

# Foolish Galatianism

*Reflections on the 2003 Auburn Avenue  
Pastors Conference: Part 1*

Andrew Webb, M.Div

**O** foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed among you as crucified? This only I want to learn from you: Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are you now being made perfect by the flesh? Have you suffered so many things in vain -- if indeed it was in vain? Therefore He who supplies the Spirit to you and works miracles among you, does He do it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? -- just as Abraham "believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." Therefore know that only those who are of faith are sons of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel to Abraham beforehand, saying, "In you all the nations shall be blessed." So then those who are of faith are blessed with believing Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, "Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them." But that no one is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident, for "the just shall live by faith." (Gal. 3:1-11)

## Introduction

This initial essay is not intended to be an extensive response to the biblical, theological, and historical assertions made by the main speakers at the 2003 Auburn Avenue Pastor's Conference (hereafter AAPC), instead I will have time to address the speaker's comments in greater detail in following installments. In this first part, I wish to give a brief overview and critique of the conference and to give my own highly subjective observations of the events that transpired.

My intention in writing this critique is not to snipe at the participants from a concealed position. It is my intention to make copies of this essay available electronically to all the speakers at the conference, and indeed I do not intend to say anything in these pages I would not say to them in person, or in a court of the church.

I should probably begin by saying I attended every session of this year's conference and tried take the most extensive notes I could, I also made sure I had tapes of the four main presentations made by those espousing what was termed the "Auburn Theology" by the respondents at the conference. Those main speakers and their presentations were, in order:

- 1) John Barach – "Covenant and Election"
- 2) Doug Wilson – "The Visible/Invisible Church Distinction"
- 3) Steve Schlissel – "What Does the Lord Require?"
- 4) Steve Wilkins – "Covenant and Baptism"

Although I did not attend last year's AAPC, I have listened to the audio files and read the transcripts that were made available. In any event, my main emphasis will not be on responding to the conference of last year, but on the 2003 conference especially as the stated intention of this year's conference was to clarify the positions of the speakers at the 2002 conference, and that this was therefore the conference that they sought to be judged by.

Having said that, I should comment that the positions of the speakers as they were expressed at 2002 do not appear to have substantively changed as they themselves admitted. If anything, those opinions appear to have only become stronger in the intervening time, and as Steve Schlissel so succinctly put it: "I don't envy me, but out of all that was said last year and this year, I agree with me."

The Conference itself consisted of sessions featuring further statements by the original speakers regarding what they said at last year's conference about the "Federal Vision" followed by comments by respondents, all of whom indicated that they were concerned by the statements made at the 2002 AAPC. Then, there were further discussions of those positions as well as two sessions where the "Monroe Four" (Barach, Wilson, Schlissel, and Wilkins) and the Respondents (Carl Robbins, Morton Smith, R.C. Sproul Jr., and Joey Pipa) could answer questions put to them by members of the audience.

## The Major Themes

In a very real sense any discussion of the major themes of the conference is also inevitably a discussion of the major theological problems with the theology of the new paradigm being proposed by the speakers. When I say "new paradigm," I am literally using the same language used explicitly by most of the speakers. All of their presentations sought to identify what they saw as problems with traditional Reformed theology, especially in the way it deals with "problem passages" of the Bible, and the pastoral problems that these problems

supposedly create. From my point of view, the “problems” brought to light by the Monroe Four were either the result of peculiarities of Dutch Reformed Theology (this was especially true of John Barach’s presentation), problems created by misunderstanding or ignorance of what Reformed theology really teaches, or simply straw men. In fact, at the end of the conference it was my sincere belief that enough straw men had been produced to keep the American Midwest well supplied with scarecrows for many years to come.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. John Barach pointed out that the “traditional” reformed view of election and assurance has produced such a crisis of assurance that he knows of a Reformed church near him with over 700 members, but that only 20 or so actually attend the Lord’s Supper. This is due, he says, to the fact that most members have not reached a point where they feel holy enough to be assured of their election, and thus truly worthy of coming to the Lord’s Supper. This, he claims, is a result of basing our view of who is really a Christian on the doctrine of election. How, after all, can one know if he is truly predestined?

