Paul views the Church in the same way in 1 Corinthians 3:9, 10, "I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. Ye are God's building." **(God's "building" is the place where God dwells. God dwells in His building with His wife in God's kingdom on earth, and He dwells in His building with His body in God's kingdom in heaven. People can have two homes, a summer home and a winter home, and no one thinks that is strange. Why, then, couldn't God, Who can be in more**

**than one place at once, have two homes—one for His body and one for His bride?)** Again in Ephesians 2:19-22: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God: and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." In regard to this passage, please take note that if the Bullingerites are correct, we have here a building suspended in the air with a great gap between the foundation and the superstructure; for this building is said to rest upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, but according to the views of those we are discussing, we must separate in a very definite way the New Testament apostles and prophets of the book of Acts from the Ephesian church, which is supposed to be a different company altogether. **(Ironside fails to recognize two, distinct groups of apostles and prophets in the New Testament. Jesus chose 12 apostles in Matthew – John. Then, Ephesians 4:7-13 says that “WHEN HE ASCENDED UP ON HIGH..., He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets.” Therefore, if Jesus chose apostles in His earthly ministry and He chose apostles after His ascension, there are two, distinct groups of apostles and prophets. The former group was for Israel’s program, and the latter group is for the body of Christ. The apostles and prophets of the body of Christ were given “TILL we all come in the unity of the faith” (Ephesians 4:13), which is until the Bible is complete. We learn from I Corinthians 14:37 that a prophet’s job was to determine which of Paul’s epistles were scripture and which were not. Therefore, there is no gap between the foundation and the superstructure, as Ironside claims. Rather, Jesus Christ’s death, burial, and resurrection is the chief cornerstone, and the foundation is the revelation of Jesus Christ of mystery doctrine given to Paul (Galatians 1:12) and confirmed by apostles and prophets (I Corinthians 14:37) that Jesus Christ gave to the body of Christ (Ephesians 4:11).)** The absurdity of this becomes the more apparent as we see how we would have to do damage to the picture of the building as used here by the apostle Paul. The fact is the Church of Acts and that of the prison epistles is one and indivisible. **(A church is a group of believers. The believing remnant of Israel believed the gospel of the kingdom. The body of Christ believes the gospel of grace. Since we are all believers, you can say that we are all part of God’s church. However, in the sense that we were given different things by God to believe, we are different groups of believers. If the two groups do not believe different things, there would not have been “much disputing” (Acts 15:7) between Paul and the 12 apostles of Israel’s dispensation. The body and the bride are not the same, although they both belong to Christ. Therefore, Israel and the body are not the same, even though they can both be classified as the church, since they both belong to Christ.)** In I Timothy 3:15, he speaks of "the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." The apostle Peter looks at the Church in exactly the same way,

as a company of living stones built upon the Living Stone, our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:5). **(In I Timothy, Paul is referring to proper behavior among the body of Christ, since the church is the pillar and ground of the truth. In I Peter, Peter is talking about the believing remnant of Israel being lively stones to go out to the Gentiles with the gospel of the kingdom and the law covenant during Jesus' millennial reign. I notice that Ironside does not quote I Peter 2:5, as he quoted I Timothy 3:15. That is because I Peter 2:5 also says that Israel is "an holy priesthood," which goes in line with Israel being a kingdom of priests to reach the Gentiles in the kingdom (Exodus 19:6; Isaiah 61:6). John the Baptist said, "Think not to say within yourselves, 'We have Abraham to our father:' for I say unto you, that God is able OF THESE STONES to raise up children unto Abraham" (Matthew 3:9). Jesus said, in reference to the believing remnant that, "if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out" (Luke 19:40). In other words, stones are a reference to the believing remnant of Israel that will go out to the Gentiles with the gospel of the kingdom, while the church of the living God is a reference to believers in the mystery dispensation. Therefore, Paul and Peter are NOT talking about the same thing!)**

We have already seen that the figure of the Body **(There he goes again by saying that something is a figure. I Corinthians 12:27 very clearly says, "Ye are the body of Christ," which shows that the body is NOT a figure.)** is used in a number of Paul's writings, not only in the prison Epistles, but in Romans and 1 Corinthians, to set forth the intimate relationship subsisting between Christ in glory and His people on earth, **(Correction: The Body sets forth the intimate relationship between Christ and His people of today's dispensation, who will live forever with Him in heaven and, as far as God is concerned, are already there, e.g., Ephesians 2:5-6 and Philippians 3:20.)** whereas the house expresses stability, and tells us that the Church is a dwelling place for God in this world, as the temple was of old. **(The church, the body of Christ, is only part of the dwelling place for God. The most important part, the chief corner stone, is Jesus Christ. The next most important part is the foundation of the house, which is the word of Jesus Christ to us today via the apostle Paul. The body of Christ is then "the building fitly framed together" (Ephesians 2:19-22). This tells us that the dwelling place for God in the dispensation of grace is a spiritual house. We should note that this is separate from the house of God for Israel's program. Jesus told the 12 apostles that His Father's house was already built, and that He went to prepare a place for believing Israel within that house (John 14:2).)** The Body speaks of union with Christ, by the indwelling Spirit. But Paul sees no incongruity whatever in changing the figure from that of the Body to the Bride. In the fifth chapter of Ephesians he glides readily from one to the other, and no violence whatever is done to either view. **(Paul does not "glide...from one to the other." Paul talks about the mystery in Ephesians 3. Then, he talks about the unity of the body in Ephesians**

**4:1-16. Then, he gives practical application of how the body should treat each other in Ephesians 4:17-32. Then, in Ephesians 5:1-20, he talks about how different we are from the world. Then, in Ephesians 5:21-33, he talks about how we should treat each other at home. Then, in Ephesians 6, he talks about how we should act in the world. Thus, there is no gliding from body to bride. Rather, Ephesians 5:21-33 is practical application of mystery doctrine for husbands and wives that is within a larger practical application section of mystery doctrine and has nothing to do with Israel, the bride of Christ.)** He shows us that a man's wife is to be regarded as his own body. And in the latter part of that chapter, where he goes back to the marriage relationship as originally established by God, he says:

- "Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church: for we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself: and the wife see that she reverence her husband" (verses 24-33).

Surely nothing could be plainer than that we are to understand the relationship of Adam and Eve at the very beginning was intended by God to set forth the great mystery of Christ and the Church. **(In marriage, the man and the woman become one flesh. They are one body. In other words, as far as the flesh is concerned, the man's body and the woman's body are one. As such, the husband and wife should take care of each other as they would take care of their own bodies, because the other person is part of their body. To illustrate this, Paul tells of how Christ takes care of His Own body, the church. Paul is just using an analogy that the Ephesians already understand in order to explain the relationship that should be present between a husband and a wife. Not once in the passage does Paul refer to the body of Christ as Christ's wife. In fact, Paul says that Christ sanctifies and washes the church, and then says, "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies" (Ephesians 5:28). In other words, Paul uses the relationship between**

**Christ and His body to show that husbands and wives should take care of each as they do their own bodies, which shows that the church today is Christ's body.)** Writing to the Corinthians at an earlier date, he said, "I have espoused you as a chaste virgin unto Christ," and Christian behavior is shown to spring from the responsibility connected with that espousal. The Church is viewed as an affianced bride, not yet married, but called upon to be faithful to her absent Lord until the day when she will be openly acknowledged by Him as His Bride. **(II Corinthians 11:2 is the scripture reference here. First, we should note that the Corinthians are "espoused," which means they are engaged to be married but are not married yet. This is important to note because I Corinthians 12:27 says, "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Therefore, Paul cannot be talking about the same thing in II Corinthians 11:2 as he is in I Corinthians 12:27, because they are already part of the body of Christ, but they are engaged to be married in II Corinthians 11:2. In other words, in II Corinthians 11:2, Paul is not talking about them being married to Christ. Second, we should note that Ironside misquoted the passage to fit his belief. As Ironside misquoted it, it sounds like the Corinthians are espoused to Christ. However, the passage really reads, "I have espoused you TO ONE HUSBAND, THAT I MAY PRESENT YOU as a chaste virgin to Christ." We now need to look at the context to see what this "one husband" is. The context is the battle for the mind. This is seen by looking at the next verse: "I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ" (II Corinthians 11:3). (How ironic that Ironside uses subtilty by misquoting the previous verse to get people away from the simplicity that is in Christ!) Before this, Paul mentioned to cast "down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (II Corinthians 10:5). What Paul is saying, then, is that the Corinthians are saved, but they are not using the mind of Christ that they have (I Corinthians 2:16). So, the "one husband" that Paul has espoused the Corinthians to is not Christ Himself, but "the mind of Christ." If they use the mind of Christ, not allowing it to be corrupted by the serpent through people who preach "another Jesus..., another spirit..., or another gospel" (II Corinthians 11:4), then they will be presented "as a chaste virgin to Christ" (II Corinthians 11:2). If not, then Christ Himself will have to cleanse them of the religion that is in their corrupted minds through the fire on the day of judgment (I Corinthians 3:12-15). "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (I Corinthians 3:17), meaning that the impurities will be destroyed on judgment day. Paul's prayer is that, if the Corinthians stay true to the "one husband" of the mind of Christ, then there will be no impurities and Paul can present them to Christ as chaste virgins, who are part of His body. If Christ were the "one husband," the verse would read, "for I have espoused you to Christ, that I may present you as a chaste virgin**

to Him.” Instead, it reads, “for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.” By reading the context, we see the battle is the mind. Furthermore, Paul gives examples of this to the Philippians. First, he tells the Philippians to “let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus” (Philippians 2:5). Then, he shows Timothy as being “likeminded” (Philippians 2:20). Then, we see Epaphroditus having this mind, such that “for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death” (Philippians 2:30). Then, Paul himself says that his goal is to know Christ, “and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death” (Philippians 3:10). Thus, Paul tells the Philippians to be espoused to the mind of Christ, and then he gives the examples of Timothy, Epaphroditus, and himself to show, practically speaking, what a chaste virgin for Christ looks like.) It is this glorious occasion that John brings before us in the nineteenth chapter of the book of Revelation. It is of no earthly bride he is speaking, but of the heavenly. (In the sense that Jesus marries “the Israel of God” (Galatians 6:16), which are all believing Jews and does not include unbelieving Jews, yes, Israel is a heavenly bride. However, their home is in God’s kingdom on earth, not in heaven. Revelation 21:2 says that “John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.” When an angel tells John that he will show him “the bride, the Lamb’s wife” (Revelation 21:9), he carries him to a high mountain on earth to shew him “that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God” (Revelation 21:10). Therefore, the bride of Christ is New Jerusalem on earth with believing Israel in it.) After the destruction of the false harlot, Babylon the Great, the marriage supper of the Lamb is celebrated in the Father’s house, and all saints are called upon to rejoice because the marriage of the Lamb has come and His wife hath made herself ready. (This is Israel—not the church. Ironside has the two programs confused here. If he understood how to rightly divide the Word of truth, he would know that only Israel could make “herself ready” (Revelation 19:7) because she has to keep her salvation by works (James 2:24). By contrast, the body of Christ is sanctified by Christ to present it to Himself a glorious church (Ephesians 5:26-27). This is in perfect alignment with a wedding. The groom takes care of his body, while the wife takes care of her body. As the body of Christ, Christ has made us ready through His death on the cross. As the bride of Christ, Israel has made herself ready by enduring unto the end of the tribulation period (Matthew 24:13).) At the judgment seat of Christ, she receives from His hand the linen garments in which she is to be arrayed at the marriage feast. (Because the “wife hath made herself ready” (Revelation 19:7) by trusting in God to save her under the law covenant He made with her, she is given God’s righteousness to wear as her wedding garment (Revelation 19:8). It is AFTER the marriage supper that “judgment was given unto them” to rule in God’s kingdom on earth (Revelation 20:4). This is separate from the judgment seat of Christ, described in I Corinthians 3:11-15, where

members of the body of Christ receive their positions in heavenly places. Saved Israel receives her linen garments when she comes out of the tribulation period (Revelation 6:9-11), not at the judgment seat of Christ, because she never goes to that judgment. The judgment seat of Christ is specifically reserved for the body of Christ, and has to do with receiving “a reward” (I Corinthians 3:14), not with receiving a wedding garment.) Notice that on this occasion we have not only the Bride and the Bridegroom, but we read, "Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb." These invited guests are distinguished from the Bride herself. They of course are another group of redeemed sinners, namely, Old Testament saints, and possibly some Tribulation saints who have been martyred for Christ's sake. **(Huh? “Old Testament saints”? “Some tribulation saints who have been martyred for Christ’s sake”? So, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, TO WHOM THE PROMISES WERE MADE, do not ever receive the promises God gave them because they are just “friends of the Bridegroom,” but only the New Testament saints receive the kingdom! Sorry, David. I know God said to you, “that He will make thee a house” (II Samuel 7:11) and God specifically says that “David my servant shall be king over them” (Ezekiel 37:24), but Ironside says you are only God’s friend. You do not get to rule with Him forever. Oh well, better luck next time. This is blasphemy of the highest order! Instead of making up ridiculous things out of thin air, Ironside should at least admit that he has no clue who these people are, because he does not rightly divide the word of truth. Jesus’ parable in Matthew 22:1-14 explains that “those bidden to the wedding” (Matthew 22:3), i.e., apostate Israel, do not believe. Therefore, “they would not come” (Matthew 22:3). God then gathers the believing remnant of Israel, and they marry Jesus Christ and enter the kingdom (Matthew 22:8-10). These are not guests that are not part of the ceremony. They are the bride. Remember that Revelation 21:9-10 defines the bride as “holy Jersusalem.” God marries the city, and the people in it are part of the bride. Isaiah 62:4 says, “the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy LAND shall be married.” Therefore, those “called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb,” “arrayed in fine linen, clean and white” are the bride (Revelation 19:8-9).) These are the friends of the Bridegroom who rejoice in His happiness when He takes His Bride to Himself. (I assume Ironside is referring to John 3:29, where John the Baptist says, “the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth Him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom’s voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled.” All John is saying is that He is not the Christ (John 3:28), and so he rejoices in Israel’s attention shifting away from him and toward Christ (John 3:30). Spiritually speaking, John is part of saved Israel. Therefore, he is part of Christ’s bride.)**

All down through the Christian centuries believers have revelled in the sweetness of the thought of the bridal relationship, setting forth, as no other figure does, the intensity of Christ's love for His own. **(Wouldn’t the body of Christ be just as close to Christ as the bride of Christ will be? Given**

**Ironside's recent comment about "friends of the bridegroom," consider this: Jesus told the bride, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you" (John 15:13-14). Yet, God tells the body of Christ "God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). Therefore, if Ironside wants to talk about "the intensity of Christ's love," an argument can be made that a greater intensity of Christ's love has been given to His body than to His bride.) How truly we may sing:**

- *"The bride eyes not her garment,  
But her dear Bridegroom's face;  
I will not gaze on glory,  
But on my King of grace;  
Not at the crown He giveth,  
But on His pierced hand;  
The Lamb is all the glory  
Of Immanuel's land."*

