

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JANUARY, 1929

NO. 1

MUCH-NEEDED SCRIPTURES

Elder Moore, of the Charleston congregation, where they have classes and women teachers in the church, wrote me at the South Charleston congregation, that he would like to give us some badly needed Scriptures, and I wrote him that we were ready any time. So we arranged a debate between him and Evangelist Jas. D. Phillips, which began at South Charleston, Nov. 11, 1928, with a packed house to hear it. He began by saying that he was ashamed of himself for letting the sectarians get ahead of him in this work of class teaching and women teaching and preaching in the church, and that he had opposed this work himself for many years and had been unsettled religiously, but had finally stabilized himself just the last year. He had no Scriptures to sustain his present stand, but simply tried to make out that the Scriptures in these cases about one speaking at a time (1 Cor. 14:31), and the women not to speak (1 Cor. 14:34) are not for us to follow today, and that the elders have liberty to say what shall be done or not done in the church. This seemed to be argument 1.

He then told about a man in Virginia who cried, "My God, not allowed to preach the Gospel. And this was argument 2. And for argument 3, he told a story about a man who had a head like a tar bucket, referring to Bro. Phillips; he just caught everything. And for argument 4, he told about Bro. Phillips being a young man, not even married and no children, therefore he would not notice his arguments. For No. 5, he said the woman had a right to do anything in the church that the elder told her to do—teach, preach, whistle, sing, pray—just so the elder told her to do it. His 6th was that Paul was just writing personal letters to Corinth, and that they applied only to that church. For 7 he said Bro. Phillips was just a school-boy and it was not necessary to notice what he said, and that he, Moore, had taught school and had burned the midnight oil for 35 years in getting an education. (But it was amusing to the congregation to see Bro. Harper call him down and expose the ignorance of his contention, after the debate closed on the use of English. It made him fairly sweat and boil with heat.) For 8, he told about a slop bucket that caught everything that came its way, and just what he meant by this nobody ever knew—it was like the rest, just to fill in his time. For 9, he told about an old horse on a cane-mill sweep that went round and round and got nowhere, but where it proved his classes and women teachers in the church no one could see, but it, too, filled in his time so he could hold out for thirty minutes.

Now, for one, if these are the much needed Scriptures Bro. Moore has to offer to the church at South Charleston, we can well get along without such. But all digressives furnish the same kind of arguments, it seems. As to the Scriptures, he avoided any contact with them as long as he possibly could. Bro. Phillips pressed him in every speech to read 1 Tim. 2:11-14, where Paul gave the reason for the silence of women teachers, but he could not be induced to read it, until about the close of the debate, and then he almost choked in getting over it. And he never did read 1 Cor. 14:31, about one speaking at a time in the church, although he was urged to do so time, and time, and time again by Bro. Phillips. In fact all could see that he avoided the scriptures Bro. Phillips put up to him and ignored them continually. The outsiders plainly saw that he was defeated, and said, "Moore got a skinning for once." If Bro. Moore made one Scriptural argument for his position it was too weak to be seen. It was assertion and assertion, and he seemed to think we should take it for proof because he, Moore, said it. If he ever met one of the arguments advanced by Bro. Phillips, it escaped my notice. I want to give some of the arguments put up by Bro. Phillips later, and I can say to any church that needs a digressive preacher cleaned up on these issues, you do not need to look farther for a man than to Bro. Phillips. He will do the job in first manner. If you do not believe it, ask Bro. Chas. E. Fogle, of St. Marys, Moore's moderator, or G. W. Grayley, who took Fogle's place when Fogle quit and left.

—C. H. Williams.

LOYALTY

Of what does our loyalty to God consist? It appears to me that some of us have a very narrow and limited conception of the term, "loyalty", if we may judge by the common use of the term. With some, a man is loyal if he opposes the use of instrumental music in the worship, even though, he may advocate many other departures from the apostolic order, just as dangerous and sinful. While with others a man is said to be loyal if he opposes the Sunday school, or class system of teaching, and at the same time he may advocate other departures just as far from the truth, or his life may be unclean. Brethren, if this is the meaning of the term, I confess that I know nothing of what it means.

Let us hear James: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Jas. 2:10. And then turn to Heb. 2:2, 3., and hear Paul: "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression

and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." Note, brethren, that it was "every transgression and disobedience that received a just recompense of reward" under the old law. Will God be less strict under the new? Certainly not. How then, shall we escape the eternal vengeance of God if we wilfully refuse or neglect to obey any commandment? It appears to me that it is high time that we awake out of this spiritual slumber, and "put on the whole armor of God." I have never been able to see that we should fight just one sin, or departure, at a time; as some of our brethren contend that we should. I could never see where anything could be gained by fighting the Devil on one point, while we lie supinely upon our backs, and allow him to encroach upon us from the rear or elsewhere. Such a procedure will never get us any where. Some write and act as though the Sunday school is the only sin in the world to-day. Brethren, we have made a splendid fight against this innovation, but other matters just as serious have been woefully neglected.

I hope that I may never settle down on any one thing, riding it as a "hobby", to the exclusion of everything else. I have striven to avoid such a course, but have endeavored to oppose the Devil on every hand, and I expect to continue to do so. I stand for a "thus saith the Lord" in the work and worship of the Church; a clean ministry; a clean Church, and in general, a closer walk with God. Who will help in this great work? May Jesus give us strength and courage to press these great things in our messages and in our lives! I hope to find time to write more in future.

Yours for the whole truth,
Homer L. King

WHO OPPOSES DISCUSSIONS?

"Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."—Jude.

"Debate thy cause with thy neighbor."—Solomon.

"Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil."—Jesus.

"I am so tired and sick at heart over the 'sickly sentimental' religion in the church of the Lord that would hinder—yea, that does hinder—free discussion of matters pertaining to the practice and teaching of the children of God."—J. N. Armstrong.

"Truth ever gains, and error uniformly loses, by discussion."—Alexander Campbell.

Then, who is opposed to discussions? And why do they oppose them? Does not the blame for not having discussions of differences between us rest upon those who "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil"?

Why do the advocates of instrumental music in the worship refuse to debate it? Yes, why? And why do the advocates of the Sunday School refuse to debate it? Yes, why? And why do the advocates of the Boll theory refuse to debate it?

Yes, why? And why do the advocates of sect baptism refuse to debate it? Yes, why? And why do the advocates of the cups (plural) refuse to debate the issue? Yes, why? Is it because they know that it will be a losing proposition for their false doctrine? I think so.

"But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts; and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:

"Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your conversation in Christ." (1 Pet. 3:15, 16).

As J. N. Cowan says,

"Yours for more investigations,"

Jas. D. Phillips,

439 N. Drury Ave.,
Kansas City, Mo.

REMARKS

Yes, let us open the Bible, and examine ourselves whether we are in the faith. 2 Cor. 13:5.

There seems to be no more prospect now for a debate with Cowan on the cups than there was in 1925, when we signed his proposition. He says he is not ready for a written debate with Trott or Harper now; and he seems to be at a loss whether to sign an agreement stipulating time and place for oral debate. He now says he can not debate where the church will not invite him. But when I was in a meeting last August at Graham, Texas, he made a great flourish for a debate with me there, and that, too, without the consent of the church. But he played safe, and sent a bogus proposition. I wrote him that it was a "mess of nonsense, and asked him what he meant. He made no reply until I got home in Florida, and then wrote that he meant it for the one we had signed, and tried to make it appear that I was running from him. He next proposed to have it in Elk City, Okla., and that, too, without consulting the church there. I accepted this, provided he would repeat it with me at Holdenville, Okla. He said he did not know whether they wanted it at Holdenville, but he could write and see. It seems he got no reply or a negative one, for he dropped this. He then asked me to meet him at Mickey, Texas, and that, too, without asking the church there. This I accepted on the condition that he repeat it with me at Floydada, Texas, and drew up and signed the following agreement and sent it to him. He then wrote me that he could not go to Floydada without the consent of the church there and would not sign it. And this ended the matter.

Charleston, W. Va., Nov. 12, 1928.

J. N. Cowan, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dear Brother Cowan:

Yours of the 7th instant is at hand. If we debate at Mickey, Texas, where they use one cup, and you are allowed to go there with it, justice demands that I select a place where they use a plurality of cups, and I have drawn up the agreement accordingly. If you are willing to deny my teaching and practice, I am willing to affirm it, but if your correspondence with me expresses

your mind, you admit my practice to be scriptural. However, if you wish to deny it, I shall affirm it with you at the same place and under the same conditions that you affirm yours, the discussion to immediately follow your proposition.

AGREEMENT.—It is hereby agreed by and between J. N. Cowan and H. C. Harper: (1). That we will discuss the following proposition at Mickey, Texas, namely, "The cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27, and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same.

J. N. Cowan, affirms, and H. C. Harper, denies.

(2). That there shall be four sessions of two hours each and each session shall consist of four speeches of not more than thirty minutes each; and no new argument shall be introduced in a final speech.

(3). The discussion shall begin at Mickey, Texas, on the first Monday in June, 1929, and at Floydada, Texas, on the following day after the close of the Mickey discussion unless Cowan asks Harper to follow on a proposition, affirming his faith, and practice immediately for four sessions; in which case they shall begin at Floydada, Texas, at the close of Harper's affirmative, in the same order.

(4). The sessions shall begin at 10 A. M. and at 2:30 P. M.

(5). Each shall choose a moderator, and these may, if they wish, choose a Chairman moderator; and these shall exercise the duties of such moderators.

-----, H. C. Harper.

NOTE:

Do the cups brethren want the truth? Are they as much afraid of an investigation as are the Sunday School brethren? I will now make this offer. Cowan says he can furnish as many places for the discussion as I can. Then let him start out on places where they use cups, since it is up to him to lead, and I will follow with places where they use one cup. And let us get the dates fixed. —Ed.

THANKS, BROTHER FOGLE

Elizabeth, W. Va.
Nov. 26, '28.