Now, I was not shocked by his example, because I have heard of this problem in Dutch Reformed churches before. Only the undoubtedly holy approach the table, because supposedly they are the only ones worthy to come. While this is a problem in *some* Dutch Reformed circles, it stems from a misunderstanding of the Lord’s Supper and for whom it is intended. Joel Beeke and other theologians from the Dutch tradition have chronicled the fall off in attendance on the Lord’s Supper in Dutch Reformed circles, and are working to undo the damage that has been done. This is not, however, a problem for *Presbyterians*, as they have long understood that the Lord’s Supper was given by Christ for the spiritual strengthening of a people who are justified and yet who will continue to struggle with sin this side of glory. In the words of “Rabbi” Duncan: “Take it - it’s for sinners.” Against Barach’s thesis, the Westminster Standards explicitly state that full assurance is not necessary to approach the table:

*Question: May one who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation, come to the Lord’s supper?*

*Answer: One who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation to the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof; and in God’s account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity: in which case (because promises are made, and this sacrament is appointed, for the relief even of weak and doubting Christians) he is to bewail his unbelief, and labor to have his doubts resolved; and, so doing, he may and ought to come to the Lord’s supper, that he may be further strengthened.*

– Larger Catechism Question 172

Barach’s supposition is a straw man as far as the issue of communion in Presbyterian congregations is concerned. This kind of straw man was a common feature throughout the conference.

The pattern was:

1. Propose a straw man problem...
2. Propose a new paradigm solution.

Unfortunately however, the new paradigm solution that Barach offers for the Dutch Reformed churches laboring under this misconception regarding the Lord’s Supper is worse than the problem itself. Barach claims that they don’t know if they are predestined (actually the problem is an uncertainty that they are *really* regenerate, not *really* predestined. The assurance is related to one’s salvation, not one’s predestination.)

Instead of saying that those uncertain of their salvation should look to Christ and trust in *His completed work on their behalf* and *His righteousness imputed to them* crying out to Him in prayer to “help their unbelief” or even to heed the advice of the Westminster Confession that:

True believers may have the assurance of their salvation divers ways shaken, diminished, and intermitted; as, by negligence in preserving of it, by falling into some special sin which woundeth the conscience and grieveth the Spirit; by some sudden or vehement temptation, by God’s withdrawing the light of his countenance, and suffering even such as fear him to walk in darkness and to have no light: yet are they never utterly destitute of that seed of God, and life of faith, that love of Christ and the brethren, that sincerity of heart, and conscience of duty, out of which, by the operation of the Spirit, this assurance may, in due time, be revived; and by the which, in the meantime, they are supported from utter despair. (WCF 18.4)

The Westminster Standards already offer a sound corrective for the Dutch problem, and those Reformed churches that suffer from this problem, would probably be wise to embrace the Presbyterian understanding. But this is not the new paradigm solution that Barach proposed. Barach’s actual answer (and that of *all* the Monroe Four) brings us to the first and perhaps most important theme of the conference.

### **Baptism Saves: How We Enter the Covenant**

Where do we look for assurance of our salvation? To our Baptism, the Auburn Avenue Theology replies. All those who are baptized with a Trinitarian Baptism are members of the New Covenant. All those who are baptized are members of the church. All those who are baptized are members of the Covenant of Grace. Those who are baptized are

in Christ, all of them are united to Christ, they are clothed with Christ, they are washed, they are sanctified, and they are engrafted into Christ, the True Vine of John 15 and become true members of the one Church. We become Christians at our Baptism, Wilkins assures us. We really receive the Spirit of Jesus in our baptism, and at baptism we are transferred from Adam to Christ.

Baptism “ushers us into the regeneration.” If you are baptized, you need not worry, your baptism is not merely a sign of something that *might* be yours if you have true faith: it actually conveys what it signifies and gives us assurance that these things are actually ours. We are not waiting for conversion – waiting for a moment – Schlissel assures us. Sure, that may be the *experience* of the prodigal, says Schlissel, but what our Reformed confessions have forgotten is the experience of the elder son! HIS EXPERIENCE, Schlissel tells us, is that which should be the template for those in the covenant: “Son, you are always with me, and all that I have is yours.” (Luke 15:31) [I suppose the elder son’s lament in 15:29 is that of a righteous person after all, so much for my understanding – but that, after all, is what the Monroe Four are here to change – Avanti! We march at dawn to the next paradigm!]