How much we would lose if we lost this! **(No! Rather, how much Israel would lose if this were true of us today! If we are both the body and bride of Christ today, then there is no salvation for the nation of Israel. How selfish of Christians to claim they are spiritual Israel, so that all of God's promises for all dispensations are given to us today, to the exclusion of all other people. In our dispensation alone, God "hath blessed us with ALL spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" (Ephesians 1:3). Must we also steal Israel's blessings in earthly places in Christ to keep for ourselves, as well?! It is not surprising, then, that Ironside does not consider Old Testament saints to be part of the bride of Christ, since he selfishly hogs all of God's blessings upon mankind for the body of Christ exclusively.)** And yet one is pained sometimes to realize how insensible Christians who ought to know better, can be as to its preciousness. **(I am pained to see Christians exclude God's chosen people, the nation of Israel, from realizing the promises that God has promised them. In a sense, Christians think they are God, because they can change what God has said to suit their fancy.)** I remember on one occasion hearing an advocate of the system we are reviewing exclaim, "I am not part of the Bride; I am part of the Bridegroom Himself. I belong to Christ's Body, and His Body is far more precious to Him than His Bride." I replied, "You mean then that you think far more of your own body than you do of your wife!" He was rather taken back, as he might well be. **(Ironside was appealing to the man's pride, rather than the Word of God, to make his point. Ephesians 5:29 says, "No man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church." This tells us that the Lord nourishes and cherishes the church as His Own**



**body.)**

But after all, if Israel is a divorced wife to be restored some day, and the Church is also a bride, is there not ground for what some have called "spiritual polygamy?" **(In this paper, Ironside has accused Christ of spiritual polygamy if this were the case. As I have already explained, the body of Christ belongs to the man, Christ Jesus. The bride of Christ is His wife, Israel. A man marrying a woman is how God designed marriage. There is no spiritual polygamy here.)** Certainly not. Similar figures may be used in each dispensation to illustrate spiritual realities; and then it is important to see that Israel is distinctively called the wife of Jehovah, whereas the Church is the Bride of the Lamb. **(Where are these distinct names given? The term "wife of Jehovah" is nowhere to be found in scripture. The closest reference to "the Bride of the Lamb" is found in Revelation 21:9. This verse says that an angel will show John "the bride, the Lamb's wife," and then John sees "that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God" (Revelation 21:10). Therefore, the bride of the Lamb is "the holy Jerusalem;" it is not the church. Furthermore, Jehovah is God the Father, while the Lamb is God the Son. Therefore, if Israel is "the wife of Jehovah" and the church is "the bride of the Lamb," then they are married to two, different members of the Godhead!)** Israel's nuptial relationship is with God Himself apart altogether from any question of incarnation. The Church is the Bride of the Incarnate One who became the Lamb of God for our redemption. Who would want to lose the blessedness of this? **(Ironside needs to stop writing this paper, because he commits greater blasphemy as he continues. Here goes Ironside, changing his position again. Before, he stated that there cannot be two brides, because Christ would be guilty of spiritual polygamy. Therefore, we are all one—both Israel and the body of Christ. Now, he is saying that God IS creating spiritual polygamy, because we are separate brides. Israel is God's bride, and those saved in the grace dispensation are Christ's bride. Well, since Christ is God that means that Ironside believes that Christ will commit spiritual polygamy—the very charge he hurls against Acts-28 dispensationalists, when he readily admits that the Acts-28 dispensationalists accurately explain the one man and one woman relationship as mystery-dispensation believers being the body of Christ and prophecy-dispensation believers being the bride of Christ. There is no "blessedness" in Ironside's position. Rather, it is eternal, spiritual fornication that Ironside accuses the Lord Jesus Christ of—a very serious charge!).**

In the last chapter of the book of the Revelation, we have added confirmation as to the correctness of the position taken in this paper. In verse 16, our Lord Jesus declares Himself as the Coming One, saying, "I am the Root and Offspring of David, the Bright and Morning Star." In the very next verse we are told, "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come." Here we have the Church's response to our Lord's declaration that He is the Morning

Star. **(No! In the previous chapter, the bride was defined as holy Jerusalem, which is the nation of the believing remnant of Israel alone. It is saved Israel that says "Come." In other words, saved Israel is anxious to receive their new bodies. This is no different than the body of Christ today. Paul says, "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body" (Philippians 3:20-21). Although we are still physically on this earth, God says we are already in heaven, and it is from that position in heaven that we wait for Christ to come to the earth, pick up our vile body, and fashion it like His glorious body. Similarly, the Bride (the believing remnant of Israel) is in holy Jerusalem in heaven and is waiting for Christ to come to give them their new bodies, marry them, and bring them into God's kingdom on earth.)** The morning star shines out before the rising of the sun. It is as the Morning Star Christ comes for His Church. **(Chapter and verse, please! Paul never refers to Jesus as the Morning Star. Jesus is only called the Morning Star in Revelation 2:28 and 22:16. It is a reference to His coming after the night of tribulation to set up the kingdom on earth for Israel. Matthew 14:25 says Jesus comes in the fourth watch of the night, which is at the end of the night. II Peter 3:10 says that Jesus comes "as a thief in the night." Psalm 30:5 says, "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Therefore, the term "Morning Star" relates specifically to Jesus' second coming when the night of the tribulation period is over. Furthermore, Paul makes a contrast between the tribulation saints and us, the body of Christ. With regard to the tribulation saints, he says that "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" (I Thessalonians 5:2). Then, he provides the contrast of: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness." (I Thessalonians 5:4-5). Therefore, the body of Christ is raptured up before the tribulation period starts, while believing Israel must endure the night of the tribulation before the Morning Star sets up God's kingdom on earth.)** Unto Israel, He will arise as the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His wings. And so here the moment the announcement is made which indicates His near return, **(People assume that this is an announcement of Jesus' near return. That is not true. Jesus does not say, "I am coming soon." Rather, He says, "Surely I come quickly" (Revelation 22:20). Meaning that, when it is time, He will come with quickness. That is why the 5 virgins without oil in their lamps do not have time to go get the oil (Matthew 25:6-13).)** the Spirit who dwells in the Church, and the Bride actuated by the Spirit, cry with eager longing, "Come," for the word is addressed to Him. How truly absurd it would be to try to bring Israel in here as though the earthly people were those responding to the Saviour's voice during this present age! **(The absurdity is Ironside's in trying to bring the body of Christ into a book that is distinctly Jewish in nature, being written to Israel in their program**

only. Revelation 1:1 says the book of Revelation is written to God's "servants." Galatians 4:7 says that, today, in the dispensation of grace, "thou art no more a servant, but a son." Therefore, Revelation cannot be written to us. Furthermore, even someone giving Revelation only a cursory glance can tell it is Jewish in nature. The 144,000 sealed are "of all the tribes of the children of Israel" (Revelation 7:4). God makes them "priests of God" (Revelation 20:6), which is a promise God made specifically to "the children of Israel" (Exodus 19:5-6). Since the bride is Israel, as previously proven, it is Israel crying for Jesus to come. This cry is also seen in Revelation 6:9-10, where martyred saints during the tribulation period are seen under the altar in heaven asking God, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell in the earth?" Therefore, the bride says, "Come," because it does not want to see others martyred for Christ, and it wants to see "Thy kingdom come" to earth (Matthew 6:10.)

But so determined are these ultra-dispensationalists to take from the Church everything that is found in the book of Revelation, that they even insist that the letters addressed to the churches in chapters 2 and 3 are all for Israel too. **(Why wouldn't the letters in Revelation be addressed to Israel? All we are doing is believing what God has said. Revelation 1:4 says, "John to the seven churches which are in Asia." What gives Ironside the right to change God's Word into a lie by saying, "Well, the book of Revelation is not really written to 7 churches in Asia as God said it is. Rather, they are written to seven church ages that will come before the rapture." That is utter blasphemy! As far as taking things away from the church is concerned, we are already "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" (Ephesians 1:3). Meanwhile, God has promised blessings to Israel in earthly places in Christ. One of those blessings is given in Revelation 1:6, which says that God has made Israel "kings and priests." This goes right along with the kingdom dispensation in which Israel will be a kingdom of priests to the Gentiles, as Exodus 19:6 says, "Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." How dare Ironside say, "Sorry, Israel, God ain't giving you squat. God is only blessing the body of Christ!" However, by rightly dividing the Word of truth, we rightly recognize the blessings God has given to us, the body of Christ, as identified in Romans – Philemon, and the blessings God has given to Israel, some of which are mentioned in the book of Revelation. Therefore, it is Ironside who is robbing saints of God (Israel) of their blessings—not the dispensationalists.)** Ignoring the fact that the apostle John had labored for years in the Roman proconsular Province of Asia, that he was thoroughly familiar with all these seven churches, **(Before, Ironside said they represent seven church ages. Is he now changing his position to say that they are seven, literal churches? Ironside has no qualms about freely changing the Word of God back and forth to match his philosophies.)** they nevertheless even go so far as to deny that some of

these churches had any existence in the first century of the Christian era, when John wrote the Apocalypse, although Sir William Ramsay's researches have proven the contrary. **(The seven churches existed at the time of the writing of Revelation, and they will all exist in the future tribulation period, as well, just like the 12 tribes of Israel existed at the writing of the Revelation, and they will exist in the future tribulation period (Revelation 7:3-8).)** On the other hand they declare that all of these churches are to rise up in the future after the Body has been removed to Heaven, and that then the seven letters will have their application, but have no present bearing upon the consciences of the saints. **(It is not the dispensationalists who came up with this. Rather, God says that John wrote to the seven churches in Asia and the warnings pertain to the tribulation period. Therefore, by God's writing, the seven churches must both have existed at the time of the writing and will exist during the future tribulation period. To believe anything else is to change God's Word into a lie. As mentioned, the same holds true for the 12 tribes of Israel. Today, no Jew can tell what tribe he is from, yet God is able to tell, such that He seals 12,000 from each tribe halfway through the tribulation period (Revelation 7:3-8). Furthermore, exactly how do the seven letters have a "present bearing upon the consciences of the saints?" For example, if the seven letters are written to us today, how do we apply "Thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (Revelation 2:20)?)** I cannot conceive of anything more Satanic than this. **(So, according to Ironside, the most Satanic thing he can think of is for man to believe God's Word is true! Here are some things in the Bible that Ironside may want to reclassify as being a bit more Satanic than believing God's Word: 1) Kids killed in the hands of a idol to appease the god, Molech (Jeremiah 32:35), 2) A woman raped repeatedly by a crowd of men all night and being left for dead (Judges 19:22-28), and 3) Men cutting themselves until blood gushes out to get the attention of their god, Baal (I Kings 18:27-28). However, Ironside may say those are fairy tales, since he does not believe the Bible is true.)** Here are churches actually raised up of God through the preaching of the Gospel. **(True, but they believed the gospel of the kingdom (Repent and be baptized (Acts 2:38)) rather than the gospel of grace (Believe in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for your sins (I Corinthians 15:3-4)). Each one of the seven churches is told to overcome (Revelation 2:7,11,17,26 and 3:5,12,21), yet, today, we are told: "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Corinthians 15:57).)** Ephesus we know well. Laodicea is mentioned in the letter to the Colossians. **(Since Paul and Barnabas went to the heathen and the 12 apostles went to the circumcision (Galatians 2:9), the churches addressed by John must be different congregations than the ones Paul addressed, even if they were in the same city.)** The other churches we may be sure existed at the time and in exactly the state that John depicts, and the risen Christ addresses these churches in the most

solemn way, and seven times over calls upon all exercised souls to give heed to what he says to each one, crying, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." In these letters, we have depicted every possible condition in which the churches of God can be found from Apostolic days to the end of the Christian era. **(Okay. So, Ironside is changing back to saying that the seven churches represent seven church ages.)** More than that: we have in a mystic way **(So, now Ironside is following mysticism? By saying the instructions in Revelation 2-3 are mystic, he can make them mean whatever he wants them to mean. For example, Pergamos is said to dwell "even where Satan's seat is" (Revelation 2:13). If we take this literally, we can understand that they are in the area where the Antichrist's throne is during the tribulation period. However, if you change this to the time period of 312-590 AD, as "Biblical scholars" do today, you have to say that Satan's seat means something entirely different. If the letters are mystic, you can make them mean whatever fits your fancy, and no one can question you.)** the moral and spiritual principles of the entire course of Church History portrayed. **(Really? And, what principles are those? More bad things are mentioned than good among the seven churches. The only good things mentioned are the following: Revelation 2:3 mentions patience and labouring. Revelation 2:13 mentions not denying Jesus' faith. Revelation 2:19 mentions charity, service, faith, and patience. Revelation 3:8 says they have kept Jesus' word and have not denied His name. All we can gather, then, are a few spiritual principles that are given in a general way. That is why I have never heard anyone apply the spiritual principles mentioned to the so-called seven, church ages, because it cannot be done! Furthermore, why should we look to the faulty, seven churches for moral and spiritual principles when we can look to the perfect, spiritual principles given to us today in Paul's epistles? We can glean more spiritual principles out of Galatians 5:22-23 (the fruit of the Spirit) then we can out of the whole of Revelation 2-3.)** All this should have immense weight with us as believers, and should speak loudly to our consciences; **(If we apply Revelation 2-3 to us today and try to get it to speak to our consciences, the result will be the negation of sound doctrine for us today, given by the apostle Paul. For example, Romans 5:11 says that "we have now received the atonement," while Revelation 2:5 warns the Ephesian church that, if they do not "repent, and do the first works," Jesus will "remove thy candlestick out of his place." Thus, if we allow this verse to "speak loudly to our consciences," it would negate the promise of eternal life that we already have and replace it with a fear of losing our salvation.)** but along comes the Bullingerite and, with a wave of his interpretative wand, dismisses them entirely for the present age, airily declaring that they have no message for us whatever, that they are all Jewish, and will only have their place in the Great Tribulation after the Church is gone! **(Not "after the Church is gone," but after the body of Christ is gone, at which time, God promises to save Israel and bring them into God's kingdom (Romans 11:26). If anyone needs instruction in God's Word, it**

