

The BEACON



Published by the Newton church of Christ
Meeting at: St. James Church Rd and Glendale Ave

Vol. 21, No. 5-6 Edited by John Cripps May & June 2007

WAS CORNELIUS SAVED WITHOUT BAPTISM?

THE CONCLUSIONS OF MEN vrs THE WORD OF GOD

Hello,

The conversion of Cornelius clearly shows that water baptism is not necessary for salvation. There are three good reasons that we know that he was saved before he was water baptized.

1. Before he was water baptized he already "received" the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:47). In view of this, there are three passages that demonstrate that he was saved. They are Romans 8:9; Galatians 4:6 and 1 John 4:13.
 - a. Romans 8:9 - If one has the Holy Spirit they "belong" to Christ. To belong to Christ does not describe an unbeliever but a believer - such was the case of Cornelius before he was water baptized.
 - b. Galatians 4:6 - Because he was already a "son" God sent the Holy Spirit into his heart whereby he can now rightly refer to God as "Abba! Father!" This would only describe a condition of one who is a believer.
 - c. 1 John 4:13 - Because he had the Holy Spirit Cornelius abided in God and God abided in him. To abide in God and to have God abide in you does not describe an unbeliever but a believer - such was the case of Cornelius before he was water baptized.
2. Some what related to point number 1 is the fact that before his baptism the Holy Spirit is

said to have been "poured out" upon Cornelius (Acts 10:45). According to Romans 5:5 the love of God is "poured out" in our hearts through the Holy Spirit. Therefore Cornelius already had the love of God in his heart before he was baptized. But unbelievers do not have the love of God in them (John 5:42) only believers do. Therefore Cornelius by having the love of God in him was already saved before he was baptized.

3. Before he was water baptized he spoke in the New Testament gift of tongues (Acts 10:46). This New Testament gift is for those "in" not "out of" the church which is Christ's body (Colossians 1:24). Therefore, by having this New Testament gift Cornelius was already "in" the body of Christ and that before he was water baptized.

Marc

Dear Marc Taylor,

Thank you for your post of April 24, 2004 regarding the conversion of Cornelius. Since you did not introduce yourself with any more than a, "Hello," I'm not sure if you want to study the Bible with me or not. I am willing to do so with you. I'd like to answer your article and encourage you to also respond. If I have missed your point on anything please clarify it to me.

The conversion of Cornelius is told in Acts 10:1-11:18. The article you posted me did not deal with this text, which tells us why the Holy Spirit fell on Cornelius and his household. You have stated what you think the pouring out of the Holy Spirit meant in this case, but you did not deal with what the context says it meant.

Further, your article denied baptism a role in Cornelius' salvation, but it did not state the purpose of his baptism. Your article states, "The conversion of Cornelius clearly shows that water baptism is not necessary for salvation. There are three good reasons that we know that he was saved before he was water baptized. 1. Before he was water baptized he already "received" the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:47). In view of this, there are three passages that demonstrate that he was saved. They are Romans 8:9; Galatians 4:6 and 1 John 4:13." Your first point was that receiving the Holy Spirit was evidence of Cornelius' salvation. The text of Acts 10:1-11:18 does not state such. This might be why you went to other texts for help. However, the text of Acts 10:1-11:18 shows that the receiving of the Holy Spirit by the Gentiles was to indicate to the Jewish Christians present, and those who would hear of it, that, "God has also granted to the Gentiles repentance to life" (11:18). This is the direct statement found in the account to which you begin your appeal but then depart. Your article attempts to remove baptism in water from its correct role in man's salvation. Rather than show that baptism had nothing to do with salvation, the reception of the Spirit by the Gentiles showed that circumcision had nothing to do with

salvation.

Now, if Acts 10:1-11:18 had stated that baptism was not necessary for salvation—that reception of the Spirit meant they were saved without baptism—then it would not have been necessary for you to resort to the other passages you did. In fact, if Acts 10:1-11:18 had said what you wish it would have said, then you would never have sent such an article to me for I would believe it and we'd be in agreement. To support your point you cited Romans 8:9; Galatians 4:6 and 1 John 4:13. Do these texts teach that a person is saved when they receive the Holy Spirit as did Cornelius' household? Let's see. Here is Romans 8:9 in its context: (Rom 8:1-11 KJV) "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. {2} For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. {3} For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: {4} That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. {5} For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. {6} For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. {7} Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. {8} So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. {9} But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is

Evolution 101 - Lesson # 5“Is Progressive Creation Tenable?”