Dear Brother Phillips:

Many thanks for your good, brotherly letter of recent date.

Am glad that our association was a pleasure to you and assure you that it was a joy to me and glad that I was favorably impressed with your courteous conduct.

I believe that debates between our brethren should be in written discussion rather than orally.

Let us at all times endeavor to narrow the breach rather than widen it.

I wish you every good blessing.

Your brother,
Chas. E. Fogle.

Brother Fogle was Brother Moore's moderator during our debate at Charleston. I was glad to learn that he was favorably impressed with me,

and I assure our readers that Bro. Harper and I were favorably impressed with him.

I am glad Bro. Fogle thinks debates ought to be in written form.—This would give all a chance to read them. But am sorry that the Christian Leader, of which Bro. Moore is editor, refuses to publish such discussions. Brother Harper challenged Bro. Moore to debate with him, on the same propositions we debated at Charleston, and publish it in the Christian Leader and "The Truth", but Bro. Moore refused. So the Leader staff is a bunch of religious cowards, as all can see.

If we could have a debate at every place in W. Va. where trouble has come over the Sunday School, and then get the Christian Leader to open its columns for a written debate on this question, I am sure much of the contention now going on would soon cease.

I want it understood that I am ready to meet any man the Sunday School advocates are willing to put up in debate.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

Remarks

Ira C. Moore bemeaned Bro. Phillips in their debate for calling the thing they have at Virginia Street church a Sunday School; but when R. H. Boll, in the Leader of Oct. 9, 1928, says of Lipscomb's lessons that appear weekly in that paper, "A. B. Lipscomb's Sunday School lessons are exceptionally good always," Rowe says, "Thank You." But they are not hypocrites—they just try to hide the truth, because they fear they cannot deceive the brethren when the truth is known.

"The attendance at Sunday School and other appointments of the church increased." "Overseers, W. M. Lock, Chas. G. Traux, J. H. Sturgeon" in "An Announcement From Washington, D. C.," in Christian Leader of Nov. 6, 1928.

Still they do not want us to say they have a Sunday School. What will the devil do with such Christians when he gets them in hell? Yes, there's where they are going—the Book says so. Mt. 7:23.

"He makes out his case by dubbing such work 'a Sunday School.'"—Ira C. Moore, C. L., Nov. 6, 1928. Then his case will stand, for that is what it is, taking the children, who have no better sense than to tell the truth about it and the testimony of writers in the Leader. There is no escape for you. What will you call it at the judgment? You can not deceive the Lord.

Chas. F. Reese, Yuma, Ariz.—Bro. Musgrave has just closed his work in and around Yuma, and his preaching has been the best ever heard in these parts. Large crowds attended all the time: Three baptisms here and one confessed faults. He is to return next year for another siege of the forces of Satan. Thank God for this brave soldier of the cross of Christ.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER, Publisher

Entered as second class matter January 6, 1928, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year	\$1.00
Six Months	.50
Three Months	.25



LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

"HOW IS THIS" REVIEWED Review

Dr. Trott offers the following review:

1. Jesus sent Peter and John ahead to prepare the Passover supper. Therefore everything pertaining to the institution of the Lord's supper was prepared beforehand. The fruit of the vine was already in the cup from which all the disciples drank, before the supper was instituted. It was neither poured into another cup nor is there any evidence that there was another empty cup on the table into which it might be poured. They drank from the cup prepared and for which the Lord gave thanks, hence to follow his example we should do likewise. To say that we may pour it out into other cups is only an assertion without proof.

2. Another assumption is that the container is only used by metonymy for its contents—easy to assert, but utterly lacking proof.

3. Moreover metonymy gives no right to change from singular to plural and substitute cups for "cup."

4. The New Testament is the only source from which we may derive the benefits of the blood of Christ and therefore is fitly symbolized by the cup from which we drink. Luke 22:20.

5. According to Bro. Cowan's peculiar logic, the meeting of the brethren on the first day of the week may be regarded merely as a precedent not binding upon us as there is no command to do so. This shows the flaw in his reasoning, miscalling incidentals precedents and trying to make them synonymous.

6. Bro. Cowan's trouble is in not being able to properly define his words. Everything connected with the communion service is a precedent (example) for us to follow and equivalent to a command. The things not included in the actual performance of our obedience, such as clothing worn, the place chosen, number present, etc., are incidentals and not precedents.

7. We all agree that there should be but one bread, but a plurality of cups necessarily calls for an equal number of breads. The bread may be broken into a thousand pieces, but as long as it is kept together in one container it represents the whole body of Christ. You may cut up the whole human body and as long as it remains together it is the one body of the one dissected, but remove

one finger to another place or receptacle and each is a part of the body. Therefore the plurality of cups causes the communicant to partake of the part of the body handed to him, while another eats from another part handed to him.

Remarks

Brother Trott Says: "I have not referred to the more obvious points which have been brought out time and again." But enough has here been presented to show the futile efforts of any one who advocates the cups.

THE ISSUE

I believe, teach, and practice one cup in observing the communion. When Christ instituted the supper and observed it with his disciples here before he left to be with the Father again. He set the example to govern his disciples. And Paul received the same example to deliver to the churches, as we have it in the eleventh chapter of 1st Corinthians. So this is the divine way for the observance. And for man to change this WAY is sinful.

Now for the purpose—the WHY: "Do this in remembrance of me," said Christ. Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. Christ was shamefully betrayed by Judas and forsaken by his disciples, mocked and derided in his trial, suffered the agonies of the garden, and eked out his life for three awful hours in painful suffering on the cruel cross. And now says, "Do this in memory of me." O, what a purpose.

Now if a person has right to change the WAY, I have right to change the purpose, and vice versa. If not, why not? But I hear that some "real preachers" say the Lord did not have in mind the cup, container. Paul said we have the mind of Christ: 1 Cor. 2:16. And if Christ has in mind what he says in the Bible, I know his mind, unless he has changed it. But if his mind has changed from cup to cups, the Bible does not say anything about it. Has there been a change of Christ's mind to cups, containers. It sounds odd to me to see such men as Bro. Duckworth writing about the cup container, but I guess he knows what the Lord had in mind but failed to say.

And here is another funny thing to me—that an honest man will practice a thing and then not want to defend it.

Those preachers that PRACTICE the use of "two or more cups" do not want to defend their practice. They want to juggle over what "the cup" is. I practice one cup, and I will defend one cup. They practice "two or more cups." I will deny the practice. Then why not take up the issue? If I would practice "two or more cups," I would be all right with them. This shows plainly what the issue is, namely; the number of cups.

They do not want to deny my practice, nor do they want to defend theirs. What is the matter with them? I can read my practice in the Book—cup, not cups. God said, "Seek ye out of the Book of the Lord and read; no one shall fail." Isa. 34:16. And John says, "He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true." Jno. 3:33. And Paul says, "Yea, let God be true but every man a liar." Rom. 3:4. I am in

doubt of any practice in the worship of God that can't be read from the Book of God. I am ready to meet the issue.

—Bob Musgrave.

Remarks

Yes, this is the issue, and Cowan, in our correspondence, admitted my practice and would not defend his with me. But he wiggled around to what "the cup" is, and signed his name and said he would affirm that "The cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27, and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same; as though he thought cup might be the name of a liquid. Thayer says, "Pino ek (drink out of) with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks, ek tou poterion (out of the cup), Mt. 26:27." P. 510. And on P. 533 he says cup is used properly, or literally, in this verse. And he is backed by the scholarship of the world.—Harvard, Yale, Chicago University, etc.

So if anything linguistic can be settled, this is settled. —Ed.

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

PROPOSITIONS: "The first day of the week is the Lord's day, the day upon which Christians are required by the Lord to meet for worship."

Jas. D. Phillips, Affirms
Albert S. Hodges, Denies

Third Affirmative

In my first affirmative, I proved my proposition. Mr. Hodges has not met any of my arguments—not one!

Of course the tomb was empty when the women came to it. Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week. Mark says, "Now, when Jesus was risen early on the first day of the week," thus showing that it was not on the Sabbath, as Mr. Hodges would have you believe. See here: "mia sabbatoon, the first day of the week, Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1,2."—Thayer. This shows that His resurrection was on the first day of the week. And there is no need of fighting the plain truth about this matter. Better just "fess up" and quit trying to prove that which is contrary to plain statements of the Bible.

He says "Greek scholars gave us our present versions of the Scripture, and they made it plain that at each visit at the tomb it was empty." Yes, and "they made it plain" that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week, too; for the Book expressly tells us so. Can he beat what the Bible says about it? I think not.

He wants me to "come on with my proof that "type" and "anti-type" are Bible terms. Well, I have already shown that any good Lexicon will show that we have in the Greek, tupos, type, and anti-tupos, anti-type. Did he answer this? No! Read this: "In the anti-type" (1 Pet. 3:21 Marg.)

He criticises me for following the example of the disciples in Acts 20:7, giving as his reason that "they did many unwise things." Well, Paul tell us, "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, . . . but exhorting one another, and so much the more as you see the day drawing nigh" (Heb. 10:25). What day is "the day" here? "Upon the first day of the week, when

the disciples came together to break bread" (Acts 20:7). "Upon the first day of the week, when you come together" (1 Cor. 16:2). Hence, "the day" is the first day of the week. I am sure Mr. Hodges won't say that Paul made a mistake in assembling with the Troas disciples. Paul says, "Those things, which you have both learned, and received; and heard, and seen in me, do." (Phil. 4:8). He commanded us to assemble (Heb. 10:25). He showed us that "the day" upon which we are to assemble is "the first day of the week" (Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2). Hence, we must assemble "upon the first day of the week."

Mr. Hodges, in closing his first negative, said that the keeping of the first day of the week is of Catholic origin, and that the Pope was the author of it. Can he prove this? No, for there is no proof!