### **Apostasy: How Those Really United with Christ Exit the Covenant**

Ah, but we must also heed the warnings of the Covenant, say the Monroe Four, lest we become hypocrites and unfruitful members of the Vine and thus be cut off. Be warned, the New Covenant can be broken, and it is our duty to heed the threats and warnings as well as listen to the promises of the New Covenant. We are to remain in the Vine into which we have been engrafted by remaining Covenantally faithful and obeying the demands of the covenant. For we are warned, as Barach tells us, in session #1, “Jesus teaches us some who are in Christ, get cut off and burned, they apostatize and go to hell. Scripture tells us that not all who are in the covenant have been predestined to eternal glory with Christ.”

“What?” I hear you ask, “Hypocrites *and their children* are in the true Vine, in the Covenant?” Yes, say the Monroe Four, that is why you can address the whole church as *God’s chosen ones, the people of God, etc.* We don’t need, and indeed the Bible doesn’t teach, a visible/invisible church distinction. Of course, only the Predestined will end up in glory, but we know nothing of that, those are the secret decreative things of God. Our job is to be concerned with the covenant language of the Bible. That is why Paul could say that his fellow workers were in the book of life (Phi. 4:3)! Not because Paul had some *special* insight into God’s predestining decrees, but because all who are baptized are in the Church, and all who are in the Church are the elect in Christ, they are all part of

the True Vine. Paul did not go above to look into the secret things of God in this regard, we don’t need to either. We may and should rightly use the Bible’s covenantal language in addressing ALL members of the Church as the elect!

And you again ask, “Don’t those united to Christ go to heaven?” No, no! Not necessarily. We have to read those “problematic” passages of the Bible that seem to indicate the reality of apostasy as they are written, not via the easy escape provided by our Systematic theology. The Bible appears to say that those who have “become partakers of the Holy Spirit,” (Heb. 6:4) can slip away *because that is really what it means*. This is not just a hypothetical warning, say the Monroe Four, this is a *real warning* and that is what gives the warning real teeth!

Peter teaches us that “all the members of the church have been born again”, as Steve Wilkins says (Wilkins, session #7). There aren’t different rosters between the visible church and the invisible church, that is an illegitimate distinction, Doug Wilson, makes clear. We have supposedly, traditionally had recourse to the old Invisible/Visible distinction in order to account for the obvious presence of hypocrites in the church. Simon Magus, Hymenaeus, Alexander – they were in the visible church, but not the *invisible church* we have said. These men were professing Christians, but never really converted. But were they not baptized? Were they not part of “The Church our Mother?” Who ever heard of an invisible mother?, quoth Douglas Wilson. It is the new paradigm which offers us the real solution – they really were members of the true Vine, and they really were cut out!

No longer do we need to feel embarrassed when Arminians bring up verses dealing with Apostasy [funny, I never did before] now we *can handle, touch, and taste* Hebrews 6. Imagine the shock on the Arminians face when we answer, yes, members of the Covenant, who have been real partakers of the Holy Spirit can indeed apostatize! “The Hypocrite *is* genuinely in Christ,” says Wilson. Oh, what freedom, and what joy, we should reply. The hypocrite in the church is merely like ivy on the tree, said the Puritans. That understanding is *too provincial* answers the Auburn Theology. The hypocrite is, my friend, indeed part of the tree! If they were not, points out Wilkins, then it would be illogical for them to receive a greater punishment as scripture says they do.

### **Covenant Faithfulness: How Those Really United with Christ Stay in the Covenant**

While we enter into the church by our Baptism, really gaining all the things mentioned above, we do not automatically persevere. Wilkins tells us, “The Church is the body of Christ. If you are in the body of Christ you are in salvation.” (Wilkins, session #7) But he also points out that Paul teaches that, “if they depart from Christ they will sink like Israel of old.” (Ibid.) In fact, he says, Corinthians is “a powerful attack on unfaithfulness.” (ibid.) And, of course, “The covenant

requires faithfulness.” (ibid.) Faithfulness means keeping the obligations of the Covenant, and the obligations are spelled out in the law. That law is of course not “evil or burdensome,” as Schlissel tells us, and Paul, when he speaks against the law, is speaking of Jewish corruptions of the law that make it a system by which we accumulate points with God. These corruptions make the law an illegitimate *meritorious system*.