is Israel in the tribulation period, when deception will be so strong “that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect” (Matthew 24:24). Besides, we have plenty of instruction in Paul’s epistles that almost 100% of Christians have no clue about. Why not obey the command of II Timothy 2:7 to consider what Paul says in order to give us understanding in all things, instead of robbing Israel of instructions that are for written specifically to them in a time when those instructions are most needed?) And thus the people of God who accept this unscriptural system (What is unscriptural about the Acts 9 position? Since John clearly indicates that Revelation was written to the Jews, it would be inaccurate to try to apply Revelation to us today. At the same time, this does not mean that nothing can be learned from Revelation today as all scripture is profitable (II Timothy 3:16).) are robbed of not only the precious things in which these letters abound, but their consciences become indifferent to the solemn admonitions found therein. (If Revelation 2-3 applies to us today, then how am I supposed to apply the solemn admonition of Revelation 2:5 to my conscience? Should I ignore Paul’s instruction that, “I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God” (Galatians 2:19), and “do the first works” instead (Revelation 2:5), constantly getting re-saved, such that I do not live unto God, since I am worried about my own salvation?) Surely this is a masterpiece of Satanic strategy, (The masterpiece of Satan’s strategy is to get people to be scriptural, but not dispensational. Satan wants people to follow Matthew – John, rationalizing that they are following God’s Word today, since they are following the “red letters,” while criticizing Paul’s epistles, even though what Paul writes “are the commandments of the Lord” for us today (I Corinthians 14:37). No doubt that, in the tribulation period, when it is time to apply Revelation, Satan’s strategy will be to get people to follow Paul’s letters. Religion will then say, “You now have the atonement (Romans 5:11). You are not under the law, but under grace (Romans 6:14). Do not be afraid to take the mark. It is not the mark of the beast, but it is a security measure to prevent identity theft. Go ahead and worship the image, because “an idol is nothing” (I Corinthians 8:4). Besides, it is of the virgin Mary, and the Christ wants you to worship her.”) whereby under the plea of rightly dividing the Word of Truth, the Scriptures are so wrongly divided that they cease to have any message for God’s people today, and the Word of the Lord is made of no effect by this unscriptural tradition. (First, mid-Acts dispensationalism is not “unscriptural tradition.” We have already seen that Paul says that, “a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me” (I Corinthians 9:17), and that what Paul received was “by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:12). God says to rightly divide “the word of truth” (II Timothy 2:15), and that, in order to understand the whole Bible, we must consider what Paul says (II Timothy 2:7). Therefore, it is only by mid-Acts dispensationalism that the whole Bible becomes clear. Instead of trying to mysticize Revelation 2-3 to make these chapters give some vague principles from the last 2,000 years, we can see that they are really

giving specific instructions to Israel in the tribulation period. It is interesting that Ironside mentions that right division makes “the Word of the Lord...of no effect,” because that is exactly what Ironside is doing by not rightly dividing. He is pushing a religious system that changes God’s Word to fit man’s traditions to cater to the flesh in order to make the Word of God of none effect. This is exactly what Jesus said that the religious people of His day were doing with the Word of God: “Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition” (Mark 7:9), and “Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered” (Mark 7:13). Finally, Ironside’s assertion that right division makes the Word of God cease from having a message for God’s people today is also utterly false. By rightly dividing, we can understand Paul’s epistles. Paul’s epistles give different doctrine than the rest of the Bible because they are in a different dispensation. When you put Matthew – John above all other scripture, you end up changing Paul’s epistles to fit Matthew – John. You also do not believe everything in Matthew – John, such as “sell that ye have, and give alms” (Luke 12:33), and “The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do” (Matthew 23:2-3). Therefore, Ironside is changing the whole Bible to fit his religion. Also, we need to note that just because all scripture is FOR us today (II Timothy 3:16-17), it is not all written TO us today. In fact, we are specifically told that Israel’s history is in scripture for “our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted” (I Corinthians 10:6). Therefore, we can read the Old Testament, believe what it says, and learn the spiritual lessons behind their examples, rather than trying to change what the verses say, yielding to “another spirit” (II Corinthians 11:4), so that the verses are somehow written directly to us. Such treatment makes the Word of God cease to have a message from God for us today and leaves it up to the willy-nilly fantasies of religious zealots.) And yet the Lord in instructing John, says, "Write the things which are." It is the present continuous tense. It might be rendered, "The things which are now going on." "Not at all," exclaims the Bullingerite. "These are the things which are not going on, neither will they have any place so long as the Church of God is on earth." **(First, when Revelation is written, “the time is at hand” for “those things which are written therein” (Revelation 1:3), because Revelation was written before Acts 9, and they have been put on hold for 2,000 years, due to the unbelief of Israel. Second, Revelation 1:19 says: “Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter.” Most people think this means past, present, and future, but it does not. Hebrews 11:3 says that “things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.” In other words, God made a good creation, but the things of Satan in the tribulation period are not of God. From this perspective, we can see that the things of Revelation 1:19 are all one group—not three groups. “The things which are” are the things that exist of God’s creation that are in heavenly places.**

**Those things “shall be hereafter” on the earth, after Satan’s kingdom is destroyed. These are the things that John saw. Therefore, “the things which are” is a reference to the pure things that God has created, which are in heaven now, due to man’s corrupting of the earth, and that will appear later on earth, once Satan and his forces are cast out of the earth. Ironside’s changing of the word of God to “the things which are now going on” makes no sense, since the things of the tribulation period are still future.)** Others may accept this as deep teaching and advanced truth. **(Even history tells you that the things of Revelation were not going on at the time of its writing, as Ironside maintains.)** Personally, I reject it as a Satanic perversion calculated to destroy the power of the Word of God over the souls of His people.



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### **Do Baptism and the Lord's Supper Have Any Place in the Present Dispensation of the Grace of God?**

IT is most distressing to one who has revelled in the grace of God for years, but has recognized on the other hand that grace produces loving obedience in the heart of the believer, to read the puerile and childish diatribes **(Ironside seems to have worked himself into a frenzy by this point.)** of the ultra-dispensationalists, as they inveigh against the Christian ordinances as though observance of these in some way contravened the liberty of Grace. **(The “liberty of grace” is not the issue because that liberty states that “all things are lawful unto me” (I Corinthians 6:12). Rather, the issue is sound doctrine. Paul says to “hold fast the form of sound words” (II Timothy 1:13) “for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine” (II Timothy 4:3). Therefore, when Ironside tries to take away, among other things, our spirit baptism by which we live for Christ, God’s Word commands us to stand against such an attack of sound doctrine.)** Insisting that Paul had a new ministry revealed to him after Acts 28, and that this ministry is given only in the so-called prison epistles, they make a great deal of the fact that in these epistles we do not have any distinct instruction as to the baptizing of believers, or the observance of the Lord's Supper. **(Water baptism is the sacred cow of Christianity. Most Christians say that water baptism is “an outward manifestation of an inward work of grace.” Regardless of dispensation, that is NEVER the definition of water baptism found in scripture. In Exodus 19:5-6, God says that Israel will be a kingdom of priests to reconcile the world, i.e., the Gentiles, back to God. In Exodus 29:4, we see that a Jew is washed with water as part of his ordination as a priest. Ordinary Jews are never water baptized in the Old Testament because the time is not yet for them to go to the Gentiles with the gospel of the kingdom. However, the first words in the ministry of both John the Baptist and Jesus are: “Repent [ye]: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matthew 3:2 and 4:17). Therefore, they water baptized believing Jews, as a way of making them part of the kingdom of priests, who will reconcile the Gentiles back to God in the millennial kingdom. We must note that Jesus confined His ministry entirely to Israel, since He said, “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 15:24). Therefore, water baptism was only done of Jews in Israel’s program beginning with John the Baptist’s ministry. Water baptism, at that time, was required for salvation (Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38). By the time Paul comes on the scene, he says, “For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (I Corinthians 1:17). This tells us that the gospel for today does not include water baptism. Now, I Corinthians 12:13 says “for by one Spirit**

are we all baptized into one body.” Paul cannot be talking about water baptism, because he says to these same Corinthians, “I know not whether I baptized any other” (I Corinthians 1:16). Since that is the case, Paul could not make the statement that all of the Corinthians were baptized into the body of Christ if Spirit baptism is accomplished by water. (Paul did water baptize some of the Corinthians, and the reason was so as not to stumble the Jews, who needed water baptism for salvation as part of Israel’s program before Paul’s call in Acts 9.) Rather, Romans 6:3-4 says that, today, we are “baptized into [Jesus Christ’s] death.” The word “baptize” means “to be identified with.” When we trust in Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for our sins, we are given the Holy Ghost (Romans 5:5), Who immediately baptizes us into Christ’s death so that we may walk in His resurrection life (Romans 6:4). Therefore, today’s baptism is a dry baptism done by the Spirit into Christ’s death. It has nothing to do with water. Then, in Ephesians 4:5, we are told that there is only “one baptism,” which means that God does not even recognize water baptism today. With that being the case, why would anyone want to get water baptized, since it masks the true baptism into Christ’s death? With regard to the Lord’s Supper, that is an observance for today, as Paul tells the Corinthians how they should conduct the Lord’s Supper (See I Corinthians 11:20-34). However, we must note that the Lord’s Supper is a full meal. It is not a wafer and some grape juice. The Christian religion has made it something it is not so that they can control it so that you must come to their church and do what they say to do in order to partake in the Lord’s Supper. However, as far as God is concerned, we have the Lord’s Supper every time believers get together for a meal.)

We have already seen, I trust clearly, that Paul himself disavows any new revelation having been given him after his imprisonment, (Paul received the mystery “by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:12). However, he did not receive it all at once. He said, “I WILL come to visions and revelations of the Lord” (II Corinthians 12:1). Paul said this because Jesus told him that He would make Paul “a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee” (Acts 26:16). Therefore, Paul did receive a new revelation of the mystery after his imprisonment, and those things are recorded in Ephesians – Colossians. However, he did not receive a new dispensation at that time. Rather, he was just given further revelation of mystery doctrine. For example, Ephesians 1:21 gives the governmental structure in heaven, which was not written down in any of Paul’s previous epistles.) but insists that the mystery was that very message which he had already made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. It was but part of that whole counsel of God which he had declared to the Ephesians long before his arrest. These brethren, by a process of sophisticated reasoning, (There is no “sophistical reasoning” necessary in order to see that water baptism has been replaced by Holy

**Spirit baptism into Christ's death. Rather, "scriptural" reasoning is used by the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart to come to this conclusion (I Corinthians 2:9-16.)** try to prove that baptism belonged only to an earlier dispensation and was in some sense meritorious, as though it had in itself saving virtue, (**"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"** (Mark 16:16). **"Repent and be baptized...for the remission of sins"** (Acts 2:38). Both of these verses make it clear that baptism did have some saving virtue at the time when the kingdom of heaven was at hand for Israel. Therefore, we believe that water baptism was required for salvation, not because some religious philosophy says so, but because God's Word says so. Ironside is the one following religious philosophy, because there is NO scriptural backing for believing that water baptism is an ordinance that shows a person's salvation.) but that since the dispensation of grace has been fully revealed, there is no place for baptism, because of changed conditions for salvation. **(Absolutely! Christians take great offense to the idea that salvation conditions change over time, but the Bible is clear that they do. When Peter preached Jesus Christ in Acts 2, he preached it as the anti-gospel or bad news: "Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" Jesus Christ (Acts 2:23). Peter did NOT tell his audience to trust in Jesus' death in order to be saved. Yet, in preaching Jesus Christ today, Paul says that the gospel is "how that Christ died for our sins" (I Corinthians 15:3). If you do not recognize the changed conditions, then you are calling God a liar!)** To state this argument is but to expose its fallacy.

Let one point be absolutely clear: No one was ever saved in any dispensation on any other ground than the finished work of Christ. **(Agreed, but the mid-Acts dispensationalist is not stating anything to the contrary. There are two parts to salvation: 1) The payment for sin, and 2) The way to receive that payment. Christianity teaches that the payment for sin was Jesus' death on the cross and the way you receive that payment is by trusting in His death as atonement for your sins. However, for most of history, these two parts were NOT the same. The payment for sin, regardless of dispensation, is always Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection. However, the way a person receives that payment is by having faith in what God has told him. What God tells him differs based upon dispensation. For example, Genesis 15:5-6 says that Abram was declared righteous by believing that God would make his seed as the stars in heaven. No mention of Christ is given there. Hebrews 9:8 says that, "the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." That is why the 12 disciples said, "We know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way?" (John 14:5). When Jesus responded, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me" (John 14:6), for the first time in history, man knew that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was the way to the Father. According to Hebrews 9:8, no one in the Old Testament ever knew that. Therefore,**

for 4,000 years, what you had to believe to be saved was different from the actual payment for sin. If not, then everyone who ever lived before Jesus' first coming will go to the lake of fire, but we know from scripture that this is not true. The fact that the 12 disciples did not preach believing in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection for atonement of sins can also be seen by examining Matthew – John. In Luke 9:6, we are told that Jesus had the 12 disciples preach “the gospel,” but, 2 years later, we are told, “FROM THAT TIME FORTH BEGAN Jesus to shew unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day” (Matthew 16:21). Peter's response to that was, “Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee” (Matthew 16:22). If Peter had been preaching Jesus' death as atonement for sins, Peter's response would have been, “DUH! What do you think I've been telling everyone for the past 2 years?!” The point is that the gospel the 12 disciples preached could not have been today's gospel of trusting in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for sins, because they had been preaching the gospel for at least 2 years before Jesus began to shew them of His impending death. While Ironside is correct in that the method for payment of sins is always the finished work of Christ, he is incorrect in assuming that what man trusts to receive that payment for sins is Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection. That is what we trust since Acts 9, but the gospel was different before that time. It had to be in order for the Bible to be true.) In all the ages before the cross, God justified men by faith; in all the years since, men have been justified in exactly the same way. (That is not true. In today's dispensation, we are justified by faith alone. Romans 3:28 says, “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” However, in Israel's dispensation, they were justified by faith plus works. James 2:24 says, “Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” That is because salvation for Israel required that they have faith in what God told them, which was to put themselves under the law covenant. Therefore, they had to do works that showed faith in that law covenant. Today, however, God has told us to trust in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for sin. “Ye are not under the law, but under grace” (Romans 6:14). Therefore, our justification today is by faith alone. For Ironside to say that man has always been justified in exactly the same way, he has to change what James 2:24 says or what Romans 3:28 says, because they present two, different methods of justification.) Adam believed God and was clothed with coats of skin, a picture of one becoming the righteousness of God in Christ. (We are never told that Adam believed God. God clothed Adam with “coats of skins” (Genesis 3:21) to show him that salvation is by God's covering, not by man's covering (religion). We are not told what Adam did with that information.) Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. (Yes, but, as previously mentioned, what Abram believed was that God would make his seed as the stars in heaven. He did not