This scheme claims that God first created everything in **Genesis 1:1** and then destroyed it and started over after **Genesis 1:2** which describes the chaotic condition of the earth. Supposedly, this created a huge gap between the first two verses of **Genesis 1**. During this gap of millions or billions of years (fill in the blank) and after creating the plants and animals, God destroyed the first creation during which the present fossil record was laid down in the earth's crust. Apparently, the earth and fossil record was not completely destroyed in the process and continued on in the recreation that took place after **Genesis 1:2**.

The proponents of this line of thinking usually contend that Noah's Flood was only local, not world wide, and was not responsible for the present fossil record. This exegesis is supposed to silence the geologists and astronomers most of whom are evolutionists and demand eons of time for their scheme to work.

One proof text for this interpretation of the Bible is **Genesis 1:2** where *was* is replaced with *became*. Even though the translations of the four Bibles in the Layman's Parallel Bible use *was*, these scholars render **Genesis 1:2** as, “And the earth **be-came** without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” This is supposed to describe the condition of the earth when the second creation account began.

The other proof text is **Genesis 1:28** which states, “. . . God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and *replenish* the earth, and subdue it;” Replenish is supposed to mean to refill an earth that had been previously filled. This is not imperative since the Hebrew dictionary lists *fill* as a synonym for **replenish**. Three of the four bibles mentioned above use *fill* instead of *replenish* in this passage.

These proof texts seem to be a less than convincing premise to embark on the grand scheme of declaring, in effect, that God couldn't get it right the first time. One suspects that these scholars would never have thought of this scheme to help God out had they not been strongly swayed by the geologists and astronomers, most of whom are atheists.

This writer recalls the alibi of a famous politician who declared that there is “no controlling legal authority” that condemns his misdeeds. But there is a “controlling legal authority” that covers the issue raised in this essay. That would be **Exodus 20:11** which states, “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day.” If replenish means to fill a second time as claimed for **Genesis 1:28**, then *made* in the verse above should have been translated “*remade*” to indicate remaking the leftover from the first creation. This controlling, watershed verse demands a creation from nothing, not from the remains of a previous creation.

There should be no confusion about **Exodus 20:11**. It is not just inspired scripture; it is inscribed scripture, written by

the finger of God on a stone tablet. As a part of the Fourth Commandment, it was delivered to the people at a time when they all understood from long experience that a day was a solar day, not just a vague period of time. God surely understands Hebrew.

We are faced with deciding if the earth is young or old. God's word can't mean both. Only one is right and the other is blasphemy. This decision about the age of the earth should not be influenced by the opinions of pagan scientists. You will recall in an earlier lesson that it is impossible to prove empirically that the earth is millions or billions of years old.

One needs to remember the loss of credibility suffered by the church over the Galileo affair. The church had sanctified the finding of the Greek astronomer, Ptolemy, who contended that the earth was the center of the solar system. The scientists soon changed their minds as they do all the time and pronounced the sun as the center of our solar system. But the church cannot change a supposedly doctrinal absolute without losing credibility. Is the church inviting another disaster by adapting to the speculations and lies of the atheistic scientists concerning evolution and the age of the earth?

In trying to help God out, these progressive creationists trash the understanding that God's curse brought death into the world as the result of the sin of one man, Adam. If the progressive creationists are correct, the fossil record already showed that animals (including early man) had already lived and died. If

death had already stained the creation before Adam arrived, then the Bible is in error and Jesus did not die for our sins and was only a martyr.

Occam's principle, followed in science and logic, teaches that the simplest explanation of a proposition is the correct solution. For example, the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. A convoluted explanation, therefore, is wrong.

Taking the Genesis account of creation and Noah's flood at face value as historical narrative and **Exodus 20:11** as reinforcement, satisfies Occam's principle, also known as the rule of parsimony. The progressive creationists' convoluted solution is to postulate an original creation of life and animals including early man which was then destroyed and resulted in the fossils now found in the earth's crust. This was supposedly followed by the second creation described in Genesis beginning with **Genesis 1:2**.

How convoluted can one get? To complicate things even more, they claim that death of animals and early man found as fossils do not dispute the doctrine that sin and death entered the world only through Adam. These earlier men, they say, were not spiritual persons like Adam and only Adam's sin counted as the cause of the curse. Whew!