The following authors used the term, "the Lord's day", in speaking of the first day of the week, in the Second Century. I could give the quotations, but haven't the space. So I simply give the names of the authors, the date of writing, and reference to the works in which the use of the term is found:

Pliny, 104 A. D. (Pliny's Letters, b. 10, epis. 97)

Barnabas, 120 A. D. (Barnabas, 13:9, 10).

Justin Martyr, 140 A. D. ("First Apology", page 127).

Clement, 194 A. D. ("History of the Sabbath", Old Edit., p 222)

Tertullian, 200 A. D. ("Apology," Chap. 16).

Can Mr. Hodges find a history that will refute what these men have said? Can he show that they were followers of the "Pope?" and had the "Mark of the Beast"? He can not. The first Pope did not exist before the Fourth Century, at the earliest. Hence, the "Lord's day" (first day of the week) is not of Papal origin, as Mr. Hodges declares.

I now insist that Mr. Hodges meet my arguments or admit that he can not do it. Please re-read my first affirmative and see the overwhelming evidence that I gave in support of my proposition. And read all his replies and see if he has successfully met any of my arguments.

—Jas. D. Phillips,
439 N. Drury, K. C. Mo.

Third Negative

My opponent admits the tomb was empty at each visit of the disciples. The first of these visits being "in the end of the Sabbath." The Sabbath began at Friday at sunset and ended at sunset on what is commonly called Saturday. Whenever it is proven and admitted that the tomb was empty before the first day began, this annuls any claim that Jesus arose on that day. My opponent's sole claim for calling the first day "Lord's Day" is based on the allegation that Jesus arose from the dead on that day, and when he admits, as he does, that the tomb was EMPTY at each visit this virtually annuls his proposition. I am not disputing that early Christians called it "Lord's Day" for they did many things without authority, but there is no record in any Gospel or Epistle requiring a meeting on that day for WORSHIP.

"Now when Jesus was risen" is PAST TENSE, and I will leave it to any unbiased scholar. Where is the text "required by the Lord" for any meeting for "worship" on the first day of the week. Brother Phillips cites to 1 Cor. 16:2, as a text to support "Lord's Day" worship. Well, let's examine it closely. Not one word in this text about breaking bread" or worship, or the Lord's Supper. I am patiently waiting for one text to be shown where Christians were "required" by the Lord to meet for worship on the first day of the week. Every meeting on the first of the week was purely voluntary and no command was attached to it, as before stated it was a meeting for "collections" and business and not called for worship, although it was perfectly proper and right to worship God on all days of the week, as we do at camp and business meetings generally.

The early followers of Christ were just human and had their faults and imperfections. It is a trait of humanity to err and take custom or legend and defy and build up great organizations as we see them all over the world today, and the early Christians were no exception. The very name Christian is applied to followers of Christ just like followers of Alexander Campbell are called "Campbellites." I am still waiting for one text in the authorized or King James Bible where the word "type" or "anti-type" occurs. Can't some of our readers send it in? And to just to provoke study and interest in this question, the Negative side offers a five dollar Bible for every text where "type" or "anti-type" occurs, also one text where the first day of the week is called "Lord's Day," or where disciples were "required" to meet on that day for worship. Dr. Mosheim (Ecclesiastical History 2nd Century, Chapter 5) says, "When this Emperor (Hadrian) had at length, razed Jerusalem and entirely destroyed even its very foundations and enacted laws of the severest kind against the whole body of the Jewish people, the greater part of the Christians who lived in Palestine, to prevent their being confounded with the Jews abandoned entirely the Mosaic rites (Laws) and chose a bishop named Mark by nation and consequently an alien from the commonwealth of Israel."

"Up to that date the Christians READ IN THEIR CHURCHES THE JEWISH BIBLE ONLY AND EXCLUSIVELY. One of the edicts of Hadrian prohibited under penalty of death, to possess, read, expound, or teach the Jewish Bible, especially the Pentateuch. So the Christians had no Scriptures to read in their churches. Therefore Mark was obliged to write a gospel to be read in the Churches in lieu of the Bible."—Dr. Isaac Wise.

You can easily see WHY more is not said about the Laws of God. These Gospels contain ample testimony to confirm the Law.—Math. 5:18; Mark 7:13.

ALBERT S. HODGES

Orlando, Florida.

NOTE:—So many have written me about this debate that I feel a word of explanation is due those who are interested in it. Mr. Hodges has never replied to my last affirmative in time to ap-

pear in the Dec. issue of "The Truth." I hope, however, that he will reply more promptly and that we may go on with the discussion, as the issues between us are vital.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

HONEST CONFESSION

It is said that an honest confession is good for the soul. Hence the following article from the F. F. of July 30, 1928, must bring relief to Bro. Dunn, and consolation to those who have opposed the Sunday School, which can not function without "classes," and without "classrooms" to the church, as it now appears. There is no "Bible argument" for this practice you see.

Now carry the news to Warlick, to Tant, to Taylor, to Lawrence, to Whitt, to Sommer, to Cameron, to Young, to Sanders, to Arceneaux, and all. Per Dunn, they have never advanced one "Bible argument" for it.

This is true, and no one knows this better than Showalter and Nichol. And all can now see why S. refused to meet us in the F.F. and Nichol on the Rostrum. There is no "Bible argument" for it.

But like the Digressives No. 2, they say, neither is there a "Bible argument" against it. But in this they are mistaken, as were the old Digressives. The Savior's prayer is against it, John 17. The teaching of Paul is against it, 1 Cor. 1:10; 1 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 4:1-15; 2 Jno. 9; Matt. 28:20.

Now read it.

THE DEPARTED

Miss Maxine Marie Alton, daughter of Ben F. and Mary Alton, was born Sept. 5, 1912, and died Nov. 8, 1928, aged sixteen years, two months, and three days. She had been in poor health all of her life, but held up bravely until the last two months.

She leaves to mourn her loss, her father and mother; two brothers, Eugene and Hubert; two sisters, Helen and Jane; and uncles, aunts and cousins, and a host of other relatives and friends. Funeral services were conducted at Pleasant Grove church of Christ, near Lyons, Indiana, by Bro. James Douglas Phillips.—Lucile Abram.

TRUTH FUND

Bro. Hayeslett, Charleston, W. Va. _____\$1.00
Bro. Hogland, Melrose, N. M. _____\$1.00

J. C. Falkner, Wesley, Ark.—I am favorably impressed with the paper. I am glad to see so many of our strongest writers taking up the fight for the Bible as it is written. As long as the paper is furnished with such copy as you have in the last issue, I could not hope to make it better. If you need me, I am at your service.

J. B. Daniel, Hatch, New Mex.—I here send my subscription for "The Truth." I admire the stand you are taking. The _____ seems to me to be getting off.

THE CHARLESTON DEBATE

There was a public, oral debate held at Charleston, W. Va., between Ira C. Moore, editor of the *Christian Leader*, and Jas. D. Phillips, of Kansas City, Mo., Nov. 11-15, 1928, on the Sunday School question.

Moore's Proposition

Brother Moore affirmed the following proposition: "The Scriptures teach that the properly constituted Elders of a congregation of the Church of Christ are the properly constituted overseers of the congregation and its work of teaching all the teachable ones they can reach, and as such have a Scriptural right and are under obligation to do all they can to disseminate a knowledge of God's word in their community, even to having an extra Sunday meeting before or after the regular worship period, and in said study have the privilege of dividing those present into groups or classes and placing such teachers, including female teachers, over them as in their judgment will bring the best results."

There was no controversy between Brother Moore and me on the Elder's duties, except this "extra Sunday meeting." I have no objection to having as many Scriptural meetings on Sunday as the Elders may see fit to have. But I denied (and still deny) that the Elders have a right to go beyond "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6) by "dividing those present into groups or classes" and "placing female teachers over them."

Arguments

Brother Moore opened the debate by saying, "I am in no way responsible for this debate." I showed that he was responsible for the debate, for it is his doctrine and practice that is called in question and that divided the church in Charleston. He was the one that put in the Sunday School. He is the one that is responsible for the division. Hence, he is responsible for the debate.

He then made a fine talk on the qualifications of the Elders, which I endorsed. But in his same talk, he said, "Christ said, 'Go teach'. 'Teach is a generic term. Elders are the overseers of the church. The words 'Elders', 'Bishops', 'Overseers', etc., imply that they have a right to devise ways of teaching.

He then made his strongest argument on the class system, by quoting, "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost" and said, "Here is a lesson on economy." He then quoted Paul: "Redeeming the time, for the days are evil." And he said, "Redeeming the time" means, make good use of the time. Classes save time. Therefore we may have classes."

I showed that classes were not in the term, "teach"—that we can teach without classes and the Apostles did teach all assemblies taught by them without classes.

Brother Moore says, "It is all in the method of teaching." But I showed that organizing classes was not a method of teaching. He denied that they had organized classes. But I showed by Webster that to "organize" a thing meant to

"arrange it in parts for systematic work." This is exactly what was done when they arranged their classes, with both men and women teachers; a certain teacher over each class; a regular and pre-arranged program; a regular time and place of meeting, etc. Hence, they have a separate organization from the church—an extra body, you see.

Brother Moore told us how they conducted their Lord's day services. He said they met at a certain time, divided into classes, and had two women to teach that many groups, while he taught one. "But after that is over," he said, "We begin our regular worship by singing a song, after which a lesson is read, some one preaches, then we make our contributions, partake of the Lord's supper, pray, sing another song and dismiss." He was careful to tell us that they had neither classes nor women teachers when they came together for the "regular worship."

But his contention was that they could have the class system of teaching at any time before or after the "regular worship period." Thus, he seemed to think they could detour around the Lord by having a meeting He did not authorize.