**trust in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for his sins.)** Nevertheless, afterwards he was circumcised; but that circumcision, the apostle tells us, was simply a seal of the righteousness he had by faith. **(What apostle tells us that circumcision was a seal of Abraham's righteousness? Of course, it is Paul, in Romans 4:11, "the apostle of the Gentiles" (Romans 11:13). However, that is not all that Paul tells us regarding Abraham here. He says that Abraham is "the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised" (Romans 4:11), and Abraham is "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham" (Romans 4:12). This shows that faith plus works is required for the circumcision (Israel's program), while faith alone is required for the uncircumcision (the body of Christ). Since faith plus works is required in Israel's program, circumcision was required for salvation. When God gave Abraham the commandment of circumcision, God said, "And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken My covenant" (Genesis 17:14). Thus, we see Abraham being justified in two, different ways, so that he might be the father of all those who believe. That is how Paul can use Abraham as an example of justification by faith (Romans 4), while James uses Abraham as an example of justification by faith plus works (James 2:21-24).)** And throughout all the Old Testament dispensation, however legalistic Jews may have observed the ordinance of circumcision and thought of it as having in itself some saving virtue, it still remained in God's sight, as in the beginning, only a seal, where there was genuine faith, of that righteousness which He imputed. **(How did Ironside determine that? When God gave Abraham the requirement of circumcision in Genesis 17, He said, "And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken My covenant" (Genesis 17:14). That is quite clear that the seal of circumcision was required, or else that person would not be part of God's eternal kingdom on earth.)** The difficulty with many who reason as these Bullingerites do, is that they cannot seem to understand the difference between the loving loyal obedience of a devoted heart, and a legal obedience which is offered to God as though it were in itself meritorious. **(Right dividers understand this difference. They believe God when He says that faith plus works are required for salvation in Israel's program, and they believe God when He says that faith alone is required for salvation today. It is Ironside who fails to believe God's Word and recognize that God requires different things under different programs. The different requirements make perfect sense when you recognize that God treated Israel like children, while He treats us today as full-grown adults. The phrase "children of Israel" is found 341 times in the law books of Exodus – Deuteronomy alone, while God says of us today, "Thou art no more a servant, but a son" (Galatians 4:7). Therefore, as full-grown sons, we receive eternal life by faith, while, as children, Israel must have the works of faith, in addition to faith, in order to have eternal**

life.) No one was ever saved through the sacrifices offered under law, for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin. **(As previously mentioned, Ironside has confused the PAYMENT for sin with the method by which man accepts that payment. Yes, Christ's blood is the payment for sin for all dispensations, but the method by which Israel received that payment was by believing God would give them eternal life by their having faith in God's provision for them under the law covenant.)** Nevertheless, wherever there was real faith in Israel, the sacrifices were offered because of the instruction given in the Word of God, and in these sacrifices the work of Christ was pictured continually. **(Yes, only when the sacrifices were offered in real faith, were they pleasing to the Lord. However, note that forgiveness of sins was actually attained by offering the sacrifices, because the offering of these sacrifices was the work of faith. Leviticus 4:26 says, "He shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace offerings: and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be FORGIVEN him." Leviticus 5:10 says, "He shall offer the second for a burnt offering, according to the manner: and the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him." The verses do not say, "Thou shalt offer the burnt offering as a faith response, and then their sins will be forgiven them after Christ makes the real payment for sin." Rather, their forgiveness was conditional upon them offering animal sacrifices for the atonement of sin. Therefore, the sacrifices were the method by which Israel accepted Christ's payment for their sin, because the sacrifices were a work of faith.)**

When John the Baptist came in the way of righteousness, he called on men to confess their sinfulness and their just dessert of death by baptism, and so we read that the publicans and sinners "justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John." There was no merit in the baptism. **(If they "justified God," as Luke 7:29 says, it means that God would not have been just if He gave eternal life to them without being baptized, because water baptized was required in order to be saved. If there was no merit in baptism, it would say that they "glorified" or "praised" God. It would not say that they "justified" God.)** It was the divinely appointed way of acknowledging their sinfulness and need of a Saviour. Therefore it is called a baptism "unto repentance for the remission of sins." **(Ironside has combined Matthew 3:11 with Acts 2:38 to come up with his quote. Does he not see that the quote he just gave goes against his assertion that there is no merit in baptism? Acts 2:38 clearly says that baptism is "FOR the remission of sins." It does not say, "baptism in order to let everyone know your sins have been forgiven." This shows how Christians are so used to changing God's Word to fit their religious views, that they are not offended when someone takes the holy Word of God and changes it to fit the Christian religion's view, instead of just believing what the verse says.)** They were like men in debt, giving their notes to the divine creditor. A note does not pay a debt but it is an

acknowledgment of indebtedness. Christ's baptism was simply His endorsement of all of these notes. **(Most people do not realize this, but Christ was actually baptized twice. Everyone is familiar with His water baptism here, because that is what Christianity preaches. However, they skip over His most important baptism, which is His baptism into death. Christ says in Luke 12:50, "I HAVE a baptism to be baptized with." This baptism is still future in Luke 12:50, even though He had already been water baptized in Luke 3:21. Matthew 20:22-23 makes it clearer that His future baptism would be His baptism into death. It was this baptism that was Christ's payment of their indebtedness, not His water baptism. His water baptism, like the rest of Israel's, was part of His priest ordination ceremony, as commanded in Exodus 29:4.)** When He said to John, who would have hindered Him from being baptized, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," **(To "fulfil all righteousness" means that Jesus had to fulfil all requirements of the law and all the requirements of being the Messiah. In other words, John the Baptist told Jesus, "You don't need to be baptized, because you do not have any sins to be forgiven of." Then, Jesus responded, "True, but allow me to be baptized because it is a requirement for Me to be the Anointed of God, since all priests must be washed in water. Jesus' anointing as the Messiah is confirmed by the fact that the Holy Spirit came upon Him at that time, and God the Father recognized Him as His "beloved Son" (Matthew 3:16-17). Without this water baptism, He would not have been the Messiah, the Holy Spirit would not have indwelled Him, and He would not have been able to perform His ministry.)** it was as though He said, "In this way I pledge Myself to meet every righteous demand of the throne of God on behalf of these confessed sinners." And this is surely what He had in mind when, three years later, He exclaimed, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" (Luke 12:50). **(Ironside is so blind to the truth that he mentions this second baptism without recognizing that it has nothing to do with water or that His death baptism is a separate baptism from His water baptism! Today, Paul talks about us being baptized with Christ into His death. Romans 6:4 says, "Buried with Him by baptism into death." If this was water, it would say "submerged with Him by baptism." A burial is done of a dead person, not of someone you pour water on! It is this death baptism that is the "one baptism" of the grace dispensation that God recognizes (Ephesians 4:5). The problem is that people get this confused with water baptism and bring water baptism, a requirement only of Israel in the last days, into the grace dispensation.)** On the cross He met the claims of righteousness and thus fulfilled the meaning of His baptism. **(Jesus met "the claims of righteousness" by living His entire life without sinning (Hebrews 4:15). What He did on the cross was that He was made sin for us so "that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (II Corinthians 5:21).)**

Christian baptism has its beginning in resurrection. **(Nope. Christian**

**baptism has its beginning in Christian tradition. The only baptism God recognizes today is the dry baptism of the Spirit into Christ's death the moment we are saved. This dry baptism has its ENDING in resurrection, since, because we have been identified with Christ's death, we are also identified with His life (Romans 6:3-4.)** It was the risen Christ about to be glorified who commissioned His apostles to go out, not simply to Jews, observe, nor yet to proclaim a second offer of the kingdom, as some say, but to carry the Gospel to men of all nations, baptizing those who professed to believe, in (or, unto) the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. **(Not so. Jesus told them to "be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). They were commissioned to go to the Jews only (Matthew 10:6) until Jesus' second coming. Jesus said, "ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come" (Matthew 10:23). If what Jesus established in Matthew – John is still continuing today, then the gospel should only be going to Jews today because Jesus has not come back yet. Also, with regard to a second offer of the kingdom, Jesus said, "this gospel of the KINGDOM shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matthew 24:14). Therefore, Jesus commissioned His disciples to offer the kingdom to the Jews only until His second coming. If not for the interruption of that program with the dispensation of grace, that is what would have happened.)** This we see them literally doing throughout the early days of the Church, as recorded in the Book of Acts. **(We never see them going to the Gentiles before Israel's program is put on hold with the call of Paul in Acts 9. In Acts 2, we are told that they stayed in Jerusalem, going house to house (Acts 2:46). All of the believers stay in Jerusalem until after the stoning of Stephen, when there is a "great persecution against the church at Jerusalem" (Acts 8:1). Even then, they are only scattered among Judaea and Samaria, while the apostles stayed in Jerusalem, because they were not done going house to house there yet (Acts 8:1). And, even among those scattered to other areas, we are told that they were "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only" (Acts 11:19).)** Wherever the Gospel is preached, baptism is linked with it, not as part of the Gospel, **(No, baptism IS part of the gospel. Peter says in Acts 2:38: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." If they were not water baptized, they would not receive the remission of sins.)** for Paul distinctly says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel," but as an outward expression of faith in the Gospel. **(That is because Paul was preaching a different gospel for a different dispensation. Paul specifically calls his gospel "my gospel" in Romans 2:16, Romans 16:25, and II Timothy 2:8. No other person in the Bible ever refers to the message he preaches as "my gospel"—not even Jesus Christ. That is because Paul was given a message from God that no other person received directly from God. So, Paul can say that water baptism is not part of his gospel, while Peter said that water baptism was required for the remission of sins (Acts**



2:38). We can also see the different gospels by comparing John the Baptist with Paul. John the Baptist was so much into baptism, because it was required for salvation, that we call him “the Baptist.” Paul, on the other hand, did not even keep track of water baptisms, because it was not part of his gospel. Also, Paul NEVER said that water baptisms were done “as an outward expression of faith in the Gospel.” Paul performed limited water baptisms so as not to cause offense to those Jews saved in Israel’s program.) It is evident in the Book of Acts that there is a somewhat different presentation of this, according as to whether the message is addressed to Jews in outward covenant relation with God or to Gentiles who are strangers to the covenants of promise. (That is because there are two, different gospels. In Acts 1-7, Peter was sure to baptize everyone who believed. Then, there was a change in program, bringing about a different gospel without water baptism, with the call of Paul in Acts 9. Yet, water baptism still continued to some extent. Limited water baptism continued so as not to offend the Jews, who had to be water baptized in order to be saved. Paul said, “Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law” (I Corinthians 9:20). Paul says that “ye are not under the law, but under grace” (Romans 6:14), yet Paul put himself under the law to gain those under the law. For example, Paul had Timothy circumcised (Acts 16:1-3), even though Paul says, “For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision” (Galatians 5:6). Although circumcision means nothing today, Paul had Timothy circumcised so as not to offend the Jews, who had to be circumcised in order to be saved (Genesis 17:14). Similarly, water baptism means nothing today, but, so as not to offend the Jews, who had to be water baptized in order to be saved (Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38), Paul sometimes water baptized people. Therefore, just because water baptism continues, in part, with Paul, it does not mean it is for today. Since no one alive today is saved by water baptism, there is no need to partake in it today, because it can only lead to false doctrine. People say that water baptism is “an outward manifestation of an inward work of grace.” However, the water from the baptism is only on the person for a minute or so, then, the outward manifestation is gone. Circumcision is a permanent manifestation. Therefore, it should be favored over water baptism. Of course, like baptism is only spiritual today, so is circumcision, as Colossians 2:11 says, “In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ.” Therefore, if you want an outward manifestation of an inward work of grace, it is best to have the attitude of “yet not I, but Christ” (Galatians 2:20), putting off the deeds of the flesh and putting on the new man (Colossians 3:8-14). That is the true outward manifestation of an inward work of grace—not drops of water that are quickly wiped off after a dunking!) Paul calls these two aspects of the one Gospel, the Gospel of the circumcision and the Gospel of the uncircumcision. (Not true! “Gospel OF the circumcision” means the

**gospel that pertains to the circumcision. “Gospel OF the uncircumcision” means the gospel that pertains to the uncircumcision (Galatians 2:7). Therefore, Paul mentions two, separate gospels, not two aspects of the one gospel! Peter preached repent and be baptized for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). Paul preached trusting in Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection for the remission of sins (I Corinthians 15:3-4). These are two, different gospels. Because there are two, different gospels, we see Peter and the apostles going to a different group than Paul went to. Since Paul went to both Jews and Gentiles (Acts 9:15), “the heathen” (Galatians 2:9), to which Paul went, would be all unsaved people. Therefore, “the circumcision” (Galatians 2:9), to which Peter and the apostles of Israel’s program went, would be all saved people in Israel’s program. This is important to note. Otherwise, there would still be two gospels existing today. It is not that one gospel applied to Jews and one gospel applied to Gentiles. Rather, it is that the gospel of the kingdom applies to Israel’s program in which the kingdom of priests was still being built with Jews before God started the grace dispensation with Paul. We do not see Gentiles included in the kingdom program yet when it is put on hold in Acts 7, because the Jews were not saved yet, and they were to be saved first. Then, from Acts 9 until the rapture, the gospel of the grace of God applies to the body of Christ, in which “there is neither Jew nor Greek” (Galatians 3:28).) The Jew being already a member of a nation which, up to the cross, had been recognized as in covenant relationship with God, was called upon to be baptized to save himself from that untoward generation. That is, to step out, as it were, from the nation, no longer claiming national privilege, nor yet being exposed to national judgment. (Ironside is saying that God broke His covenant with Israel at the cross. In other words, Ironside is saying that, before the cross, Israel is God’s people, but, since they crucified their Messiah, God decides that Israel does not get all the promises God made to them in the old covenant, and that “spiritual Israel,” comprised of both Jews and Gentiles will now receive those promises. That is utterly false, as it makes God out to be a liar. Paul specifically addresses this accusation in Romans when he says, “I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen ACCORDING TO THE FLESH: Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises” (Romans 9:3-4). By saying “according to the flesh,” Paul says that the covenants, the PROMISES, etc., all pertain only to PHYSICAL Jews. He does not say that they USED to pertain to Israel, but he says that they still pertain to Israel. Therefore, even in the writings of the dispensation of grace, God affirms that the promises and covenants He made with physical Israel still apply to physical Israel. Rather, the issue is: “For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel” (Romans 9:6). In other words, God’s promises still apply only to PHYSICAL Jews, but not to ALL, physical Jews. In other words, they only apply to the Jews, who, as Ironside quoted, separate themselves “from that untoward**

generation” (Acts 2:40). Jesus very plainly told the Jewish religious leaders that “the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to A NATION bringing forth the fruits thereof” (Matthew 21:43).” If Jesus were referring to Gentiles, He would have said “NATIONS.” The fact that He says “a nation,” shows that national identity has not been done away with in Israel’s program, just because of the unbelief of Israel. Rather, Jesus is referring to Deuteronomy 32:21, where God said that He would “move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.” And, in case you did not understand this, the Holy Spirit specifically calls out this issue in Romans 10:19 by quoting Deuteronomy 32:21 in the context of Israel’s being set aside. Therefore, the covenant is still in force with Israel, but it is not in force with apostate Israel, but it is in force with the little flock of Israel, who bring forth the fruits of believing what God has promised them, which makes them a foolish nation in the eyes of religious Israel (I Corinthians 2:14). That is why Jesus says in Matthew 21:43 that the promises of the old covenant will not be fulfilled with religious Israel, and then He turns around and says, “Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom” (Luke 12:32). Therefore, there is a “spiritual Israel” in the sense that not all physical Jews receive the kingdom on earth, but it is still a promise made only to physical Jews, who repent and are baptized (Acts 2:38) in order to save themselves “from this untoward generation” (Acts 2:40) of unbelieving physical Jews. They do NOT, as Ironside says, no longer claim national privilege, because, when God does establish the new covenant in His kingdom, which is still future, He will only establish it “with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah” (Jeremiah 31:31). In fact, this is the only way God could make promises to a nation without altering the free will of man. Does Ironside honestly think that God was going to give all Jews the kingdom, including those who worshipped idols? Or, does Ironside think that God was ignorant in thinking that all Jews would believe God and enter the kingdom and that God was caught by surprise when He saw otherwise and had to change His plan, as a result?) With the Gentile, it was otherwise. He was simply called upon to believe the Gospel, and believing it, to confess his faith in baptism. **(According to Paul, ALL, in the Corinthian church, had been baptized into the body of Christ by the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:13). If Paul is referring to water, here, then water baptism is required for salvation, or else you are not part of the body of Christ. If that is the case, Paul would not take such a lackadaisical attitude with regard to water baptism. Instead of saying, “besides, I know not whether I baptized any other” (I Corinthians 1:16), Paul would have been dunking Corinthians left and right, and would have said, “I may have baptized some of you twice, but I wanted to make sure all of you have eternal life. So, better safe, than sorry.” And, without baptizing them, if I Corinthians 12:13 is water baptism, then Paul also would not have been able to make the statement that they are all part of the body of Christ. Therefore, Paul must be referring to a**