--Jolly F. Griggs, Ventura College

Evolution |

101 - Lesson # 6

Does Time and Chance Have a Chance?

The First Law of Thermo-dynamics teaches us that only matter and energy can be the cause of anything. Believers in macroevolution agree that random matter in motion is its basic causal source. Here are the words of George Wald written in **The Physics and Chemistry of Life:**

“The important point is that since the origin of life belongs in the category of at-least-once phenomena, time is on its side. However improbable we regard this event, ... given enough time it will certainly happen at least once.

“Time is in fact the hero of the plot. The time with which we have to deal is of the order of two billion years. What we regard as impossible on the basis of human experience is meaningless here. Given so much time, the ‘impossible’ becomes possible, the possible probable, and the probable virtually certain. One has only to wait: time itself performs miracles.”

It will be useful to see if chance can select any useful arrangement of atoms in motion regardless of the time available. Suppose we place ten similar coins in a container and number them one through ten. Can chance count to ten? Shake the container thoroughly. If we draw out one without looking, we naturally expect that we have a one-out-ten chance of getting the number one coin first. The probability is 1/10.

Replace the coin. Continue to draw and replace until you select number one. Return it to

the container and draw for coin number 2. Your chance is 1/10, one out of ten. Now, what is the probability of selecting coins number one and two in succession? 1/20? No. The probability is 1/100, one out a hundred on an average.

The number of chances per step is multiplied, not added. In this case when we multiply 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 x 10 the answer is 10,000,000,000. There is one chance in ten billion of getting all ten in a row. There is not enough time in many, many lifetimes to complete such an experiment. If a person could draw and record one coin every five seconds day and night, it would take over 1,500 years to achieve one success. Chance does not have a chance to produce an ordered result. On the other hand, an eight-year-old student could produce the outcome in a minute or less. The Law of Probability says chance cannot produce ordered results.

“It is truth very certain that, when it is not in our power to determine what is true, we ought to follow what is most probable.” -- Ren? Descartes

What is the probability of spelling “evolution” by chance? Obtaining the nine letters in order, each having a probability of 1/26, you have a probability of 1 in 5,429,503,678,976. Drawing as before, it would take 800,000 years to spell “evolution” one time. For a detailed discussion of probability, refer to **Evolution: Possible or Impos-sible** by James F. Coppedge.

Assume there is an ocean full of amino acids, the building blocks for proteins that form the stuff of living creatures. What is the probability of mindless matter producing a meaningful protein? Think of amino acids as ABCs and proteins as words. There are usually

20 amino acids that can build any one of thousands of proteins. The smallest useful protein needs a chain of 400 amino acids at the very least. The largest protein molecule ranges up to 50,000 amino acids.

There is another complication. Amino acids come in two species that are chemically identical but are physically mirror images of each other like a person’s left and right hands. Living creatures are composed of only “left-handed” amino acids. This means the amino acid alphabet is 40 letters long instead of 20. The probability of finding one meaningful protein of 400 amino acids by chance over time is essentially zero. A person cannot imagine the size of the number 40 multiplied by itself 400 times! The number is so large that mathematicians use shorthand to express it: 1 in 10⁵²⁰. That is 1 followed by 520 zeroes! That number is billions of times larger than the number of atoms in the whole universe. And it is only the beginning. It takes thousands of proteins to form a living creature. And there is more.

What Makes A Protein Meaningful?

Not just any old protein will work. Specific proteins are required for specific jobs in a living organism. Both *evolution* and its reverse, *noitulove*, are equally probable on the basis of chance. Why is one meaningful and other is nonsense? Let this paragraph illustrate the point. Each word, analogous to a protein, is composed of ABCs, analogous to amino acids.

Where did the meaning of these words come from? They came from a language convention designed by humans to enable one human being to communicate with another. The ink and paper are physical. The message is spiritual and “rides” on these words. They came from a

transcending author, the writer of this essay. Similarly, radio waves do not create the music. They are physical. The music has been created by a transcending composer and “rides” on the waves.

Now, where does a specific protein get its meaning? There must be a “*language of life*” convention created by an intelligent being to explain it. This language of life convention is inferred by the DNA molecule in the cell and is the master plan or blueprint that gives direction to the thousands of proteins in a living cell on how to perform their unique tasks. The DNA molecule is physical, like this ink and paper, and the spiritual “*language of life*” rides on it. The author is meta-physical and transcends the physical. Christians believe this author is the God of the Bible.