But I asked him, "If we may divide an assembly of the church into classes and have women teachers over some of the classes at 10:00 o'clock, where is the Scripture that forbids the same assembly, under the same Elders, being divided into classes at 11:00 o'clock? And if it is wrong to divide the assembly at 11:00, why is it right to divide the same assembly at 10:00? And I pressed him on this for three nights before he would answer me. Seeing that he would have to make some kind of a reply, he said, "I never did say it was wrong to divide the assembly into classes and use women teachers during the regular worship period." So he now has the *Gospel Advocate*, the *Firm Foundation*, the *Apostolic Review*, and I may add, most, if not all, the other editors of his own paper, the *Christian Leader*, against him.

Here is his dodge on 1 Cor. 14:31: "The ones told to teach 'one by one' were inspired men. We have no inspired men now. Hence that language does not apply to us." But I showed from Berry's *Lexicon* that the word "prophet" does not always mean an inspired man, or a foreteller of future events, as Bro. Moore contended, but it sometimes means "one who expounds sacred oracles." In fact, Berry says, this is the primary definition. I showed that the reason they were to teach "one by one" was to avoid confusion in the assembly, "for God is not the author of confusion." Two uninspired men will cause as much confusion by both speaking at the same time as two inspired men will.

Here is his dodge on 1 Cor. 14:35 "Those women had no N. T. They had no spiritual gifts. The spiritual gifts were not bestowed upon the sisters. This is the reason they were commanded to keep silence in the church." But I showed that he was wrong, since Philip's virgin daughters did prophesy. And that Priscilla taught Apollos "the way of the Lord more perfectly." They must have had spiritual gifts. They be-

longed to a congregation somewhere, evidently. Paul says, "As in all churches of the saints, let your women keep silent in the churches." Therefore, the reason they were to keep silence was not because of a lack of spiritual gifts; but as Paul said, "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach; nor to usurp authority over a man. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Eve being deceived was in the transgression." 1 Tim. 2:11-15. From this I showed that either Bro. Moore or God was wrong. And I asked the audience whom they were going to believe—Moore or God.

We shall have more to say about the woman questions in some "hot-shots" we are going to hand to Bro. Moore thru "The Truth," later.

And I shall report my affirmative with Bro. Moore's reply in the next issue of "The Truth." Watch for it.

—Jas. D. Phillips,
439 N. Drury Ave.,
Kansas City, Mo.

NEWS AND NOTES

J. D. Perkins, Lomata, Texas.—Enclosed find five subs. As long as you contend for the word of Christ I will help you all I can. God bless you.

O. McIntyre, Huntington, W. Va.—After closing his debate with Ire C. Moore, of the Christian Leader, at Charleston, Bro. Jas. D. Phillips came to Huntington, and preached for us a week. Bro. Phillips is but twenty-four years old, but he preaches the word with power; and the faithful ones here were greatly strengthened and encouraged to press on in the work of the Lord. We have had our church troubles here as they have had at many other places since the antichrist has come among the churches of Christ. The congregation here was recently divided by those who wanted innovations pulling off and leaving the congregation. They purchased a building site and said they were going to build a modern house. This means one with classrooms, and a parsonage for their pastor, and make arrangements for all the modern "appendages." They carried off the songbooks, seats, and the stand. We then furnished the house ourselves. They then got a court order, restraining us from entering our house, and all our equipment was locked in. We now meet in private homes. Bro. Phillips is the first preacher that came to our assistance, and we now feel much encouraged.

Oswald S. Hodges, Harptree, Sask., Canada.—I have read a few copies of "The Truth", and I am enclosing money order for it regularly. I am glad it is to be published twice a month. I wish you success in all your undertakings in the spirit of Christ.

Jas Douglas Phillips, Lyons, Ind.—Bro. Homer L. King is in a good meeting near Lyons. He recently closed a fine meeting at Sullivan, Indiana. I go from here to Kansas City, Mo., for a little rest.

J. F. Haston, Direct, Texas.—Please send me subscription price of "The Truth." I will subscribe and help you.

Geo. A. Moore, Lexington, Neb.—I would like a copy of "The Truth," and addresses in Kans. and Neb.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—Am sorry that my debate on the cups with Wiggs was knocked in the head by the Way refusing to publish it as he had agreed with me it would. Somebody is surely wrong and if the brethren are studying the question and need teaching on it, I can not understand why they refuse to have the light turned on.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Dec. 12.—From my meeting near Montazuma, Iowa, I went via home to Sullivan, Ind. This place was the battleground of the Cowan-Sommer debate. The church there is gathering strength continually, while the Sommer faction that left them to have the Sunday School are losing ground. My meeting there continued over three Lord's days, and closed Nov. 25, with two baptisms, one restored, and three placed membership. I then began at a place near Lyons, Ind., and continued over two Lord's days. The church seemed to be greatly strengthened. Bro. Jas. D. Phillips was with me during most of this meeting and assisted greatly in the work. We then moved on to Herrodsburg, Ind., where we preached alternately. We have work planned for the South and West next year, and brethren are requested to write us in time to hold meetings. Homer L. King, Rout 2, Lebanon, Mo., or Jas. D. Phillips, 439 Drewry Ave., Kansas City, Mo.

G. W. Terry, Charleston, W. Va.—On Dec. 14 I came to South Charleston, where the Phillips-Moore debate was recently held, and was with the brethren over Lord's day, and an enjoyable time it was for all. The church there is doing fine. The attendance has increased fully 40 percent since the debate and the contributions have increased accordingly. It looked bad for Moore the champion debater of many contests to have to back out on the written debate with Bro. Harper, and it also looked bad to those who have read his report in the Leader to see him snarl and misrepresent as to the stuff he put up for arguments for the classes in the church and woman teachers, when he really admitted in trying to argue for them in the church that they may be in the "regular worship" as well as before or after it. Now let him come clean, and debate it with the Leader staff. I hope he meets the challenge of Bro. Phillips at Huntington, W. Va. Dare the church there that has the classes permit Moore to defend them?

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.—I note what Bro. Reese said, and I stand strictly for the one cup, as Dr. Trott has said of himself, and I am ready to meet the opposition with an open Bible and defend the truth of God. The Book says "cup," not cups, as man does.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JANUARY 15, 1929

NO. 2

TAKE YOUR STAND

The Lord is now calling His people out of false religion, saying, "Come out of Babylon, my people, that you have no fellowship with her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues" (Rev. 18:4), and it is high time we were obeying the call, for "The business of the King demands haste."

All who really love the Lord and are His disciples indeed will heed the call and come out of Babylon immediately, for the "Chief Shepherd" (Christ) says, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me" (John 10:27). Are you a disciple indeed?

What has become of that religious body known as Disciples of Christ that flourished in this country a hundred years ago? Where is it? Why is L. Davenport, who calls himself a "Buckeye Catholic," asking, "What has become of the old-time Campbell-ite preacher? Is it not because we have so defiled ourselves with the garments of 'Mystery Babylon' that we have almost lost our New Testament identity? I think so.

From Josh. 7 we learn that when Israel, the type of the church of Christ, were fighting their enemies at Ai, they began to lose and their enemies to gain; and Joshua fell down and prayed to God about the matter. And God said to him, "Get up. There is sin in the camp!" And He told Joshua to examine every Israelite until he found the guilty man. So Joshua had Israel to pass before him until Achan came. "And Joshua said unto Achan, My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him; and tell me now what thou hast done; and hide nothing from me. And Achan answered Joshua and said, . . . When I saw among the spoils a goodly Babylonish garment, . . . I coveted them, and took them." And he confessed, "I have sinned." And Israel took Achan, and stoned him to death, according as the Lord had said unto them. Thus they cleansed themselves of the "sin in the camp." And they prospered. Israel always prospered while they walked in the Lord's way, but in their own way they failed.

Now, the churches of Christ are in Babylon to some extent. True, indeed, all of them have come out of Babylon to some extent, but most, if not all of them, have some of her garments with them yet.—Instrumental music in the worship; the societies, the pastor, the cups, the classes, etc., are all Babylonish garments because they have been borrowed by our people from the sects.

In Rev. 17:1-5 John describes an abominable religious institution, which he calls, "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and of the Abominations of the Earth." And it is ever apparent to "the mind that hath wisdom" (Rev.

17:10) that this great harlot is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy; and the daughters of her are the Protestant churches who have borrowed most of their doctrines from her. And since the churches of Christ have borrowed a lot of Babylonish garments from them, thus causing sin to be in "the camp of the saints" (Rev. 20:9), she must discard all these things, and thus come out of Babylon.

Just now "The Truth", which is published in the interest of a completion of the restoration of Primitive Christianity, needs and deserves the support of every true disciple of Christ, for it is making a plea for a restoration of Apostolic Christianity, in name, in doctrine, and in spirit. And there are many who would like to stand and work with us, but they are afraid they will lose their prestige with other papers and some of the churches if they do, so they continue to fellowship those who have "the mark of the Beast" (Rev. 13) and wear their Babylonish garments.

But it is high time we were cleansing the church of this sin so that we may the sooner complete the restoration begun by A. Campbell a century ago. (Dan. 8:13,14).

"Babel's garments we've rejected,
And her fellowship know no more."

Have you the courage to stand by your convictions? Then take your stand with us. Show your colors.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

"REPLY TO A CRITIC"

Under the above caption J. C. Roady, of the "Review Family", tried to reply to some things I said in the June issue of The Truth about his book, "What the Church of Christ Believes and Teaches and Why It Teaches It." His article appeared in the July 31 No. of the Apostolic Review.

I made a number of quotations from his book and then showed that they flatly condemned many things practiced by the "Review Family" of which Brother Roady is a member. Brother Roady got all "wrought up" about it and, seeing that he could not meet the arguments I made, turned his attention to the Review and boosted it and ridiculed The Truth and me. This was evidently to make a bigger "hit" with the Review. "The Review has a "You work for me and I will work for you" policy, so if I work for them, I will get me a big name among their readers, you see."