Keeping the Old and New covenants is *not* impossible, we are taught. We are not meant to get all frustrated at trying to keep laws that are impossible to keep and therefore be driven to Christ. The Covenant has conditions, and those gracious conditions can be non-meritoriously kept by those in the covenant. The Old and New testaments are one book, and the requirements are the same for both. We of course are used to speaking as though there are two different systems of salvation in both books, they say, but in both books its all about Covenant faithfulness.

I hear you ask, “What about Justification by Faith?” Well, Schlissel tells us, when Paul “speaks of Justification by faith, either immediately after or just before or somewhere before he has been talking about Gentiles coming into the covenant.” (Schlissel, session #5) It was therefore ludicrous for *katakōmen* (The GPTS theological magazine) to devote an entire issue to justification that never discussed it in terms of Gentiles being incorporated, except in a quote from N.T. Wright [Schlissel held up the magazine and ridiculed it in front of Joey Pipa at the conference. How Irenic, eh?]. “This is the issue, how can Gentiles be incorporated into the body of Christ without first becoming Jewish? How can we allow them in?” (Ibid.) declared Schlissel. Unless we understand that this is what Justification by faith is referring to, Schlissel tells us, then the meaning of the NT will elude us [hmmm... most of the Pauline epistles talk about the Gentiles coming into the Covenant, most of the epistles talk about Justification by faith. Hey, will you look at that, Schlissel is right! Wait a minute, Paul also never discusses Justification without a greeting either somewhere before, or after it. That must mean that unless we greet Gentiles, we will never understand the New Testament.]

In any event, reflecting on this wonderful new paradigm understanding of Justification by Faith [apparently “Faith Alone” is an outmoded expression – besides “by Faith” allows us to be more ecumenical with our Roman Catholic brethren, since they are baptized members of the Church and therefore presumably members of the True Vine as well] gives us perhaps the most memorable quote of the conference:

“It goes back to Galatians and Romans, and these two letters are said to be containing letters upon which the true church stands or falls. Hooley and Hogwash! If those letters had never been written we’d still have the word of God that saves! The letters were written

into a particular context they were highly charged polemical treatises that were meant to put out a fire, or to prevent a fire at particular locations, and yet when these books are read by modern reformers especially and by Lutherans, inexplicably these polemical pastoral and historical circumstances are simply ignored.” (Steve Schlissel, Session #5)

[Interestingly enough, way back in 1996 when I was just beginning seminary, I had an on-line debate with a Roman Catholic who said *exactly* the same thing when I referenced the *faith alone* passages in Romans and Galatians. Apparently, my old sparring partner was right all along.]

### The New Paradigm

The discussion of whether the new “Covenantal” paradigm was really or necessarily novel was a glorious masterpiece of equivocations and virulent post-modernism. Wilson spoke frequently of the problem of “Paradigm bumper-cars” which prevented their camp from communicating effectively with the older camp. As he described it, those attached to the old understanding got in their car and just bumped into the new one and bounced off.

Perhaps what Wilson was saying, without realizing it, is that there are simply ways in which the new understanding is fundamentally different from the old, and trying to understand the new in terms of the old is like trying to put the new wine into the old skins once again. But, misunderstanding at this point is absolutely inevitable because in stating that the paradigm is genuinely new and in some ways no longer compatible with the old, the speakers got into their own bumper cars and raced around in circles, bumping into each other, and often simply contradicting themselves. Some argued it was indeed new, others old. Wilkins argued that he could hold to the new paradigm and yet still subscribe to everything in the Westminster Confession, maintaining directly after discussing the reality of apostasy and baptismal regeneration that he still affirmed 14.1 and 17.1 in the Confession.<sup>1</sup>

Later still, during the debate, Wilkins stated that to simply say that the Puritan wing of the Reformation was right about these things was “arrogant, and prideful, and schismatic” and insisted that we must listen to the testimony of the entire church over the last 2000 years, not a provincial wing for “300 years”. This of course comes after he has dismissed the testimony of the entire Reformed church for the last 500 years on the issue of Paedocommunion!<sup>2</sup> Barach insisted, citing out-of-context quotes, that his positions were the positions of the early Reformers and the Dutch Reformed, which of course makes Wilhelmus A’Brakel and his ilk non-Dutch [perhaps they were crypto-Lutherans like the rest of us?].