The DNA molecule is even more complicated than proteins and its probability of origin by dancing atoms is far less than that of proteins. Furthermore, the arrival of proteins and the DNA molecule had to come into existence at the same time. Each is essential for the function of the other

Think about it! The words on this page of ink and paper did not give the meaning to the words. The meaning of these words came from a transcending author and “rides” on the ink and paper. Likewise, the DNA molecule is physical like this ink and paper and is not alive. Its meaning, or aliveness, is spiritual and “rides” on it. Like the author of these words, the meaning of DNA must come from a transcending intelligence. God is a rational meta-physical cause of it all.

Time and Chance are dead ends for the evolutionists.

–Jolly F. Griggs, Ventura College

none of his. {10} And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. {11} But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

Your article equates being "in the Spirit" (Romans 8:9) with the case of Cornelius who "received the Holy Spirit" and did "speak with tongues" (Acts 19:46, 47). The context of Romans 8:9 shows that that is not what Paul was talking about. He was speaking about the Christian's manner of life, or, "walk". He spoke of those who, "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (v 1), "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (v 4), "they that are after the Spirit [mind] the things of the Spirit" (v 5), and are "spiritually minded" (v 6). Therefore, those who "walk ... after the Spirit" are the ones who are "in the Spirit" and in whom dwells the Spirit (vv 9, 11). Therefore, the Spirit dwelling in them was because they walked according to the Spirit. These words of Paul were not a reference to the gift of tongues received by Cornelius and his household. Your article begs the question, "When does newness of life begin?" Is it when one speaks in tongues? Is it at the point of faith? Or is it in water baptism as Jesus commanded? According to the same epistle you cited, Romans, it begins with water baptism. Paul stated: (Rom 6:1-6 KJV) "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? {2} God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? {3} Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into

TAPE REQUEST FOR Vol 5 & 6 2007

1. 228) LYING
2. 289) Mark 16:16 - Baptism
3. 289) Matt 28:19 - Baptism
4. 147) Metaphors of Baptism
5. 230) Midnight Conversion
6. 183) My God My God Why Hast thou forsaken Me?
7. 254) Peter's Faith
8. 296) Organization of the church
9. 201) Obedience
10. 279) Old Law Done Awy
11. 78) Origin of Denominations
12. 305) Our Liberty in Christ

Tape Request For Vol 3 & 4 - 2007

Cut out this form, write down the numbers of the tapes you want and mail to the **Newton church of Christ, P.O. Box 893, Newton, NC 28658.**
Limit: Two Selections per request.

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____ Zip _____

Phone: (_____) _____ - _____

Tape: Selection # 1: _____

Selection # 2: _____



**WATCH "THE WORD
and THE SWORD"
channel 14 WHKY
8pm - 10pm
OUR STUDY IN 2007
"WHY WE BELIEVE"**

**Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage Paid
PERMIT No. 32**

**THE NEWTON CHURCH OF CHRIST
ST JAMES CHURCH RD. AND GLENDALE AVE.
P.O. BOX 893
NEWTON, NC 28658
EVANGELIST: JOHN CRIPPS
OFFICE PHONE: (828) 465-3009**

**Schedule of Services:
Sunday:**

Wednesday:

his death? {4} Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. {5} For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: {6} Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." "So many" ("as many" or "all of us") here means "the same number of." Hence, every person baptized into Christ was baptized into his death, and one not baptized was not baptized into his death. One baptized was raised to walk in newness of life, but one not baptized was not raised to walk in newness of life. Therefore, if one is saved at the point of faith without baptism, then he is saved without being united with the Lord in His death and is saved without newness of life. The death and burial precede the resurrection and newness of life, therefore baptism precedes the newness of life. The death to sin occurs before baptism, but the newness of life is after baptism. Paul said, "if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection," therefore, if we have not been so planted, then we will not be "in the likeness of his resurrection."

****** Continued In Next Issue 7 & 8
"OUR GOAL IS HEAVEN - SATAN'S
GOAL IS TO HAVE ALL IN HELL - BUT
GOD'S GRACE, LOVE and MERCY HAS
MADE IT POSSIBLE FOR US TO
REACH OUR GOAL"**