In that book, Brother John said, "I was convinced that the church of Christ has a 'Thus saith the Lord' for what she does." I replied:

"It is evident that the 'Review Family' is not included in our good brother's 'Church of Christ', for it hasn't any 'Thus saith the Lord' for its

Evangelistic Assumption, Sect Baptism, Classes, Women Teachers, Bible Drills, Young Peoples' Meetings, and Pastorates held by A. W. Harvey and L. N. Raines at Bloomington, Indiana."

Brother John quoted this paragraph in full, but not until after he had said enough about me to bias the minds of the Review readers against me and what I said. He said: "I can expect such as this from him, for he is a real hobby-rider." This is false. Then he says, "And he is wanting to get others on with him." Yes, brother, I am "wanting to get others" to "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein" (Jer. 6:16). And I thank God that I am successful, too. I am glad, too, that my success, as well as that of others, is hurting you so much that you are fighting our work here in the North; for "Every kick" from you "is a boost", as Brother Teurman was wont to say. Brother John then says, "Even at that, he will want to be in front." This is false. I have never tried to be "in front."

He says, "James, who told you that the Review taught 'Evangelistic Assumption'?" Here is my evidence: When "trouble" arises in the Church where the Review has any influence, an "Evangelist", who has the full indorsement of the Review is sent for. For example, read the tracts the Review put out about the trouble at Long Beach, Calif. Here you will find a case of it. And D. A. Sommer (God bless him), son of Daniel Sommer, and brother of Chester (the Review's main man), said, in criticising the work of A. R. Kepple (of the Review) and his work in Kansas City, "I guess this is the 'evangelistic assumption' Morris talks so much about".—Macedonian Call, for July, 1928. "Send for an evangelist and let him settle it," is a common saying among the Review people.

He wants me to "tell my readers what 'sect baptism' is." To find out what 'sect baptism' is, we will have to first find out what Scriptural baptism is. It is immersion (John 3:5). Anything different, then, is "sect baptism". It is "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). Baptism for anything else is, therefore, "sect baptism". But what does for in Acts 2:38 mean? It is from the Greek eis, meaning unto, with a view to, in order to. Baptists, as well as most other sects, teach that baptism "is an outward sign of inward life" and that its design is "because of (not in order to) the remission of sins." This is sect baptism. But Brother Roady wants to know when the Review ever indorsed "sect baptism". See here, John: "Just returned from a mission meeting . . .

baptized one. I could take in lots of folks if I would argue with them that their sect baptism would do, but I can't do that", quoth C. C. Thompson in 'Christian Leader' . . . Don't be an extremist."—Apostolic Review, July 31, 1928. And does not Daniel Sommer say that Baptists "have obeyed the right doctrine, but joined the wrong church"? He does. And you know it, too.

He wants to know who told me "that Raines and Harvey are pastors at Bloomington." Well, brother, when a man hires to a church to preach for it all the time, he is a pastor, is he not? And is D. A. Sommer not fighting the pastor system

among the Review people? He is. And doesn't he criticise "an Indiana preacher" for being a pastor? He does. And doesn't he say he fears this pastor system "is paving the way for another Christian Church"? He does. And does he not criticise the editor of Office Notes, in the Review, for trying to "discourage the sacrificing gospel preacher" and to encourage the more gifted ones to edify the church? He does. And does he not say this violates one of the Review's principles that has stood for fifty years? He does. And didn't he say he would not "be the author of that Note for \$10,000.00"? He did.

But you want the evidence that Raines and Harvey are pastors. Here it is: They publish a paper at Bloomington, called "The Gospel Reminder". Raines announces services at the Fourth and Lincoln Sts. church. And here is the way he signs it: "L. N. Raines, minister," Harvey is pastor at Indiana Ave. And there is the way he signs his announcement: "A. W. Harvey, minister."

But for fear this will not convince the Review people that they have pastors in the "Review Family", I give the following from Bro. D. A. Sommer concerning Bro. A. R. Kepple (S. and K. are both of the "Review Family").

"And while we are talking about "Slipping" (he is showing that the Review is slipping.—J. D. P.), we give a news paper clipping concerning A. R. Kepple's work at Hutchinson, Kan.: 'Three boys' clubs have been organized at the church of Christ by the pastor (italics mine, J. D. P.), A. R. Kepple, which are open, not only to the boys of the church but all in the neighborhood: The clubs are: The Friendly Indians, for boys from 9 to 12; the Pioneers, from 12 to 16 years; and the Comrades, 16 years and over . . . Rev. Kepple can be reached by calling 2272.'—Macedonian Call, July, 1928.

No wonder Bro. Sommer says the Review is "NOT SLIPPING BUT SLIDING." Just to show what else is going on in the "Review Family" I append for your consideration another paragraph from the pen of Bro. D. A. Sommer:

"NOT SLIPPING BUT SLIDING.—One preacher who says 'it' is not slipping attends foot-ball games; another got mixed up with another man's wife; another preaches nearly altogether in the affirmative; another attends picture shows; another preaches every Sunday morning and night at one place (pastoring, you see.—J. D. P.); etc. It is doubtful whether such are capable of judging whether anything is slipping. This is saddening. It is very natural that they do not wish strong preaching and reproving and rebuking." Macedonian Call, July, 1928.

Again he says, "Talk about nerve! that is more than some people have." Yes, brother, it is more than you have, I am sure.—You didn't have "nerve" enough to attend the debate held right in your home town and your old friend, Daniel Sommer, was a party to the debate, too. And I venture the assertion that you have not enough "nerve" to meet me in debate. Will you? Here is a good chance for you to show whether you have any "nerve."

And he says, "But Phillips has it (nerve) alright." Yes, brother, "Phillips has it alright." And he "has it" enough that he is not afraid to defend his position every time it is called in question. And I am sorry, brother, that you don't "have it" enough to defend your position. You even did all you could to keep Daniel Sommer out of trying to defend his and your position at Sullivan. This shows a lack of "nerve", does it not? It does.

In all Brother Roady's article he didn't attempt to show one single "Thus saith the Lord" he boasted about the "Church of Christ" having for any of the things I mentioned. Why? Because he knew he could not do it. Hence all his article didn't amount to "a hill of beans."

He says, "If you want to know about all their hobbies and then some more hobbies, send for their paper" (The Truth). Yes, send for our paper and if we have any "hobbies" you can learn about them. And Brother Roady tells you you can learn about "some more hobbies," which, I suppose, are the Review's hobbies; for they were the ones I was condemning. So I say with Brother Roady, "Send for The Truth."

The Review has borrowed Sect Baptism from the Baptists and others; the Right Hands of Fellowship, from the same source; the Pastor System from the "College" brethren; Clubs, etc., from the Christian Church. So they have become so much like the sects, by borrowing a little from one sectarian body, something else from another, etc., that the following poem pretty well describes them:

"Fillet of a fenny snake,
In the caldron boil and bake;
Eye of Newt and toe of frog,
Leg of bat and tongue of dog."

Now, Brother John, have you a sufficient amount of "nerve" to meet me in debate on the issues between us? Come on, brother; either lead or follow.

JAS. D. PHILLIPS,
439 N. Drury,
Kansas City, Mo.

YES, HOW AND WHY

Those who contend for the cups, deny that a "cup" has anything to do with the Lord's supper. They call it "vessel" or "container", which might be a bottle, a pitcher, or a jug, etc. If we could read in the Bible where the Lord took a vessel, a pitcher, for example, and blessed the cup, there might be some grounds for their contention. But the thing is impossible. The Lord could not do that, and I can not, neither can they. Paul says, "The cup of blessing which we bless." I Cor. 10:16. And he says, "Let him drink from that cup." 1 Cor. 11:28.

But these brethren know that Jesus in instituting the supper used one cup, for they try to give a reason why just one was used. But their argument, if it can be called such, is that Jesus did not say, "You can't use more than one." Let us see: When the Bible says "sing", it does not have to say you can't play with it, to exclude the instru-

ment. And when the Lord commanded, "All drink out of it," he did not have to say you shan't use cups. And if we can ever-ride the command in one case, we can in the other. Of course, if Jesus had said, as some do, that do not follow Jesus here, "Now, we have a small crowd here, but you must use as many as you like in bigger crowds," then it would be all right to do so: just as if the Apostles had said, "Sing, but when you want to use an organ, it is all right to do so,—you must not get narrow, as narrow as the command."

Paul did not say, "Now, you have a big church at Corinth, and expediency and common sense tell you to use more than one cup." No; he said, "The cup,"—"this cup,"—"that cup." "Let him drink from that cup"—"the cup of blessing which we bless."

But some have said, "When we use one cup, we that do so, are observing the 'cup' instead of the command of the Lord." If that is true, they observed the "cup" instead of the command of the Lord in Apostolic times. But those who use cups do not obey the command of the Lord, nor that of his apostle. Hence their worship is vain—carnal, not spiritual.

They talk of our binding one cup—that awful "creed." The Lord bound this "creed"—we find it in the Bible. Now find yours there if you can. It is not there, for Cowan had to make one when he left the Bible to get one. He can't find his in the Book of the Lord.

The Apostles were to teach us to observe what Jesus had commanded them (Matt. 28:20). He commanded one cup, and all to drink from it. And Paul said he received from the Lord what the Lord commanded, and he commanded one cup and to drink from it. Now who bound one cup?

"Cup" excludes cups as much as "baptize" excludes sprinkle and "sing" excludes play.

—Bob Musgrave.

Remarks

Stay with 'em, Bob! You have the Book for what you teach: they have the traditions of men for what they teach. You build on the rock: they build on the sand (Matt. 7:21-24). You are willing to debate your position: they are not. They are a set of religious cowards. God is the Author of your "creed": Cowan is the author of the creed of all who will follow him. And Cowan crows through the A. W. while Duckworth serves as stopper to keep Harper, Musgrave, et al., out.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

Fred E. Miller, Searsboro, Ia.—Our meeting at Sunnyside Chapel closed Nov. 4, all too soon. Bro. Homer L. King did the preaching, and he has a kind, but forceful way of presenting the truth. Four were added by baptism. This church has many difficulties to overcome, but we are encouraged to press on and are still gaining ground.