**dry, spirit baptism into the death and resurrection of Christ (Romans 6:3-4), and not water baptism. Also, the idea that water baptism is merely a confession of faith is found nowhere in scripture and only serves to enslave people to the rules of the Christian church they attend so that they will not leave. It is not surprising, then, that, some people are water baptized a second time, because the new, Christian denomination they have joined does not recognize the water baptism of the first, Christian denomination that baptized them.) And this abides to the end of the age (No, that is Ironside's interpretation, and lends credence to the New Age Movement. Rather, Jesus said, "lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the WORLD" (Matthew 28:20). In other words, Israel would be a kingdom of priests to go to the Gentiles with the law. This commission abides "unto the end of the world." Both John the Baptist and Jesus offered the kingdom to Israel. That offer was valid "To day if ye will hear His voice" (Hebrews 3:7). Israel was to "exhort one another daily, WHILE IT IS CALLED TO DAY" (Hebrews 3:13). Due to the unbelief of Israel, the period called "To day" was put on hold with the stoning of Stephen and Jesus Christ standing to judge Israel (Acts 7:55-56). Jesus Christ started the dispensation of grace and the body of Christ with Paul in Acts 9. Once the rapture of the body of Christ takes place, the "To day" period for Israel will resume. This time, however, they will believe, as Romans 11:25-26 says that, when "the fulness of the Gentiles be come in," "all Israel shall be saved." They will become that kingdom of priests and go to the Gentiles with the law of Moses in the millennial reign. Zechariah 8:23 says that the Gentiles "shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, 'We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you.'" The place they are going to is where Jesus dwells in the temple in Jerusalem, as Isaiah 2:3 has the Gentiles saying, "Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Note that the Gentiles learn the law of Moses. That is why Jesus told the believing remnant of Israel to teach the Gentiles "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:20). They will do this for 1,000 years. Then, Satan is released from the bottomless pit, and the Gentiles determine if they will side with Satan or with Jesus (Revelation 20:7-10). Then, those siding with Satan, are cast into the lake of fire (Revelation 20:11-15). Then, God brings a new heaven and a new earth (Revelation 21:1). Therefore, when Jesus says He is with believing Israel unto the end of the world, He is saying that He will be with them during the entire time they operate as a kingdom of priests to the Gentiles, giving them the law of Moses so that they trust Jesus as their Saviour at the end of the millennial reign. Since they are not fulfilling that role during the current dispensation of grace, this promise and this commission do not apply today, but will resume once the prophecy program resumes, but they must start in Jerusalem, assembling believing Israel as a kingdom of priests first. The Lord's**

**promise to believing Israel, then, of being with them “unto the end of the world,” is in reference to being with them as they evangelize Israel in the 7-year tribulation and then the Gentiles in the 1,000 year millennial reign.)** as our Lord Himself clearly declared in the closing verses of Matthew 28. **(This was conditional upon Israel accepting Jesus as Messiah and fulfilling their calling to be a kingdom of priests to the world. If they would have done this, we would not have had the current 2,000-year interruption in Israel’s program take place.)** There has never been any change in the order. **(There WAS a change in the order, and the apostles of Jesus’ program acknowledged it. Even though they were commissioned to “go...and teach all nations” (Matthew 28:19), at the Acts 15 council, the apostles recognized the change in programs, such that the apostles of Israel’s program agreed to confine their ministry only to saved Jews, while the apostles of the body of Christ agreed to go to all unsaved people (Galatians 2:9). Peter even admitted at that council that God “put no difference between us [Jews] and them [Gentiles]” (Acts 15:9). Therefore, he recognized that the plan of Israel being a kingdom of priests to reach the Gentiles had been put on hold. In other words, Peter recognized the “change in the order.” Since the very people Jesus directly commanded in Matthew 28:19-20 recognized the change in program, we should do the same today.)**

It has been said that the baptism of the Holy Spirit superseded water baptism, but Scripture teaches the very contrary. **(Scripture agrees with Ironside here. Acts 2:38 says, “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Water baptism was required in order to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and water baptism was required in order to receive eternal life. Water baptism is really a shadow of Holy Spirit baptism in that the Holy Spirit is “living water” (John 7:38-39), while there is nothing special about the water used in water baptism. However, I think Ironside is saying that Bullingerites believe that water baptism was done away with due to Holy Spirit baptism. That is not true. Rather, water baptism and Holy Spirit baptism are associated with Israel at the end of their program, while only Holy Spirit baptism is associated with the church, the body of Christ today. Therefore, it is not that Holy Spirit baptism superceded water baptism today, but it is that water baptism is not a requirement of the dispensation of grace.)** Cornelius and his household were baptized with the Holy Spirit when they believed the Word spoken by Peter. **(Yes, this happened in Acts 10, which is after Paul’s call in Acts 9. Before Acts 9, God said through Peter that you must repent and be water baptized BEFORE you receive the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:38). In Acts 10, we are in the dispensation of grace, where the Holy Ghost is received immediately upon belief, which is exactly what happened with Cornelius and his household. Then, Peter baptized them afterward—not for salvation—but so as not to offend the Jews, who needed water baptism before Acts 9 in order to be saved. But the apostle, turning to**

his Jewish brethren, immediately asks: "Who can forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" And they were at once baptized by authority of the Lord Jesus, which is what the expression "in the name of" involves. This was not a meritorious act. **(Yes, it was not a meritorious act because the dispensation of grace had already begun. It was merely to keep the Jews, who were saved by repenting and being water baptized, from being offended. For example, in Acts 18:8, "Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord," and was baptized. Obviously, Crispus is a Jew, and so Paul baptized him so that Jews saved in Israel's program would not be offended. He would still be coming in contact with Jews, since the house church he was now attending was "joined hard to the synagogue" (Acts 18:7). By the way, since Ironside brought up Cornelius. I think it is important to note that Ironside completely skipped over the fact that, after they believed and before they were water baptized, they spoke in tongues (Acts 10:46). If water baptism is for today, based on the Cornelius passage, then speaking in other tongues is also for today and should probably be required before water baptism is given. Of course, since Ironside believes in water baptism today and not speaking in tongues today, he chooses to ignore the tongues part. The reason Cornelius and his household spoke in other tongues was to provoke Israel to jealousy (Romans 11:11) so that Jews may be saved by believing the gospel of grace in this current dispensation. This provoking ministry of the saved Gentiles among Jewry, in which the gifts of Israel's program were displayed from Acts 9 through Acts 28, is what both Ironside and the Bullingerites fail to see. Once we get to the end of Acts, Israel has completely diminished away (Romans 11:12), as evidenced by the threefold rejection of the Jews during Paul's ministry (see Acts 13:46, 18:6, and 28:25-28). Therefore, this provoking ministry stops, as does the water baptism and spiritual gifts. If Ironside wants to bring water baptism into this dispensation, he also needs to bring speaking in tongues into this dispensation, which he will not do. Of course, both of them are not for today, but the point is that one is just as valid as the other.)** It was a blessed and precious privilege granted to this Gentile household upon the evidence of their faith in Christ. **(There is nothing "blessed and precious" about being dunked in water today, since God does not recognize water baptism today. The "one baptism" (Ephesians 4:5) God recognizes is of the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:13) into the death of Christ (Romans 6:3-4).)**

It has been objected that the apostle Paul himself makes light of baptism and was really glad that he had not baptized many at Corinth. It is surely a most shifty kind of exegesis that would lead any one to make such a statement. **(What's so shifty about that? Paul said, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius" (I Corinthians 1:14). Therefore, Paul was really glad that he had not baptized many at Corinth. That is believing God's Word, not "a most shifty kind of exegesis.")** In the record in Acts, where we read of Paul's ministry in

Corinth, we are told that many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized. Paul did not himself do the baptizing, save in a few instances, but he certainly saw that it was done, **(The reason Paul did not baptize much is because, “Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (I Corinthians 1:17). If baptizing was somehow beneath Paul and he made sure that others did it for him, Paul would not have baptized those that he did. Note, from I Corinthians 1:14-15, that the reason Paul thanked God that he did not baptize many in Corinth was “lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.” Well, if Paul had helpers, who did all of the baptizing, any baptizing they did would have counted as if Paul baptized them. In other words, all of those baptized by Paul and Paul’s helpers would have the potential of Corinthians saying that they were baptized in Paul’s name. Therefore, he did not have anyone water baptizing people for him. It is true that Acts 18:8 says that the Corinthians who believed were water baptized. That is because they came from Jewry. So as not to offend the Jews, Paul baptized them. In the next verse, we see that the Lord summoned Paul to leave (Acts 18:9). It was later on that he wrote I Corinthians. The problem with the truth is that some people may accept it at first, but many of those will leave soon afterward. At the end of his life, Paul said, “All they which are in Asia be turned away from me” (II Timothy 1:15). We see from Paul’s letters to the Corinthians that they were carnal and acting just like the world. Therefore, it should be no surprise that, in the time between Paul’s being there and baptizing people and Paul writing I Corinthians, many of those initial believers had left the church. That is why there is a shorter baptism list in I Corinthians 1:14-16 than would be expected by reading Acts 18:9. It is not that Paul had helpers baptizing for him. Also, nothing is ever beneath Paul. Paul was willing to take four Jews to the temple to fulfill a Jewish vow, even though doing so resulted in his arrest (Acts 21:23-33), just so saved Jews in Israel’s program would not be offended by the dispensation of grace. Since Paul was willing to do that, are we really supposed to believe that Paul said, “Hah! Dunking believers in water is beneath me. Let my helpers do it!”?) and the Holy Spirit evidently quotes the record with approval. (Yes, the Holy Spirit approved the water baptisms because they helped Paul reach the Jews. In Acts 16:3, Paul had Timothy circumcised. The Holy Spirit approved of that, also, not because we should be circumcised today, but Timothy was circumcised “because of the Jews which were in those quarters.” Furthermore, in Acts 21:24-27, as I just mentioned, Paul took four Jews with him and all five of them (Paul and the four Jews) had their heads shaved in the Jewish temple as part of a vow they had taken. The Nazarite vow is part of Israel’s program and is not for today. But, Paul did this to reach the Jews with the gospel of grace. Therefore, just like with circumcision and the Nazarite vow, water baptism is not for today, but was used by Paul in the latter part of Acts to reach the Jews with the gospel. Paul said, “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews” (I Corinthians 9:20). Therefore, the distinction must be**

**made between things that are done for the gospel's sake versus things that we are required to do today in the dispensation of grace.)** Why then did Paul thank God in First Corinthians 1, that he had baptized so few? The answer is perfectly plain. Because the Corinthians were making much of human leaders and he saw the tendency to glory in man. He knew that if there were many there who had been baptized by him, they would be likely, under the prevailing conditions, to pride themselves upon the fact that he, the apostle to the Gentiles, had been the one who baptized them. **(Yes, that is the reason why Paul thanked God that he only baptized a few, but that still does not negate the fact that water baptism is not for today. If water baptism was required for salvation, as it was in Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38, Paul would have regretted not baptizing more because those people missed out on eternal life as a result. He certainly would not "thank God" for them still being lost!)** But far from making light of baptism, when he chides them for their sectarian spirit, he shows them that the only name worthy of exaltation is the name of the One by whose authority they had been baptized. **(Actually, what Paul does is he thanks God that he did not water baptize many because the focus should be on the gospel, not on water baptism. He says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect" (I Corinthians 1:17). In other words, Paul is thankful that he did not baptize many Corinthians so that the focus would not be on water baptism, but it would be on the gospel, which is to trust in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection for atonement of sins (I Corinthians 15:3-4). He came to the Corinthians to make sure they were saved (I Corinthians 2:2). He did not come to argue over water baptism, since it is not for today.)**

As to the various disputed scriptures in Romans 6:3, 4 **(Baptized into Jesus' death)**; Colossians 2:12 **(Baptized into Jesus' death)**; Ephesians 4:5 **(One baptism)**; and Galatians 3:27 **(Baptized into Christ)**, where baptism is mentioned without any definite indication as to whether it is water or Spirit, one thing at least is perfectly clear. **(Those four passages clearly refer to Spirit baptism. Romans 6:3-4 is Spirit baptism because no one is "buried" into water (Romans 6:3). Colossians 2:12 is Spirit baptism because it is a definition of the spiritual circumcision of Colossians 2:11, and it is "buried with Him in baptism" again. Ephesians 4:5 needs not define what the "one baptism" is because you already know that from Romans 6 and Galatians 3. Galatians 3:27 must be Spirit baptism because Galatians 3:28 says that, by being "baptized into Christ," "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female." Since you do not lose your nationality, job, or gender status when you are baptized into Christ, this baptism must be Spirit and not water.)** Water baptism is necessarily implied, because Spirit baptism is but a figurative expression, and water baptism was the act upon which the figure was based. **(I Corinthians 12:13 says, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." In other words, Spirit baptism is what gives us eternal life. Without it, we are**



not part of the body of Christ, and we are still dead in our sins. The real baptism cannot be water, because Paul says that ALL of the Corinthians were baptized into one body by one Spirit, but he does not know if they have all been water baptized or not (I Corinthians 1:16). If water baptism is what brings you into the body of Christ, then it has to be part of the gospel, as it is in Mark 16:16 and in Acts 2:38. Paul would then be lying by saying, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (I Corinthians 1:17). Here is the issue: there are many things that God does to your spirit in Christ when you receive eternal life, such that "ye are complete in Him [Christ]" (Colossians 2:10). God could not do these things to man's spirit until after Jesus Christ's death on the cross. Even people saved today usually do not understand the things they have in Christ, because their flesh is still vile (Philippians 3:21), and "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (I Corinthians 2:14). Therefore, in order to help saved man understand what he has in Christ, God put fleshly types of those things in Israel's program. Colossians 2:17 says that those fleshly things "are a shadow of things to come; but the BODY is of Christ." In other words, water baptism, physical circumcision, etc., are shadows of the real things that we have today, being complete in Christ. We are told that, in Christ, "ye are circumcised with the circumcision made WITHOUT HANDS, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, Who hath raised Him from the dead" (Colossians 2:11-12). Obviously, this is spiritual, not physical, circumcision. Since there is a colon after "circumcision of Christ," what comes after the colon is part of what came before it. Therefore, "buried with Him in baptism" must also refer to a spiritual baptism. It is part of the spiritual circumcision we receive by which our flesh is cut off. That is why Romans 6:4 says, "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." The result is that "our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Romans 6:6-8). In other words, before you were saved, your spirit was "dead in trespasses and sins" (Ephesians 2:1). You had no capacity whatsoever to serve God, because in your flesh "dwelleth no good thing" (Romans 7:18). However, when you were saved, you were given the Holy Spirit (Romans 5:5), and He performed a spiritual baptism of you into Christ's death. Being identified with Christ's death means that you are also identified with His resurrection so that "sin shall not have dominion over you" (Romans 6:14). You are "dead to the law, that [you] might live unto God" (Galatians 2:19). "Even when we were dead in sins, [God] hath quickened us together with Christ" (Ephesians 2:5). Spirit baptism into Christ's death means

that your spirit is now alive in Christ. In other words, “ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God” (Colossians 3:3). The only way you can serve Christ is by this spirit baptism, since no good thing dwells in your flesh. Because Satan does not want you to serve Christ, he has convinced Christianity as a whole that spirit baptism does not exist. Christians think that baptism always refers to water. That way, they never understand the life they have in Christ due to their spirit baptism into Christ’s death. Therefore, Ironside states: “Spirit baptism is but a figurative expression, and water baptism was the act upon which the figure was based.” However, the opposite is really true. Water baptism was “a shadow of things to come” (Colossians 2:17), and one of the things that came was spiritual circumcision and spiritual baptism (Colossians 2:11-12). Because spiritual baptism is absolutely essential to being able to serve Christ, Satan has come along and blinded the minds of Christianity “lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, Who is the image of God, should shine unto them” (II Corinthians 4:4), so that Christianity still lives in their vile flesh, serving sin, and never recognizing that they are complete in Christ. Therefore, they never serve Christ. A person trusts in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ in order to have eternal life. As a result, God makes their spirit come alive, while bringing death to their flesh. Now, for the first time, that person can walk in the Spirit and serve Christ. However, the first thing the Christian church does is to indoctrinate them in their religion by baptizing them, which sets them on the career path of continuing to serve the lusts of the flesh, but doing so in the name of Christ now. Therefore, because of water baptism, they never learn who they are in Christ, and they are just as useless to Christ after they are saved as they were before they were saved, but they do not seek to change, because Satan has tricked them into thinking that all of their good deeds of the flesh will please God. They even do damage to God’s kingdom because they practice their religion in the name of God. That is the real issue here, which is why Satan has tricked all Christian denominations into continuing to serve the flesh via water baptism.)