Schlissel argued we'd all been wrong for allowing the Bible, which was essentially a story, to become a book of proof-texts driven by our rigid systematic theology, and that it was Reformed dogmatism. He then explained to us how the new paradigm systematic theology should drive our understanding of Romans and Galatians and gave us a series of proof-texts proving his theology, not ours, was right.

“Holy Mother Church” was exalted by Doug Wilson, and then we were told that strict subscription means that creeds will never be amended by honest men and that somehow Holy Mother church doesn't have a role in determining which understandings are orthodox or heretical. We misunderstand the Puritans because we are affected by the enlightenment, but when the Puritans themselves were quoted, apparently they were wrong because they misunderstood the documents they themselves wrote, which could only be properly interpreted by the Monroe Four because they alone had not been Hellenized, Baptized, Lutherized, or Hannitized.

There was a need for a new paradigm, the speakers declared, because the old paradigm could no longer hold the biblical data, and it was time for a paradigm shift. And yet they could still subscribe without exceptions to the statements of the old when necessary, even when those statements had been *directly contradicted* in their presentations.

Back and forth the Monroe Four went like that until I was reminded of some of the lyrics to my daughter's favorite song from Winnie the Pooh:

They're green they're blue they're pink they're white  
They're round they're square they're a terrible sight  
They tie themselves in horrible knots  
They come in stripes or polka-dots  
Beware Beware Be a very wary bear

### Main Themes: Conclusion

While most of the quotes from the Monroe Four can be fitted into one of the themes above, more could obviously be said. There were other themes that could have been brought out, I have focused purposely on the ones that were most central and problematic in order to give you a flavor of what occurred.

In parts 2 and 3 of this series, I will be focusing on answering the actual assertions of the speakers to show why this new paradigm is neither new, nor biblical, nor reformed, but is in fact yet another version of the *Foolish Galatianism* that is endemic in the church.

### The Response

The purpose of this conference was to examine the views of the original speakers more closely and if possible to hold them up to the light of the Bible and determine if these views were in fact orthodox and compatible with the historic Reformed

faith as it is expressed in the historic confessions. Joey Pipa bravely and unambiguously asserted that the supposedly New Paradigm was in fact Lutheran sacramentology and declared that Steve Wilkins' position was in fact heretical, based on the four points of Dr. Pipa's talk: 1) The Auburn Theology makes the sacraments efficacious apart from faith 2) The Auburn Theology confuses the reality and the sign 3) The Auburn Theology makes the sacraments converting ordinances, not sanctifying and strengthening ordinances and 4) The Auburn Theology teaches that baptism engrafts its recipients into Christ. But later, after learning that the Monroe Four's definition of heresy includes that it is a soul damning offense (whereas Drs. Pipa and Smith defined it as serious doctrinal error at odds with the standards of the church requiring discipline), Dr. Pipa repented of using the original expression and rephrased it, saying that holding to the Auburn Theology was a disciplinable offense. Dr. Smith also stated that the Auburn Theology was on the road to Rome.

As a result of attending this conference, I find that it is time to take the gloves off. We can no longer frame the debate as being intramural, thus implying that the issues to be discussed are of no great import, and certainly nothing that should make us look divided to the fallen world. I believe this would be a fatal error: the issues under discussion are of *paramount importance*. At various points in the conference, the Covenant of Works was unambiguously denied, it was stated that everyone in the church is united to Christ, that hypocrites are part of the true vine, that the invisible/visible Church distinction is invalid, that we become Christians and members of the church by baptism at which time we are regenerated, united to Christ, sanctified, etc. Steve Schlissel even stated unambiguously that the central issue of the new [NT] administration was “Not Justification by faith, God help us. NOT Justification by faith! But the incorporation of the Gentiles.” (Schlissel, Session #5)

At times following these declarations, my blood was boiling. Declarations at odds with *everything* I have been teaching my congregation for the last year, everything I have understood the Bible to teach regarding Baptism, the Church, the *Ordo Salutis*, the Covenants, etc. were made. Such declarations must be responded to and adequately addressed. I am not talking here about *my private opinions* about these things, but rather what I have been taught, what my mentors have professed, and what the Reformed Confessions declare. Time did not permit the respondents to respond fully to all that is entailed in the New Paradigm of the Auburn Theology. Also, the forum was somewhat collegial and not conducive to heated polemics.