Fred Hogland, Melrose, N. Mex.—I like "The Truth" because it is ready to oppose every innovation instead of one or two. Here is one dollar for renewal and one for the Truth fund.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER Publisher

Entered as second class matter January 6, 1928, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year	\$1.00
Six Months	.50
Three Months	.26



LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

"CONSIDERATIONS" RECONSIDERED

"Men who have not learned the difference between a literal and a figurative expression; between a command and an incidental to a command; between a generic and a specific term; between the field where God has legislated and the field in which he has not legislated—are posing as reformers and challenging the armies of the Living God to meet them in public discussion."—Thad Hutson, Leader of Nov. 27, 1928.

Yes, and you "Digressives No. 2," who have gone off into "the field in which he (God) has not legislated," as the "Digressives No. 1" did years ago, are frantically dodging about to keep from "meeting in debate" these "reformers," who are wielding "the sword of the Spirit" so effectively that they are taking off digressive heads wherever the man will stand for open discussion before the people. And now these fellows like Thad Hutson, who have been roaming for "picking" in the broad field "where God has not spoken," like prairie dogs, are hiding close by their holes ready to dodge in if one of the reformers should chance to come their way. They have seen one of their biggest "champions" who dared to stand out and meet in debate one of these "reformers" torn to pieces, and the rest have scampered to their holes,—yes, and a big fellow, too, who did not know the difference "between a generic and a specific term." He said "teach" is generic. Does the scholarly Hutson know no better? It is too bad about you wiseacres, who know so much that isn't so.

"The more positively they are ignored, the sooner will their mouths be stopped."—Thad Hutson, Ibid.

Now you said it—just like the organ advocates advocated. O, how sweet spirited they got when a debate was in prospect. Debate they would not. And "like begets like," they say. They, too, said, "It is better to be separated from all such and be in unity and peace." But their "unity" on the things they put in "where God has not spoken" did not last long, and having sown to the wind, they reaped the whirlwind of discord and division. "Go thou, and do likewise," we say, if you just will go" beyond the things which are written." I Cor. 4: 6. But remember that "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God." 2 John 9.

"After having his arguments fully met, and receiving arguments which he can not meet, he then resorts to abusing the man."—Thad Hutson, Ibid.

Now you said it—"murder will out." Ask Brother Fogle, who moderated for your man, how he conducted himself. Ask the outsiders who attended the debate who was the gentleman in it—not Moore: no not by a long way.

"Not every fast, loud, glib talker is a debater."—Thad Hutson, Ibid.

No; but some are—ask the people of South Charleston, W. Va., who heard the Phillips-Moore debate. "Generic and specific" terms. Yes, see "Simple Simon," elsewhere in this issue, and you can see what you have not learned. Now "Thad" close in and we shall see how much you are educated and how much you know. The trouble is you fellows know so much that isn't so. Come on now.

WILL YOU HELP?

We are planning to get a tent and hold a month's meeting in Hot Springs, Arkansas, as soon as it can be arranged. We want to get Brother Harper and Brother King to conduct this meeting if possible. Many people from all over the United States and Canada come to this city for the winter, and here is a wonderful opportunity to spread the gospel and establish a church faithful to the Word of God. We shall need song books, a hundred or more, and we shall be thankful to any church or brother that will supply these; and we shall be pleased to have brethren attend and help us in the meeting by individual work and prayer and giving to its support. I shall give my time and energy and fifty dollars (\$50.00) or more to this effort, and if others will help just a little bit and enough of them will be so minded, by the help of the Lord the victory will be ours.

This city is an important center, as all know who are familiar with the location.

Send funds to "The Truth," Sneads, Fla., or to me directly, and all will be gratefully acknowledged.—Ryan Bennett, Palestine, Ark.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

A few years ago I was not able to explain the meaning of the word "cup" used in reference to the communion; I thought it referred to the container. An article in the Review by Bro. Black (I think) very clearly showed that the word "cup" was figurative, and referred not to the container, but to the contents. That article alone was worth more to me than the price of a five-years' subscription.—I. Woodrow, Somerset, Pa., in A. R., Sept. 18, 1928.

Well, brother you should not be satisfied with anything but the truth. Yes, it was Chas. S. Black, who wrote the article. And his "explaining the word 'cup'" was about the same that I have heard from a Methodist preacher in his explaining the word "baptism." Bro. Black started

out to show a "Thus saith the Lord" for the use of cups, but when he himself saw his failure here, he switched off to "custom" as his only "authority" for the use of them, and he urged all the brethren to accept the "custom" of the church where they chanced to be. Pretty good sectarian doctrine,—just any old thing, and we swallow it just as the sectarian does, and the blind leading the blind, both fall into the ditch.

"Cup is used figuratively." This is a falsehood when the other half of the truth is suppressed; namely, Cup is used literally, as well, with reference to this institution, as Bro. Kellems, in his debate with Bro. Stigers, showed from Cruden; and Thayer and every other Greek scholar shows the same thing. Cup is the name of a solid: it is not the name of a liquid, and never was the name of a liquid. When Stigers saw this, he was man enough to give up the contest, and accept the word of God; but when Black saw it, he switched off, sectarian-like, to "custom,"—just take "custom" and keep your mouth shut, ye cranks. Black is talking. Now swallow it without question, just as the sectarian does.

Where is the humanism that cannot be sustained if "custom" is taken as "authority" for it? And Black with all his set are heading the church into humanism. And they dare not defend their practice in discussion.

After the Stigers-Kellems debate Daniel Sommer blowed about what he could prove by the Bible for the use of the cups, but when we offered to meet him, he backed off. And A. J. Armstrong backed off. Then it was that Dr. Trott reviewed in the paper Armstrong's tract on the cups.

AN ASSUMPTION

In his "How Is This" Cowan tries to base an argument upon an assumption, but we want proof. He says, "And when he had given thanks he broke it and said, Take eat, this is my body. Now I want to be right. So which piece of the bread after it is divided is the body of Christ?"

Right here Cowan leaves the Bible when he says "divided." Let Cowan prove that the loaf was divided into two parts, and then those parts passed to the disciples. The Bible does not teach it.

That Jesus drank from the cup, as did the apostle, on this occasion, is made clear in Mark 14:25; Matt. 26:29; Luke 22:18.

Paul says to the disciples at Corinth, "The bread which we break." (1 Cor. 10:16), and Luke says, "The disciples came together to break bread" (Acts 7:20).

Christ broke the bread and his apostles on that occasion broke bread, or they did not do what the disciples at Corinth and Troas did. Did the disciples come together to break the bread into two pieces? No; nor did they come together to break the bread (loaf, margin) and lay down the piece broken off or throw it away; but to "eat," as the Bible says. Nor did Christ break the loaf into two pieces and hand the two parts around—he ate what he had broken off, as did the disciples the part they broke. When the disciples

came together to break bread, did they just break it without eating? No, and when Jesus is said to have broken it, does it mean or teach that he broke it without eating? No. And when he told the apostles to "eat," does it mean or teach that the apostles ate without first breaking the bread? No. And because some have followed an unauthorized practice of breaking the bread into two parts, is that any reason why all or any should continue the practice? Let us study the book and act with intelligence.

Jesus took the cup and gave thanks, and drank from it. And God's apostle says, "After the same manner also the cup after having supped." 1 Cor. 11:25. Again: "In like manner also the cup after having supped." Luke 2:20 (Berry Tr.) Here again it is shown from the Bible that Jesus drank from the cup. And we learn from the Bible that Jesus broke bread, and that the disciples broke bread. What did Jesus do with the part he broke off? Did he throw it away? No. The disciples broke bread and ate, and any intelligent man knows that Jesus did the same. And we "eat out of that bread" (1 Cor. 11:28), by "breaking bread" and eating what we break off.

Cowan thinks precedents do not amount to commands in this matter. Why, then, does he take the bread before the cup? Why does he return thanks for the bread? And why return thanks for the cup? And why not return thanks for both on the table at one time? And did not Jesus command them all to drink from the cup? He did. Matt. 26:27. And they obeyed this command, as Mark says, "And they all drank from it." 14:23.

Jesus said, *This do in remembrance of me.* What did he mean? Can you do something else instead of "this" and obey this command? No. Did he mean for them to break the bread into two pieces and lay them down? Here is work for Cowan. Now what did he mean? Please explain just what he meant when he said, "This do in remembrance of me." Will the brother kindly explain? I shall patiently wait for Cowan to prove that the body was divided into two parts.—Ed. Swindler, Rt. 1, Bloomfield, Ia.

SIMPLE SIMON

In reporting his debate with me on the "Sunday School" at South Charleston, W. Va., in the *Leader*, Ira C. Moore, the senior editor of that journal, says, "His moderator, H. C. Harper, of Florida, after the debate was ended, in order apparently, to prop up their sinking and defeated cause, stepped aside from his duties and prerogatives as a moderator, and made the public and wild statement that 'teach is not a generic word.'" And Moore then says, "Possibly I shall have more to say in exposing this mote hunter who also stated at the same time that 'go is not a generic word.'" Yes, after the debate was ended, Harper said this, and he called upon the audience to witness it. And Harper was wholly within his rights, for the debate was ended, and Moore knows it if he knows anything about debating. And the "prop" is still up. And to get the matter before the public, I wrote the "Lexicographer's Easy Chair"

of the Literary Digest, who says, "Replying to your inquiry, teach is specific; go is specific."

I then wrote the leading linguist of Bethany College, asking, "Are the words 'go' and 'teach' specific?" He answered, "Yes."

And now "possibly" Moore will have no more to say unless he intends to expose his ignorance further, as Danile Sommer did in his translation of eis in Acts 2:38, and thus make himself the laughing stock of the brotherhood. (See Harper's exposure of Sommer on sect baptism.)