This comes out in the first mention of Spirit baptism. "I indeed," says John, "baptize you with water" (this then was the actual literal baptism), "but He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire." It is not literal baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is not literal fire, but figurative. **(If “it is not literal baptism in the Holy Spirit,” then Ironside is saying that we do not have the Holy Spirit! Yet, Peter says that those, who repented and were water baptized, received “the gift of the Holy Ghost” (Acts 2:38). Paul says that “God...hath also given unto us His Holy Spirit” (I Thessalonians 4:8). Therefore, John is most definitely talking about being baptized with the Holy Spirit. John is actually talking about 3, different baptisms in the one verse of Matthew 3:11. The three baptisms are exactly what he says they are: 1) Water, 2) Holy Ghost, and 3) Fire. If an individual in Israel was to enter the kingdom, he must repent or change his mind, which means he needs to stop following the Jewish religion and believe in God’s provision to bring him into the**

kingdom via the law covenant He had made with Israel. When a Jew believed this, he would be washed with water as a priest, which is what John did. When the Pharisees came to his baptism, the first thing John told them was, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" (Matthew 3:7). God would pour His wrath upon apostate Israel, as they would not be part of the kingdom. Those, coming to John with repentance, were fleeing from that wrath by believing God's law covenant with them. This repentance and water baptism was only a first step. After Jesus paid for the sins of believing Israel, He baptized them with the Holy Ghost in Acts 2. Rather than being a figurative baptism, as Ironside says, they literally received the Holy Ghost. Acts 2:4 says, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Peter says, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh" (Acts 2:17). In light of these verses, how can Ironside possibly say that they were not literally baptized with the Holy Ghost? The next part of the process is a refining process through the fire of the tribulation period. God said that the Lord "is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness" (Malachi 3:2-3). The baptism with the Holy Ghost gives believing Israel the capacity to survive the baptism with fire of the tribulation period so that they are brought into the kingdom, rather than being thrown into the lake of fire. That is why, just after mentioning these 3 baptisms, John says, regarding the Lord, "Whose fan is in his hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire" (Matthew 3:12). Believing Israel must go through the refining process of the spiritual fire of the tribulation period or else they will be baptized with the literal fire of the lake of fire for all eternity. Therefore, Ironside, in saying that only the water baptism is real, has eliminated the gift of the Holy Ghost in order for Israel to enter God's kingdom, and he has eliminated the punishment for unbelievers in the lake of fire! Also, you will note that not one of these three baptisms is what Paul talks about. We have already gone over how, today, the Holy Spirit baptizes us into Christ's death. This is different from water baptism, being baptized with the Holy Spirit, and being baptized with fire. Contrary to popular belief, "baptism," in the Bible, does not always mean water, as we have already seen. The word "baptism" simply means "to be identified with." Therefore, today, our baptism into Christ's death is a dry baptism, in which our sin is identified with Christ's death so that we no longer have to serve sin. Another example of dry baptism is found in I Corinthians 10:2, where we are told that the children of Israel, in escaping from Egypt, "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." In other words, they escaped Egypt because they were baptized, or identified with, God's people. They crossed the Red Sea on

**dry ground. Pharaoh's army, however, drowned in the Red Sea. If baptism is always water baptism, then it was the Egyptians who were baptized in the sea, and that is not what I Corinthians 10:2 is referring to. Therefore, baptism does not always mean water. Dry baptism is what God did for Israel in the Red Sea, and it is what God does for the body of Christ today.)** If this be but kept in mind, there would be no confusion. Baptism in water pictures both burial and resurrection. On this Paul bases his instruction in Romans 6 and Colossians 2:12. **(No! It is on this false doctrine that Christianity takes away our baptism into Christ's death today and replaces it with water. Many pastors, upon water baptizing someone, have proclaimed, "buried with Christ in baptism, risen with Christ to new life." However, you will never find such a statement related to water baptism in scripture. Water baptism is first mentioned in Exodus 29 in the ordination of priests in Israel. Exodus 29:4 says that the person, who is to become a priest, is to be washed with water. In fact, this water baptism was probably a sprinkling, because God says, in relation to the future, new covenant He will have with Israel, that He will "sprinkle clean water upon [them], and [they] shall be clean" (Ezekiel 36:25). We also see from Acts 2:41 that a group of 120 believers (Acts 1:15) water baptized "about three thousand souls" in a single day, which would have been a very time consuming and tiring task if dunking was involved. Water baptism, then, is the way that God cleanses the flesh of believing Israel to be priests of God. It does not, in any way, picture both burial and resurrection. It is Christianity that came up with that idea, and they had to change it from a sprinkling to a dunking in order to fit their false doctrine.)** Thus water baptism marks people out as belonging to Christ by profession, and therefore is the basic thought in Galatians 3:27, even though it is by the Spirit's baptism that people are actually united to Christ. **(Huh? How does water baptism mark people out as belonging to Christ by profession? People do not even know if you have been water baptized or not unless you tell them, and having someone splash water on you does not a Christian make. Even in Israel's program when all believing Jews were water baptized, Jesus said, "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John 13:34). Jesus did not say, "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if you have been water baptized!" Paul says that "we are ambassadors for Christ" (II Corinthians 5:20). The way we are ambassadors for Christ is by suffering for Him. Paul continues by saying, "Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed: But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses" (II Corinthians 6:3-4). He said earlier, "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body" (II Corinthians 4:10). In other words, the way unbelievers are reconciled to God is by seeing us operating as children of light, suffering for Christ gladly. They look at us and say, "Wow! That guy is still joyful even though he is suffering for what he believes.**

**I want what he has!” The way that people see us as belonging to Christ is NOT by saying, “Wow! Some dude threw some water on him in church. I want what he has!” The basic thought of Galatians 3:27 is walking by the Spirit. It is NOT that everyone knows you are a Christian because you have been water baptized! Galatians 3:27 says, “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” Putting on Christ means that, since “your life is hid with Christ in God” (Colossians 3:3), you now have the ability to “put off the old man with his deeds” (Colossians 3:9) and “put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering” and “put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness” (Colossians 3:12,14). When the world sees the fruit of the Spirit manifest in your life is when they begin to see the gospel as good news. Until then, Christ crucified is foolishness (I Corinthians 1:23). Furthermore, anyone, who has been water baptized, but does not walk in the Spirit, is seen by unbelievers as a hypocrite, which blasphemes God’s name and causes unbelievers to see the gospel as bad news, such that they would not believe the gospel, even if someone different, who IS walking in the Spirit, presented it to them. It is precisely because of these hypocritical Christians that very few people believe the gospel today. Now, Ironside’s last comment is confusing in light on what he has already said. He previously called Spirit baptism a “figurative expression.” Now, he says that people are actually united to Christ by the Spirit’s baptism. Well, if there is only “one baptism” (Ephesians 4:5) and that baptism is water, according to Ironside, then, whatever the Spirit’s baptism is, it is not recognized by God, since God only recognizes one baptism today. I can only assume that Ironside believes that the Spirit baptizes you into the body of Christ by the water baptism performed by a preacher, which is probably why Christian denominations generally only recognize a water baptism done by their denomination as being real water baptism. If this is Ironside’s view, then he believes, although he would never admit it or even realize it himself, that water baptism is required for salvation, because you are not part of the body of Christ until the Holy Spirit baptizes you into the body of Christ (I Corinthians 12:13).)**

There has been much disputation regarding the passage in Ephesians 4, but without laying special stress on the importance of water baptism, it is very evident that the passage would have no meaning if water baptism, as well as that of the Spirit, were not in view. **(What? Ephesians 4:5 says that there is only “one baptism,” and Ironside says that “it is very evident that” the only way “one baptism” can have any meaning is if there are really two baptisms! That is like saying, “There is only one way to God—Jesus Christ (John 14:6)—but the only way you can understand that is if you recognize that, incorporated in that one way, are really two ways. That makes absolutely no sense. He is calling God a liar!)** Let me try to make this plain. **(What is “plain” is that Ironside does not believe God’s Word.)** In the opening verses, the apostle calls upon the Ephesian believers, and of

course all Christians, to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they have been called, and he lays stress on the importance of endeavoring to keep the Spirit's unity in the bond of peace. Then he explains this unity as being sevenfold. In verse 4 he emphasizes three special things, one Body, one Spirit, and one hope. Now there can be no question that the Spirit is brought in here as forming the Body, and the Spirit forms the Body by what is called elsewhere the baptism of the Spirit. Then in verse 5 we have another trio, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Here it seems to me clearly enough we have, not a duplication of what we have already had in verse 4, but something that is more outward. One Lord in whom we believe; one faith that we confess; and one baptism by which we express our allegiance to that Lord and that faith. In verse 6 we have God Himself as the Father of all, the Founder of this blessed unity. **(There is nothing “outward” here. Paul mentions “the unity of the Spirit” in Ephesians 4:3. The unity that the Godhead has is that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit are 3 in 1. Ephesians 4:4 describes this unity of the Godhead as “one body” (God the Son), “one Spirit” (God the Holy Spirit), and “one hope” (God the Father’s gift of eternal life to believers). Ephesians 4:5 describes the unity of the body of Christ and how all three members of the Godhead are involved in creating that unity. That is, we have “One Lord” (God the Son), “one faith” (Christ’s faith to obey God the Father), and “one baptism” (by the Holy Spirit into the body of Christ). Then, Ephesians 4:6 covers how each individual is part of the body of Christ as a result of the Godhead’s work. God is “above all” (God the Father), “through all” (God the Son), and “in you all” (God the Holy Spirit). The reason Ironside and others have “much disputation” regarding this passage is that they refuse to let it mean what it says, instead trying to make it fit their own religious beliefs, which are contrary to God’s Word rightly divided.)**

Now without going into any disputation as to whether the term "one baptism," is to be confined to the baptism of the Spirit, or the baptism of water, it is certainly evident that it at least implies water. **(The reason Ironside will not dispute what the “one baptism” means is because he cannot logically explain how two baptisms—water baptism and Spirit baptism—really are just one baptism. Furthermore, Ironside keeps using terms like “it is certainly evident” or “there can be no question” so that you will just accept what he says as fact. That is what the Christian religion does. When you begin to question what they say and give them scripture that shows they are wrong, that is when they gave you the right boot of disfellowship. Since the word “water” has not even been mentioned in the book of Ephesians so far, why would it be “certainly evident” that Paul is at least implying water?)** No man confesses his faith in Christ by the baptism of the Holy Spirit alone, for millions have been baptized by the Holy Spirit, and yet the world knows nothing of it. **(Apparently, Christianity knows nothing of being baptized by the Holy Spirit either. Who are these people, according to Ironside? Are they all saved people? Are they only saved people who have been**

water baptized? Are they only saved people who speak in tongues? Confessing your faith in Christ simply means that you confess that you have abandoned your own self righteousness by trusting in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for your sins and God has given you eternal life, as a result. Spirit baptism, spiritual circumcision, regeneration, etc. are all part of what happens to you as a result of having faith in Christ. Since those things happen spiritually, "the natural man" cannot understand those things (I Corinthians 2:14), as Ironside has pointed out. Therefore, the fact, that "the world knows nothing of" Spirit baptism, shows that Spirit baptism is of God.) On the other hand, of course, many have faith in Christ who have never been baptized in water, but that does not alter the fact that, according to the Lord's own instructions, water baptism should follow confession of Christ. The Lord has never rescinded this order, **(Apparently, the Lord HAS rescinded this order. He told the 11 apostles: "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). Then, in Acts 9, the Lord appeared to Paul. Paul received the gospel, that he preached, directly "by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Galatians 1:11-12). That gospel is to trust in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for sins (I Corinthians 15:3-4), and Paul specifically says that baptism is not part of the gospel he preaches (I Corinthians 1:17). Therefore, the Lord rescinded the order to water baptize for salvation, when He revealed to Paul a new gospel. The apostles in Israel's program even recognized this themselves when they agreed that they would go only to saved Jews (Galatians 2:9), even though Jesus had commissioned them to "all the world" (Mark 16:15).) and for men to attempt to do so is but to substitute human authority for divine. (For Ironside to attempt to go against God's Word by saying that the commission of Mark 16:15-16 is still in effect today, and then to re-define what the commission actually says by taking water baptism out of the gospel, is "to substitute human authority for divine," because it was divine authority—the Lord Jesus Christ Himself—Who made the change.)**

The statement has been made that inasmuch as all carnal ordinances were abolished in the cross, this includes baptism and the Lord's Supper. **(There are many things wrong with this sentence. First, baptism and the Lord's Supper are not "carnal ordinances." They are things that God instituted, which means they are not carnal. Second, the cross does not abolish God's ordinances. Jesus said, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18). "All be fulfilled" refers to God reconciling the earth back to Himself. That does not take place until the millennial reign has been completed. In that still-future reign, we see Gentiles saying, "For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isaiah 2:3). However, in Acts 7 with the stoning of Stephen, God set aside Israel's program, and He started the dispensation of grace with Paul in Acts 9. In this current dispensation of grace, once we are saved, we are not under the law, but under grace**