The Monroe Four continues to camp out on less perspicuous texts. We must not allow this to be the case in future debates. Instead, we must force them to go to texts where the doctrines in question are more clearly discussed. Allowing a discussion to center on 1 Cor. 10:4, for instance, should

strike anyone as problematic. While even the so-called problematic passages, properly exegeted, do not support their New Paradigm, we should be pressing them to explain how *they* understand clearer texts like 1 John 2:19 and John 6:37, for instance. We would not allow Jehovah's Witnesses or Mormons to get away with this kind of "camping" behavior, and we must not allow the New Paradigm to do so either.

### Appendix: My Thoughts

I wholeheartedly believe that this "new paradigm" is heretical, and as such I would recommend that the various ecclesiastical bodies (if any) which exercise oversight over the men proposing it urge them to repent and return to teaching the orthodox faith once for all delivered to the saints. If they do not, then I sincerely believe that they need to be brought to trial for teaching heresies of the most serious kind.

The New Paradigm teaches people to depend upon their baptism for assurance, threatens those united to Christ with the real possibility of apostasy if they fail to meet the demands of the covenant, and consequently teaches them to look to their own faithful "non-meritorious" works in order to remain in the Covenant of Grace. This encourages unbelief, nominalism, legalism, and is contrary to the Reformational *Solas* and, most importantly, the Scriptures. These gentlemen have been given ample time to clarify their message, and it is abundantly clear that their message really is as unorthodox as it sounds.

In the simplest possible terms, either what I believe about the teaching of Scripture is false and heretical, or what the Monroe Four are teaching is. It is simply not possible that we could both be right when we are teaching things that contradict each other. We may both be wrong but we cannot both be right, and the scriptures cannot simultaneously teach both *A* and *non-A* at the same time in the same way.

The glory of God, the purity of His Church, and the keeping and reclaiming of disobedient sinners demands that either they need to be charged, or I do.

### (Footnotes)

<sup>1</sup> Those sections of the Confession read: "The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word, by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened." (WCF 14.1)

"They, whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called, and sanctified by his Spirit, *can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved.*" (WCF 17.1) [Italics mine]

<sup>2</sup> Calvin, for instance, writes regarding Paedocommunion: "For there, as far as regards baptism, the Lord makes no selection of age, whereas he does not admit all to partake of the Supper, but confines it to those who are fit to discern the body and blood of the Lord, to examine their own conscience, to show forth the Lord's death, and understand its power. Can we wish anything clearer than what the apostle says, when he thus exhorts, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup?" (1 Cor. 11: 28.) Examination, therefore, must precede, and this it were vain to expect from infants. Again, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." If they cannot partake worthily without being able duly to discern the sanctity of the Lord's body, why should we stretch out poison to our young children instead of vivifying food? Then what is our Lord's injunction? "Do this in remembrance of me." And what is the inference which the apostle draws from this? "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." How, pray, can we require infants to commemorate any event of which they have no understanding; how require them to "show forth the Lord's death," of the nature and benefit of which they have no idea?" ... Had these men the least particle of soundness in their brain, would they be thus blind as to a matter so very clear and obvious?" (Institutes, 4.16.30)



Andrew Webb, M.Div. - Organizing Pastor of Providence PCA Mission, Fayetteville, NC. M.Div. Westminster Theological Seminary, PA, 2001; M.A. University of St. Andrews, Fife, Scotland, 1991; Studies at the C.S. Lewis Institute, an extension program of Reformed Theological Seminary.

### A Soldier's Lament

I must away, my country calls. The battle drums are sounding. And I must leave your fair face here, while bitter tears are falling. While my bitter tears are falling.

But worry not, my own true love, my heart shan't lose its beating. For always shall you be so near, e'en when the bombs are bursting. Even when the bombs are bursting.

I shall return to marry you, and make you mine forever. Come bullet's fire or winter's cold, we'll always be together. We'll be always together.

Alas! The shadow takes me now, and here I lay a-dying. And she won't know 'til I am gone, that her only man's a-crying. That her only love is crying.

© 2002, Stephen N. Barnes, Jr. - All Rights Reserved