Moore said in debate that go and teach are generic words, and for the sake of argument, I said we will admit it; and then showed that the classes are organized before the act to "teach" begins, and hence he could not organize classes under the command to "teach." And he never met this.

He speaks of our sinking and defeated cause. If the cause at South Charleston church is what he calls a sinking and defeated cause, it would be well to have such a debate everywhere, for the attendance and membership and contributions there have increased since the debate to a surprising extent. And after Martin, who was to hold a meeting at 618 Virginia St. after the debate and whom Moore said in the debate he intended to convert to his "advanced position," failed to come for that meeting, Moore and Lucas and Janney tried to hold the meeting which had been announced, they closed after three nights, as dead as a door-nail.—Jas. D. Phillips.

HOBBY RIDERS

If we preach on 1 Cor. 14, we are called a hobby rider by those preachers that argue for the Sunday School with its classes and women teachers as some of the churches of Christ are beginning to practice; and there are some preachers that seem to be sound in the faith, who tell us that they are opposed to the classes and women teachers in the church but they do not want to make hobby riders of themselves by opposing such things. But if opposing these things makes one a hobby rider, I am perfectly willing to be called such by those who are destitute of the truth in opposing that which is wrong.

When I was a young man, before I became a Christian, I went to a place of worldly pleasure and saw folks riding something like horses, which went round and round. I noticed that they were not, however, real horses with sense, but just hobby horses; and of course I had to take a ride to be what Satan wanted me to be. But since I have found real pleasure in serving the Lord and have found a preacher who contends for things such as classes and women teachers in the church—just what the Christian Leader writers call "Sunday School"—I know he is not a real gospel preacher who will declare unto the people the whole counsel of God, but just a dummy, just a hobby horse, and I just get on him instantly and that is why he calls me a hobby rider I suppose.—C. C. Thompson, Lanark, W. Va.

SUBSCRIBE FOR THE TRUTH

FIX THIS; BROTHER MOORE

"A. B. Lipscomb's Sunday School lessons are exceedingly good always."—Christian Leader, Oct. 9, 1928.

Report from Elders Lock, Traux, and Sturgeon, W. D. C.: "The attendance at Sunday School and other departments of the church increased."—Christian Leader, Nov. 6, 1928.

Now, here is something we would like for Ira C. Moore, senior Editor of the Christian Leader, to fix: He says he is opposed to the name "Sunday School," that it is an unscriptural name, and that the Christian Leader does not indorse the Sunday School. But the very paper of which he is Editor publishes Sunday School reports and uses the name with approval, it seems. So we would like for Brother Moore to fix this up if he can.

Brother Moore got all "wrought up" because I said it was not a method of teaching, but a separate organization from the church that we were fighting. He said he did not contend for a separate organization from the church. But I showed from Will W. Slater's report in the Leader that the paper Edited by Moore favored the Sunday School. Slater was raving because he could not get the church at a point where he had been in Mo. to digress and he said, "I tried to get them to organize or institute a Sunday School or Bible Study." And the Leader published this report without a word of criticism. So the Christian Leader favors the Sunday School, its senior Editor to the contrary notwithstanding.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

SWORD SWIPES

By Cled E. Wallace

Brother McGary was wont to make some powerful "Sword Swipes" at sin and error during his life. He loved to be in the thick of the fight for truth and right. I take it that it will not be improper for me to make use on occasion of the caption he loved to write under.

It is well to revert to the fact often that real Christians are real fighters. Warfare was a favorite figure with the Apostle Paul in representing the Christian life. "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." "Fight the good fight of faith." Christians should all be fighters. Sometimes the fact that a preacher is "not a fighter" recommends him to some people. It is a sorry recommendation for both the preacher and those who want him. What is that sort of a preacher good for? Like salt that has lost its savor, he is "good for nothing." Tickling itching ears is not the "work of an evangelist." It is the business of an evangelist to "preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teachings."

The Christian fighter is panoplied with the breastplate of righteousness, the girdle of truth, the helmet of salvation, the shield of faith, etc.,

so that he can effectively wield "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Some timid souls handle it with great care lest they hurt somebody with it. What's it for? Use it on sectarianism and sin and thrust it deep.

Preaching which doesn't draw blood is pretty sorry preaching. It should convict sinners and bring their thoughts "into captivity to the obedience of Christ." A sermon should be full of Bible teaching and the points of it should stick out so the people can see them and stick in so they can feel them. If it comes to this choice, it is far better to preach the word of God to a little crowd than "much and greens" to a big one. Think of John the Baptist, or Christ, or Paul bragging on sinners and handing out the kind of "salesmanship" talk that some preachers do! Better preach the gospel. A terrible, coming Judgment Day is a reality for all. If plain Bible preaching will not convert people, we are not authorized to experiment on them with anything else. A man cannot be converted to Christ with anything else but the gospel. A woman told me that she heard "one of our preachers tell twenty-two death-bed yarns in one sermon." Telling yarns is not preaching the gospel and a preacher should give his thoughtful hearers something else to do besides count yarns. It is far better to tell the people how Christ died for their sins, than to tell them how Caesar's grandmother died in hors. Besides, most of the yarns preachers tell are lies anyhow. Substituting human lies for gospel truth is feeding people chaff for the wheat they are entitled to. Chaffy preaching is worse than none at all. If you don't like the word "chaffy" spell it "frothy."

"The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." The prevailing ignorance of what the New Testament contains is nothing short of a calamity. I am persuaded that much trouble in the church is caused more by ignorance of Bible teaching than a reckless disregard of it. There is no excuse for members of the church of Christ being ignorant of the contents of the New Testament. A brother told me that while watching at the sick bed of his wife, he timed himself in reading the New Testament. He read all of it in eighteen hours and fifteen minutes without hurrying through. There are members of the church who never did read it through. The average busy man should be able to spare eighteen hours out of each month for Bible reading. Is there really any excuse for not reading the New Testament through about a dozen times each year? There is no excuse for Christians, not knowing everything in it. Better get busy, O sluggard, and learn the New Testament.

F. F. July 30

Remarks

"Learn the New Testament." When will they ever learn it with the Sunday School system, and the preachers telling "twenty-two death-bed stories in one sermon,"—your present order of things? "Tickling itching ears" with "chaff for

wheat," giving the people "mush and greens," how can you blame the people for their "ignorance of the Bible"? Don't talk about the New Testament as a guide when your Sunday School debaters make out that we have now "no inspired Scriptures." And put your "Sunday School literature" that they advertise and laud to the skies above the Bible and turn to man instead of God to lead them. "Ignorant of the New Testament," of course they are. "There is no excuse for Christians not knowing everything in it." True; but so long as they are taught and urged to take the "Sunday School Literature," that G. H. P. Showalter used to fight in the Firm Foundation, and to "substitute human lies for gospel truth," with "chaffy preaching," they will be "ignorant of the New Testament," even if they have no excuse.

Why not get back to the "Old paths," as God's prophet urged Israel? Why not urge the people to do as the Bereans did? Why not cut out the modern clap-trap of humanisms, and seek to restore New Testament Christianity, as did the fathers one hundred years ago? Let us do our "bit" at it in view of "A terrible, coming Judgment Day," indeed "a reality for all."

SUNDAY SCHOOL TRACT

Brother Chas. F. Reese, of Yuma, Arizona, has just brought from the press his tract against the Sunday School and the cups. The tract is neat in appearance and sells at a nominal price, just enough to cover the cost of printing. This is a good tract to scatter just now. I will send them out at \$1.00 a dozen or 10 cents each.—L. C. England, Yuma, Arizona.

TRUTH FUND

C. C. Thompson, Lanark, W. Va.	\$ 1.00
J. D. Phillips, Kansas City, Mo.	6.00
John Chambers, Harrisburg, Ind.	6.00
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.	5.00
J. S. Bedingfield, Lorenzo, Texas	4.00
A brother	1.00
J. Y. Morgan, Newcastle, Texas	10.00
Mrs. Chas. T. Cook, Montazuma, Ind.	20.00

AS I VIEW IT

By J. W. Dunn

There are questions agitated among us which if had been left alone, many of us feel, they would have died a natural death and caused little or no harm, but the agitation has not only kept them alive, but has caused some to become strong supporters, of, and some equally strong opposers. Solomon says, "Where no wood is, the fire goeth out; so where there is no talebearer, the strife ceaseth" (Prov. 26:29). I doubt not, if the question of teaching in classes or teaching all together, using printed matter in the study of the Bible, had been left alone and no one who would spend time in arguing for, or against, no doubt by now, we would not hear a thing on the matter and besides, brethren, far better friends than many are today. These two questions agitated have caused some to take, what I would term, the rankest positions possible for man to take. The

harm that has been done the cause, at some points, is far reaching and the spirit displayed very bad. When brethren cannot, or will not be kind, respectful and courteous, then I do not think they should discuss anything, or be given any attention by the rest of us. This is how I feel by the question of classes when teaching a multitude, or using literature in the teaching. As I view it, I do not consider there is one passage in the Bible bidding us to teach in classes, nor one passage in condemning teaching in classes. I am convinced those who contend for either, are making a law for it or against it, as their position may be. It is a question I find not one passage for, or against in the Bible. Such questions never came before the Savior or apostles in their busy career. I have heard and read many arguments (?) pro and con, in the last few years and yet when the truth is uttered as I believe it is, no Scripture can be found on either side. I consider it a question purely in the realm of expediency—left to the better judgment of those doing the teaching. No one should try to make a "Bible argument" for it, or a "Bible argument" against it. I know not of one Bible argument on either side today, made by its supporters or its opposers. Thus viewing the matter, I here purpose, I will never divide a congregation on such questions, or have any part or lot in such destructive work. I believe it has done lots of harm and have witnessed no good to come from it. Perhaps the worst thing of all, is the bad spirit that has been manifested in their contentions. It has been simply intolerable and shameful. "Such ought not so to be" and somebody will have to account for the evil that has attended such work. We are simply "shutting up the kingdom of God against men", bringing the cause into disrepute, alienating brethren and causing many to dwarf and lose what interest they have in the work. We spend our strength in trying to tear down one another, hence tear down ourselves. Now, is this not a pity, but a shame to have such charge laid at our feet and that justly. With my present views on these matters, I will never agitate either of these questions. While I do believe we can best teach the word of God at times, having the assembly divided according to age and development, yet I can teach all, young and old, and not cause trouble in the body, by contending to the breaking point. From viewing the work done and the manner in which it was done, I do not believe it was their scrupulous conviction in favor of, or opposed to, but more of a desire to carry a point, or men to have their own way, instead of "Have Thine own way, Lord." In this I have no desire to have part or lot. I wish brethren would quit it. How can I think brethren are so conscientious about the "how" they teach, when they neglect to teach at other times and places, where no one opposes and are so careless about "preaching the gospel in the regions beyond." If they are so anxious to teach after their own views, why do they not get where there is no one to oppose them and do so to their heart's content, no but instead, they spend their energies on one another.