(Romans 6:14). As such, “all things are lawful unto me” (I Corinthians 6:12) and for me (I Corinthians 10:23). Therefore, Christians are not under the law, but, once the rapture takes place, Israel’s program will resume where it left off, and they will be under the law, as they were before. With regard to water baptism, we see Peter saying in Acts 2:38, which is AFTER the cross, that Israel needed to “repent, and be baptized...for the remission of sins” (Acts 2:38). With regard to the Lord’s Supper, it is funny that someone would think the Lord’s Supper would be abolished in the cross, because the first time it was observed was the night that Jesus was crucified on the cross! With regard to water baptism, since it belongs exclusively to Israel’s program, it was set aside along with the rest of the program, when God started the mystery dispensation with the apostle Paul in Acts 9. It is by no means abolished, because it will be picked up again once the rapture of the body of Christ takes place. In fact, Jesus Christ commissions Israel to water baptize the Gentiles during the millennial kingdom as a necessary part of their salvation (Mark 16:15-16). Now, with regard to the Lord’s Supper, when the Lord had supper with His disciples, He was really eating the feast of the Passover (John 13:1-2). In fact, Jesus specifically says, “With desire I have desired to eat this PASSOVER with you before I suffer” (Luke 22:15). The Passover, and its associated feast, was given to Israel in Egypt, as a type of how God would “pass over” Israel’s sins and give them eternal life in the kingdom, as the result of the ultimate Passover Lamb, Jesus Christ, shedding His blood to atone for their sins (John 1:29). Therefore, when Jesus gave the disciples the bread and the cup, He let them know the true meaning of the Passover feast that Israel had been celebrating since Exodus, by saying that the bread and the cup are His body and blood given for their sins. In the dispensation of grace, we are told, “let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ” (Colossians 2:16-17). In other words, we should not observe the Passover, because, for us, this shadow was replaced by the real Passover found in Christ. However, Paul says, “I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you” (I Corinthians 11:23), and then he proceeds to explain that we should have the Lord’s Supper in the dispensation of grace, because, “as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till He come” (I Corinthians 11:26). In other words, Jesus gave the disciples the real meaning behind the Passover celebration in Israel’s program. Then, He took that feast, called it the Lord’s Supper, and continued it today. The Passover was celebrated only once per year, but the Lord’s Supper is celebrated as often as you want. Also, note that the Lord’s Supper is a full meal. Paul says, “For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken” (I Corinthians 11:21). Christian churches today eat a bite of a cracker and a sip of grape juice. No one gets full on a bite of a cracker, and no one gets drunk on a sip of wine. Therefore, the Lord’s



**Supper must be a full meal. In other words, you have the Lord's Supper whenever you eat with other believers. The Christian church has made it something that can only be done at their church, using their crackers and grape juice, so that they can control your fellowship with God, so that you have to keep coming back to THEIR church in order to be in fellowship with God.)** However, to merely state this is to refute it, inasmuch as Christian baptism was not given until just before the Lord's ascension (**Acts 11:26 says, "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." Before this time, the word "Christian" was never used. How, then, could "Christian" baptism be given before the Lord's ascension? The reason that there were no Christians until the grace dispensation is because the believing remnant of Israel was not trying to be Christ-like in their program. Instead, they were to trust in the Mosaic covenant that God made with Israel in order for God to give them eternal life in God's earthly kingdom. When the mystery was revealed to Paul in Acts 9, the world was told a completely different message, which is to trust in Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for your sins. Then, you are given the Holy Spirit and the mind of Christ, and you can live Christ-like or as a Christian. That is a life that was still future in Israel's program, which means that it took the dispensation of grace to generate Christians. The instruction regarding water baptism under this new program is that "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (I Corinthians 1:17), which means that water baptism is not a part of today's dispensation. "Christian baptism," as previously discussed, is the dry baptism by the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:13) into the death of Christ (Romans 6:3-4) so that we may be raised to new life in His resurrection. This was not given until given to the apostle Paul in Acts 9. With regard to water baptism in Israel's program, it started with the priests in Exodus 29. God said that the priests are to be washed with water (Exodus 29:4). Because Israel was called to be a kingdom of priests (Exodus 19:6) and the kingdom was at hand when John the Baptist came (Matthew 3:2), all believers in Israel began to be water baptized at that time in order to identify themselves as being separate from apostate Israel and to separate them as being part of the kingdom of priests that would go to the Gentiles with the gospel of the kingdom in the millennial reign. Therefore, Ironside is incorrect. Also, since Ironside says that "Christian baptism" was given "just before the Lord's ascension," he must be saying that the commission to baptize in Matthew 28:19 was different from John's and Jesus' baptisms in John 3:22-23. This is significant to note because most Christians reference John's water baptism of Jesus to substantiate water baptisms today, when, according to Ironside, Jesus did not receive a Christian baptism! So, why would you want to be baptized like Christ was, when He received a Jewish baptism, rather than a Christian one?) , and the Lord's Supper was given from heaven to the apostle Paul by special revelation, long after Christ's ascension (1 Cor. 11:23,24). **(Yes, that is true.)** To read into such a passage as Hebrews 6:1,2 any reference to Christian baptism, is ignorance**

so colossal that it does not even deserve an answer. The apostle there is definitely referring to Judaism in contrast with Christianity. **(Paul is “the apostle of the Gentiles” (Romans 11:13). Hebrews is written to the Hebrews, and it was written when the kingdom of heaven was at hand (Hebrews 3:13). Therefore, it was written before Acts 7, which is before Paul was saved, and is part of Israel’s program. As such, there is no contrast between Judaism and Christianity in Hebrews 6:1-2, because there was no such thing as Christianity yet. Rather than making a contrast between Judaism and Christianity, Hebrews 6:1-2 shows that the author wishes to build upon the foundational doctrine that is mentioned in those verses to “go on unto perfection.” In other words, the author wants the Hebrews to learn more advanced doctrine. He is not getting rid of water baptism. Rather, he is building upon the foundation of salvation in Israel’s program, which includes water baptism. There is no contrast given in these verses, as Ironside claims. Also, given Ironside’s beliefs, how can he even say that there is a contrast between Judaism and Christianity in these verses? The reason I ask this question is that Hebrews 6:1 says, “Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection.” Ironside teaches that we should follow the sermon on the mount and the rest of Christ’s teachings found in Matthew – John. Now, he is saying that these “principles of the doctrine of Christ” really belong to Judaism, and not to Christianity. Therefore, he has contradicted himself!)** The "doctrine of baptisms" is the teaching of washings under law. **(Yes! That is exactly what water baptism is. Ironside understands that the Lord’s Supper was given to Paul by special revelation, and it is not the Passover celebration that Jesus had His disciples partake in. Why, then, does he not understand that water baptism is a washing under the Mosaic law that was NOT carried forward to the dispensation of grace, especially when he understands that the “doctrine of baptisms” does refer to washings under the law? If he recognizes that Paul was given a special revelation from Christ regarding the Lord’s Supper, why does he not recognize that Paul was also given a special revelation from Christ regarding water baptism that “Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (I Corinthians 1:17), especially when we note that the gospel was given to Paul “by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:11-12)? Since the gospel of the kingdom includes water baptism (Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38) and Christ gave Paul the gospel of grace that does not include water baptism, it should be even clearer to Ironside that water baptism is not part of the dispensation of grace than it is clear that the Lord’s Supper was given by special revelation to Paul to be included in the dispensation of grace.)**

To the lover of the Lord Jesus Christ there can be nothing legal about baptism. **(The law says, “and this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them to hallow them, to minister unto me in the priest’s office....Thou...shalt wash them with water” (Exodus 29:1,4). Therefore, water baptism is a “thou shalt” of the law. This makes water baptism a**

legal requirement of the law. To say anything different is to deny the truth of God's Word.) It is simply the glad expression of a grateful heart recognizing its identity with Christ in death, burial, and resurrection. **(Ironside just said that a saved person is identified with Christ's death, burial, and resurrection. Baptism is being identified with something. Therefore, unknowingly, Ironside just admitted that the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5 is a dry baptism of the Spirit into Christ's death. How, then, is water baptism a recognition of this? If you want to go through a ceremony to symbolize the dry baptism of the Spirit into Christ's death, instead of having the preacher dunk you in water, lie down and have him shovel some dirt on you. Then, once you are completely covered, you can get up and thank God that you are identified with Christ's death so that you are also risen to new life in His resurrection. If you still want water, we can hose you off afterward. This may seem silly, but it makes a lot more sense than dunking someone in water!)** Many of us look back to the moment when we were thus baptized as one of the most precious experiences we have ever known. **(That's because water baptism is the beginning of people's enslavement in the Christian religion. When someone is baptized into water, instead of saying, "buried with Christ and raised to new life with Him," the pastor should say, "buried into the Baptist denomination and raised to enslavement to our religion." Once you have spent your entire life in that enslavement, you actually think the event that started it all, i.e., water baptism, was a freeing experience and are thankful for it. Every cult is like that, where its members look at their initiation as one of the most precious experiences they have ever known. I am sure the pilots who hijacked planes and drove them into the Twin Towers in New York on 9/11/01 were excited about what they were doing as well, but it does not mean they were doing the right thing.)**

All ultra-dispensationalists do not reject the Lord's Supper, but those who are rigidly tied up to the prison epistles and have practically no other Bible, set this blessed ordinance aside in the same curt way that they dismiss water baptism. **(God says to "stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Galatians 5:1). In light of our freedom in Christ, why would we want to sit in church, eat a bite of a cracker, take a sip of grape juice, and feel guilty about how our sins nailed Jesus to the cross and call all of this a "blessed ordinance?" Even in Israel's program, they are told that the blood of Christ purges their conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Hebrews 9:14), and these are people still under the law! How much more, then, should we, being not under the law but under grace (Romans 6:14), live in the resurrection life of Christ instead of following a ritual that would bring us back into bondage under the law!)** We are told that in a spiritual dispensation there is no place for outward observances. **(There are things under the law "which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Colossians 2:17). Once the body has come, the shadow should be**

neglected for the body. That does not mean that there are no outward observances. The Lord's Supper is a great example of the body, because the fellowship that we have with each other being in Christ should show how Christ's body works together for God's glory. But, the true Lord's Supper is fellowshiping over a meal, recognizing such fellowship is made possible by being part of the body of Christ. What churches do, with their cracker, grape juice, and guilt trip by the pastor, enslaves people to be subject to their consciences. It does not set them free!) And yet, singularly enough, these brethren meet together for worship and prayer, and that very frequently upon the first day of the week, though they are almost a unit in denying that this is the Lord's Day. **(The day of the week that a group of believers meets is not important. The reason most right dividing churches meet on Sundays is because it is the day when most people are able to meet. As the world becomes more and more secular, more churches will change to a different meeting time. The reason we deny the Lord's Day is because every day is the Lord's Day. We should not put God in a box by being religious and spiritual on Sundays, while neglecting the rest of the week. We have the Holy Spirit all the time. We have the mind of Christ all the time. Paul says, "I die daily" (I Corinthians 15:31), not "I die on Sundays." Paul recognizes that he can make the choice every single day to walk in the Spirit and not fulfill the lusts of the flesh (Galatians 5:16). "Christ liveth in me" (Galatians 2:20) every single day, not just on Sundays. Therefore, for a believer, there is no such thing as "the Lord's Day" any more. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Colossians 2:16-17).)** They insist, though the Holy Ghost has Himself changed the term; that the Lord's Day is identical with the Day of the Lord; **(If Ironside would put off his religious glasses and put on his English grammar glasses, he would note that "the Lord's Day" is the same as "the Day of the Lord." For example, "God's love" is the same as "the love of God," and "God's law" is the same as "the law of God." There is no difference between the two terms.)** and so the observance of the first day of the week is with them simply gross legality. Think of parting with all the holy privileges of the Lord's Day on the plea that it is a mark of higher spirituality to make this a common day like any other. **(Sunday is no more holy than any other day of the week. If it were, then you would not gain as much by doing a mid-week Bible study, as opposed to studying on Sunday. Not once have I ever heard someone say, "This is a hard, Biblical passage to understand. Let's wait until Sunday to study it so we can learn what it says, because I just can't understand it on Wednesday night." "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain" (Galatians 4:9-11). Therefore, observing Sunday as "the Lord's Day" is a weak and beggarly element of**

**the law that puts Christians in bondage.)** I know that some quote as authority for this, Paul's words in Romans 14:5: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." But an examination of the entire passage in which this verse is found, will make it clear that the apostle is here referring to Jewish distinctions between clean and unclean meats, and holy and common days, and he would have Gentile believers respect even the legal feeling of their Jewish brethren in these matters. **(Yes, this is the very reason why Paul had the Corinthian believers baptized. It is important to receive those who are weak in the faith (Romans 14:1), so that they will remain in your church and become strong in the faith through the sound doctrine that is taught.)** The enlightened Christian of course in a very real sense esteems every day alike, that is, every day is devoted to the glory of God, but this does not mean that he fails to differentiate between days on which he participates in the ordinary activities of the world, and the first day of the week, which is largely set aside for spiritual exercises. We have known men to glory in their liberty, as they called it, who could take part in Christian service on Lord's Day morning and spend the afternoon golfing, or in some other more worldly way, and this on pretence of a higher spirituality than that of those who are supposed to be legal, because they use the hours of the entire day either for their own spiritual upbuilding or for the blessing of others. **(By saying that Sundays should be reserved only for "spiritual" activities, they are saying that they will be more godly on Sundays, which gives them license to do whatever they want for the rest of the week. In other words, "I have to be holy on Sunday" means "I can be unholy Monday – Saturday."** However, if any day of the week is holier than the other days, it would be Saturdays. One of the ten commandments is: **"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy" (Exodus 20:8), which is the seventh day of the week or Saturday. God set aside the seventh day as a day of rest when He created the world. "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made" (Genesis 2:2-3). Since "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (II Peter 3:8), it has been said that God's reconciliation plan for heaven and earth lasts 6,000 years, and then He rests for 1,000 years, which is the millennial reign. Of course, as time goes on, that theory becomes less likely to be true. However, the point still remains that the seventh day is the day of rest that God established from the creation of the world. Why, then, would people rest on the first day of the week? I understand that the argument is made that believers started meeting on the first day of the week to celebrate Jesus' resurrection, but that is something man did. God is the One Who established the seventh day as a day of rest, even though He knew that Jesus would rise from the dead on the first day of the week. It is interesting that, in the dispensation of grace, Paul quotes all of the ten commandments except for the one about the sabbath. The**

reason is because Israel rested on the Sabbath day because they were under the law. The law is served in the energies of the flesh. God set aside one day per week for Israel to be involved with the things of God. Today, we are not under the law, but under grace. We have the Holy Spirit and can walk in the Spirit every, single day. Therefore, there is no need for a day of rest each week, because we can rest in Christ every day. That does not mean that we go to church every day. It means that Christ can work through us every day in our normal activities. Therefore, there are no activities that are godly in themselves, and there is no need to set aside a special day each week for God. Every activity and every day is for God. "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself" (Romans 14:6-7). This is true because, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Colossians 3:3). "Christ liveth in me" (Galatians 2:20). Therefore, when a member of the body of Christ participates in the ordinary activities of the world, it is Christ living through him, which makes everything a spiritual activity, even golfing on a Sunday afternoon.)

It is strange that many, who insist that there are no ordinances or commandments connected with the dispensation of pure grace, should take up collections in their services and urge people to give as unto the Lord to support their ministry. **(What is strange about this? I Corinthians 9:11 says, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" II Corinthians 9:7 says, "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." The position that Ironside is taking is that, because we say we are not under the law, all of the things under the law do not apply today, and that is not true. Galatians 3:24-25 says, "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Galatians 4:7 says, "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." When you are a child, you are under your parents' rules. When you become an adult and move out, you are no longer under those rules. However, a lot of those rules, that your parents established, were good rules, and you may still follow them as an adult. Just because you are no longer under the rules does not mean that you do not follow some of the rules, but you are mature enough to determine how to live your life. Similarly, before we were saved, we were under the law of our conscience, written in our hearts (Romans 2:14-15). Once we are saved, that flesh is reckoned by God to be dead (Romans 6:11). The blood of Christ has purged our "conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Hebrews 9:14). We are no longer under the law, but under grace (Romans 6:14). We now have**

liberty in Christ (Galatians 5:1) to make wise, spiritual decisions, using the mind of Christ, which we now have (I Corinthians 2:16). For Israel under the law, they were robbing God if they did not pay their tithes, resulting in them being placed under the curse of the law (Malachi 3:8-9). Today, under grace, we are not required to give anything. We just give what we purpose in our hearts. Regardless of what we give, we are “blessed...with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (Ephesians 1:3). The mature member of the body of Christ will recognize the importance of giving to keep the ministry alive, while the immature believer will say, “I don’t have to give anything, so, I won’t give anything.” The difference between law and grace is the difference between being a child and being an adult. It does not mean that we do not do things that God prescribed for Israel to do under the Mosaic law. Maybe we will; maybe we will not. It is our decision in grace. If Ironside finds it strange that people would give to the ministry when they do not have to, it shows that the love of Christ has not constrained him (II Corinthians 5:14) to serve the Lord through walking in the Spirit, rather than in the energies of the flesh (Galatians 5:16). He must treat his entire congregation as children, which makes me wonder if he has ever shared the gospel of Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for sin (I Corinthians 15:3-4.) Logically, they should tell people that giving is legal and belongs to the old dispensation, but has no place in the present age, when we simply receive but give nothing in return! **(Giving does not go away under grace. Rather, the motivation to give is different. We do not give to gain favor with God. We give because we have already received favor from God. A good illustration of this is found by comparing forgiving others under the two dispensations. Under the law, Jesus said, “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses” (Matthew 6:14-15). In other words, they had to forgive in order to be forgiven by God. However, under grace, we are told: “be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you” (Ephesians 4:32). In other words, we forgive because we have already been forgiven by God. Under the law, Israel gave in order to be blessed by God. Under grace, we give in response to the blessings that God has already given us in Christ.)** The passage already referred to in 1 Corinthians 11 makes it clear that though the apostle Paul did not receive his instruction concerning the observance of the Lord's Supper from the twelve, it was given to him by special revelation from heaven, thus indicating what an important place it has in this age. **(Let me get this straight. Ironside says that the Lord’s Supper has “an important place” today because “it was given to [Paul] by special revelation from heaven.” He gets this from Paul’s statement that “I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you” (I Corinthians 11:23). Regarding the gospel Paul preached, Paul calls it “my gospel” (Romans 2:16, Romans 16:25, and II Timothy 2:8), and he states: “I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of**

me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:11-12). Thus, Paul uses stronger language, to indicate that he received a special gospel that no one before him had received (“The mystery...which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men” (Ephesians 3:2,5) and “That in me FIRST Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting” (I Timothy 1:16).), than the language he uses about the instructions for the Lord’s Supper. Furthermore, in introducing the gospel, he says, “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures” (I Corinthians 15:3). This is very similar language to what he used four chapters earlier in introducing the Lord’s supper. Yet, Ironside completely ignores the gospel of the grace of God given to Paul first, stating that Paul gave the same gospel that Peter gave, but Ironside embraces the “special revelation” of the Lord’s Supper given to Paul, not saying that it was an extension of what the Lord did before He was crucified! The reason Ironside does this is “lest [he] should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ” (Galatians 6:12) for “the gospel of Christ...is the power of God unto salvation” (Romans 1:16). Ironside denies the mystery gospel because the power behind it attacks the flesh, leading to persecution. Ironside embraces the Lord’s Supper for the mystery dispensation because the power of salvation is not in it.) Surely one is guilty of gross perversion of Scripture who dares to teach that since Paul’s imprisonment, the Lord’s Supper should no longer be observed, when the Holy Ghost has said, “As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till He come.” (Paul says, “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days” (Colossians 2:16). Therefore, even though the Acts 28ers do not observe the Lord’s Supper, they have not sinned in not observing it. The “gross perversion of Scripture,” then, is committed by Ironside when he fails to recognize that “a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto [Paul]” (I Corinthians 9:17), because, “if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed” (Galatians 1:9). In other words, if Ironside does not believe Paul’s gospel, he will burn in the lake of fire forever, while there will be no such punishment for believers, who do not take a sip of grape juice and eat a bite of a cracker every 3 months.)

The most sacred hours that many of us have ever known have been those spent with fellow-believers seated at the table of the Lord, recognizing in the broken bread and poured-out wine, the memorials of our Saviour’s death, and thus in a new way entering into and appropriating the reality of which the symbols speak. (Hebrews 9:14 says that “the blood of Christ ... [purges] your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.” Galatians 2:19 says, “For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.” Therefore, Jesus died on the cross to give you



life in Him. He did not want you sitting around feeling sorry for your sins. That is “the sorrow of the world [which] worketh death” (II Corinthians 7:10), which beguiles “you of your reward in a voluntary humility” (Colossians 2:18). Instead of dwelling on death, it would be much more blessed to dwell on the resurrection life that we have in Christ. “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, Who loved me, and gave Himself for me” (Galatians 2:20). Note how that verse mentions death once, but life 5 times. Jesus Christ stayed in the grave only as long as He had to. Life is the focus of God, while death is the focus of man. That is why Catholics still have Jesus on the cross, and why Protestants sit around feeling sorry for sending Jesus to the cross. The victory over death has already been won. Instead of contemplating the sip of grape juice and the bite of cracker with tears rolling down your face over how sorry you are that Christ had to die for you, say with Paul, “But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Corinthians 15:57). Therefore, we will yield ourselves “unto God, as those that are alive from the dead” (Romans 6:13). **Get your thoughts out of the grave, and live in Christ’s resurrection life!** We may be thought legal, because we refuse to surrender such precious privileges at the behest of some of our self-styled (Not “self-styled”, but “Christ-styled.” Christ is no longer in the grave, and neither should we be there. God has already reckoned us to be dead to sin, and God tells us to “likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Romans 6:11). So, stop expressing worldly sorrow and start living in the resurrection life of Jesus Christ our Lord!) expositors of pure grace, but we remember “that the grace of God salvation bringing for all men, hath appeared, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ,” (In “entering into and appropriating the reality” of Jesus’ death, Ironside is living in the flesh, rather than living in the “salvation” from the flesh that the resurrection life of Jesus Christ gives us. There is no joy in reliving death, but you can “rejoice evermore” (I Thessalonians 5:16) in being quickened and raised together with Christ to “sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (Ephesians 2:5-6). Ironside’s “shew of wisdom in will worship and humility” results in “the satisfying of the flesh” (Colossians 2:23), but living in Christ’s resurrection satisfies the spirit and brings glory to God. That is how you “live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world” (Titus 2:12).) and until He come, by His grace, to remember Him in the way of His own appointment. (Eating the bread and drinking the cup, spiritually speaking, are done by the sober, righteous, godly living that comes as a result of attaining “unto the resurrection of the dead” (Philippians 3:11) by walking in the Spirit (Romans 8:4). That is how “ye do shew the Lord’s death till He come” (I Corinthians 11:26). If all you do is

**take a sip of grape juice and a bite of a cracker in the confines of a church while living just like the world outside of the church, not only do you not show the Lord's death, but you blaspheme God's name. In other words, you are saying, "The Lord's death didn't do squat for me, because I live just as carnally as I ever did. If you want to be a self-righteous hypocrite, then come to my church.")**

## Concluding Remarks

In closing this review of the system of teaching which we have had before us, I do not think it necessary to go into the questions at any length of Soul-sleeping and Annihilation (conditional immortality), or the opposite view of the final restoration of Universalism. **(Rightly dividing the Word of truth does not support soul sleep, annihilation, or universalism as sound doctrine. People came up with those doctrines by following theology, not by following God's Word rightly divided.)** As already mentioned, the followers of the late Dr. E. W. Bullinger have largely taken up with the first type of teaching in Great Britain; whereas in America many of them have supported Universalist views. But these heretical teachings have been so ably answered on many different occasions by other writers, that it would seem like a work of supererogation to go into them now. I only mention them, in fact, as a warning to those who are dabbling with this system, for that which looks so innocent in the beginning often ends up in complete departure from "the faith once delivered to the saints." **(This is the danger of religious systems. People base their doctrines upon what a church teaches, not upon what the Bible teaches. If the Bible is your final authority, you will compare all doctrine with what the Bible teaches rightly divided, and your beliefs will be entirely based upon scripture. However, if you go running to your pastor, Sunday school teacher, or some other "expert" for answers, that person may lead you astray. The Bereans "received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things [which Paul taught] were so. Therefore many of them believed" (Acts 17:11-12). That is what we should do. We should NEVER follow a religious system, even if that system is an Acts 9 dispensationalist one, because, if false doctrine is introduced into that system, you will be led astray. Instead, ask the question: "What saith the scripture?" (Romans 4:3) and believe the scripture. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Romans 10:17). If all I am hearing is theology and religion, then I do not have faith in God's Word.)**

One who was a leading advocate of Bullingerism on the west coast for many years, has put out literature recently which denies the Eternal Sonship of the Lord Jesus Christ, the true personality of the Holy Spirit, and many other important truths. **(As I just mentioned, no one should ever follow a religious system. On the flip side, no one should ever reject doctrine just because a particular religious system espouses it. Bullinger helped greatly in the recovery of truth, and his writings are a great tool to use in learning sound doctrine. The great thing about making the Bible your final authority is that the Holy Spirit will use scripture to teach you the things of God, because they are spiritually discerned (I Corinthians 2:9-16). Therefore, you can compare any teacher's doctrine to scripture rightly divided and learn the sound doctrine while**

**rejecting the false doctrine. Without the Holy Spirit, you will believe all doctrine that one, religious system espouses, which almost always includes false doctrine.)** In order to support his restoration system, he has put out a private translation of the New Testament which, by his disciples, is generally accepted as absolute authority. **(That is exactly what modern Bible translations do. They all use a corrupt Greek New Testament in order to change the truth of God into a lie (Romans 1:25) that will fit their religious system. That is what the New King James, New International, New Living, and all other modern translations do. They are all part of “the slight of men and cunning craftiness” to deceive you into being “carried about with every wind of doctrine” (Ephesians 4:14).)** Making no pretence to scholarship myself, **(Since God promised to preserve His Word forever without error (Psalm 12:6-7; Matthew 24:35), there is no need to get involved with scholarship. Just read and believe your King James Bible!)** but simply seeking to be a reverent student of the English Bible with whatever help I have been enabled to glean throughout more than forty years of studying the Word, **(Your “help” is the Holy Spirit teaching you the things of God, and not anything else.)** I hesitated to pronounce upon many of the peculiar translations in this new New Testament, but several years ago it was my privilege to spend some time in company with the late Dr. A. T. Robertson, undoubtedly the foremost Greek scholar in America, and possibly without a peer elsewhere. I asked him if he had ever examined the Version in question. **(If Ironside has believed in Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection as atonement for his sins, he has the Holy Spirit to teach him the things of God. Therefore, he does not need to rely upon a man’s opinion about a version. Rather, he could just read it himself and allow the Holy Spirit to show him that it is a corrupted version. Surely, someone, who has studied the Word for over 40 years, as Ironside has, would have such spiritual discernment if he is saved!)** With a look of disgust, he said, "I certainly did. The editor had the impertinence to send me a copy, and asked me to commend his ignorance to others."

I said, "Doctor, would you give me in a few words your real estimate of this work, and give me the privilege of quoting you as occasion may arise?" **(The “doctors of the law”, in Jesus’ day (Luke 5:17), did not even believe the law (John 5:46-47). Why, then, would Ironside care about what some Greek “doctor” thinks?)**

He replied, "I can give it to you in two words, Piffle and Puffle, and you may tell any one that that is my estimate of this vaunted translation."

In giving publicity to this conversation, my desire is to warn those who are carried away by great pretence to learning, who may not themselves be familiar with the original languages in which the Bible was written, and are therefore easily impressed by a parade of assumed scholarship. **(Being familiar or not with the original languages has nothing to do with being “easily impressed by a parade of assumed scholarship.” Jesus said,**

**“Thy Word is truth” (John 17:17). If you believe that, the only thing you will be impressed by is God’s Holy Word, and you will quickly discard a corrupt Bible translation, regardless of how many Greek scholars say it should be followed. Similarly, you will still believe the King James Version is God’s Holy Word today in English, even though most scholars criticize it. The reason they criticize the KJV is because they did not write it. Therefore, they do not get royalties from KJV Bible sales, like they do for their corrupted Bible versions. “The word of God is not bound” (II Timothy 2:9).)**

Generally speaking, I have sought to avoid personalities in this discussion. Many otherwise excellent men have taken up these new views. I have no quarrel with men. I do not desire to reflect upon or belittle any of them. It is the Truth of God that is in question, and my appeal is therefore to the Word itself. **(Really? What about the terms: “Satanic perversions of the truth,” “damnable heresies,” and “childish diatribes” that Ironside used against those with opposing views to himself. There is no need for name calling when you stand on the truth of God’s Word as your argument against false doctrine. “We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth” (II Corinthians 13:8). It should be very telling that I have used many more scripture references than Ironside has. That is not to say that the one with the most scripture references “wins,” but it shows that my beliefs are based on the truth of God’s Word. By contrast, Ironside’s beliefs in this paper are largely the opinions of man that are supported by limited scripture, and that taken out of context.)**

Singularly enough, since these papers began running serially, I have received abusive letters from a number of different teachers accusing me of attacking them. **(Well, what do you expect when you use such strong language against your opponents? People tend to fight fire with fire, especially when their livelihoods are attacked by a prominent person in their field. If Coke attacked Pepsi, Pepsi would attack Coke. Similarly, when Ironside, who made considerable money from the Christian religion, attacks others, who do the same, they will fight back to maintain their empire.)** One such writes that he is neither a Bullingerite nor an ultra-dispensationalist, and resents being so designated. Each one must draw his own conclusions as to whether he holds the views I have endeavored to refute. "I speak as unto wise men. judge ye what I say." **(This is a quote of I Corinthians 10:15, which is interesting because the previous verse says, “Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry.” If you want to flee from the idolatry of the Christian religion, you will compare what Ironside has said with the scripture and judge that he is in error.)**

In bringing these papers to a close, I would urge interested readers to remember the exhortation of the apostle, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." **(Yes, and the way you “prove all things” is to compare them with scripture, not with what Christianity says.)**