"An expedient," eh? Did ever one Digressive

more closely follow another? Can it be an "expedient" since it leaves division, and hatred, and broken hearts in its path? Never. By its fruits it is classed in the Bible with drunkenness and adultery, and the Bible says, "They that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:20.

Yes, the whole New Testament is against it as is every Christian, who is walking worthy of His vocation, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit. Eph. 4:1-4. And no one can be silent where the Bible is silent and advocate such a so-called expedient. If the Scriptures authorize it, we are bound to have it, just as it would have been with instrumental music; and if the Scriptures do not authorize it, we are bound to reject it from our faith and practice. And will we do so for the unity that Christ so prayed for? Will we? Just answer in view of the judgment.

Yes, "Preach the word beyond." Then why "pastorate?" Why let sinners die in their sins? The love of ease, the love of a "salary", the love of popularity, the love of fine meetinghouses, and the love of "our ways" instead of God's—these are the things that hinder.

Yes, "If they are so anxious to teach after their own views, why do they not get out where there is no one to oppose them and do so to their heart's content."

Simply because they would rather have something the Bible is silent on than the unity that Christ prayed for. And they show by their actions that they would break up a church rather than give up the thing for which there is not one scientific of Bible proof. And they "wax worse and worse."

NEWS AND NOTES

I have just received my tracts from the Lay-cook Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn., who are printing "The Truth", and they have done a fine job for me and at a low price. This is a tract against the innovations that are now troubling the church and causing division—classes, women teachers, Sunday School literature and the use of more than one cup in the communion. I am offering the tract at a nominal price, ten cents a copy or one dollar a dozen. Order from Bro. L. C. England, Yuma, Arizona, who will look after the matter for me. Let us scatter these tracts and wake the people up and keep out digression and keep the church pure. Order them for your whole congregation to read: "The Truth" has certainly been manna to our hungry souls here, and we shall give it our unstinted support next year. Let us keep on the firing-line. The enemy has been put out of business entirely in many places. To God be all the praise.—Chas. F. Reese, Yuma, Ariz.

J. B. Daniel, Salem, N. Mex.—Church meeting each Lord's day for worship. The writer preaches each first Sunday in the month and Bro. Lee the second. If any brethren coming West wishes work here, road work, let me know. There is now a good opening here for a Shoe-shop and for a pressing club. Write me for particulars.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, FEBRUARY 1, 1929

NO. 3

WARLICK WABBLING

To show our readers how Warlick is yet wabbling, not able to gain his poise after his battering in the Sunday School ring with us, we here give a clipping that plainly shows how unbalanced he is.

WHEN Paul in preaching to the people at Athens, quoted from their literature, giving what one of their own Poets had said, and thus used human literature to teach the truths of the Christian religion, if some one of our silly Hobby Riding brethren had been present, he would perhaps have left the assembly, or maybe run out of the place saying this is all digression and leads toward the regular Sunday School. But in this case we have more than the authority to use the Sunday School Quarterly in teaching classes, for the Quarterly is the writing of loyal brethren in Christ Jesus, but Paul quoted from an heathen Poet, Acts 17:28. If our hobby riding brethren had been there, or near there, they would perhaps have set down on one of the old steps, which may yet be seen, and which lead up to the place where Paul stood when he spake the above word and did the above teaching. But I am sure there were none among the people of God in those days, who had as little gumption as Hobby Riders have, nor perhaps as little of the spirit of Christ.

WHEN after the multitude were gathered together, our Savior made a selection of twelve, out of others of his disciples, and taught them in a class to themselves, as He did when He went up into the mountain, Mark 3, and Luke 6, I am sure that if any of the Hobby Riders had been with him, they would have at once gone back and walked no more with him, for they cannot stand it if you divide the assembly into classes to teach them. Why! Noah Cowan, or Alva Johnson would have challenged Jesus for one hundred debates on the class system of teaching. Frank Duckworth would have had forty fits, and Dr. Trott would have had the laughing hysterics; while H. C. Harper would have thrown a book at the Master like he did at H. F. Oliver during their debate at Austin. The Apostolic Way would have been full of complaints; I think Joe Kelley would have dropped his underlip and said, there! Christ has gone to the bow wows, like all the rest of them, and Geo. Phillips would have said, "He frustrates the Grace of God."

As to the incident at Austin, it was Oliver who threw the Bible at Harper when Harper asked him to read from the Bible some scripture he was pretending to quote on the Lord's supper. But this is about as near the truth as Warlick gets when he tries to meet those that oppose "commandments and teachings of men." Col. 1:21,22.

Paul quoted heathen "literature" in teaching the truth. Yes, and heathen literature that states a truth divine is quite different from taking uninspired literature as a text in trying to teach truth divine. We are willing to quote Warlick in teaching truth divine when his statements accord with "what is written." Paul, being inspired, had the standards, the text if you please, and knew that this heathen literature stated a divine truth. We have the Word of God, the divine standard, or text, if you please, and like Paul, we are willing to quote uninspired literature that accords with this divine standard in teaching divine truth. We make God's word the standard of measurement and not the uninspired literature. Hence we follow the inspired, and not the uninspired. And this forever dispenses with the "Sunday School Quarterly," which supplants the Bible in the hands of the people. But those who are too lazy to study the Word of God are willing to be led by the "Sunday School Quarterly," which makes some Baptists, some Methodists, some Presbyterians, some Catholics (yes, it suits the Catholics, too) and so on; and it makes Christians think "of men above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6) and go into "humanisms,"—just where Warlick and his gang are now trying to lead the churches of Christ. And if Warlick had been with Paul, to be consistent he would have objected to Paul's procedure, saying, "You old Hobby Rider, you religious crank, why not "teach in the most effective way?" We should have here classes so that they can be "taught according to age and ability"—you should have gumption enough to quit the divine way that the Holy Spirit is leading you. Don't you know that the people can not understand your inspired word without the Sunday School Quarterlies. Are you like Trott, and Harper, and Cowan, and Musgrave, and Johnson, and the boy Phillips? Now just use a little common sense and do things. I'll take your inspired word and put it in the Quarterly—you're not smart enough to get this idea now because you're limited to the direction of the Holy Spirit, that old-fogysm; but they will find out this better and "most effective way" in the eighteenth century. You see I'm Joe Warlick, a debater of renown, and I know more than God Almighty, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost combined about these things. Now, come, Paul, just use a little sense, and let me put it in the Quarterly—you know I publish a paper, the Gospel Guide—and we have guide-posts on our roads (hadn't you thought of that), and we have classes in our public schools. Why, common sense teaches us these things. But Paul did not have the "class system" nor the Quarterlies, yet following the Holy Spirit, he with his colaborers evangelized the

world—every creature under heaven. And he, through the Holy Spirit, taught the churches "speak one by one" to the whole assembly "that all may learn and all may be exhorted."

When Warlick intimates that Jesus Christ ever divided an audience into classes and put teachers over these classes to teach them, he blasphemes the Lord—he knows better. And if he was not a religious coward, he would affirm his teaching with us and let the people see what he can do by way of defending his Sunday School, the classes, the women teachers, and the Quarterlies. He dare not do it, and he knows it. These Sunday School digressives are a joke—just like the organ digressives. They will say that they have lots of Bible for it, but when you run them down and they see that they are cornered then they change about face "expedient," a "privilege," etc. And they have less principle about them than the organ digressives had in casting slurs, and ridicule, and spite upon those they can not meet in open discussion before the people.

THE CHARLESTON DEBATE

No. II

Held at South Charleston, W. Va., Nov. 11-15, 1928, between Ira C. Moore, senior Editor of the Christian Leader, and Jas. D. Phillips, of Kansas City, Mo.

Phillips' Affirmative

"The Scriptures teach that to preach that an assembly (any and all assemblies of the church that are under the oversight of the Elders of the church), for better and more efficient teachings, MAY be divided into groups or classes, and that suitable women MAY be appointed by the Elders as teachers, is heresy."

I affirmed this proposition and Bro. Moore denied it. I defined the terms as follows:

"The Scriptures," the Bible, and especially the New Testament.

"An assembly," a group of congregation of people, assembled for worship or religious instruction.

"Divided into groups or classes," a plurality of classes being taught at the same time in the same assembly, with a teacher over each class.

"Women teachers," any class of Christian women,—whether married, single, or a widow.

"Heresy," Greek *hairesis*, That which is chosen, a chosen course of thought or action. Hence, ones opinion, tenet, according to the context, an opinion varying from the true exposition of the Christian Scriptures." Thayer. Gal. 5:19; 1 Cor. 11:19; 2 Pet. 2:1.

After defining the terms I showed that the word of God tells us plainly just how the word of God should be taught. And that any teaching contrary to this is heresy, for it is a tenet contrary to Scripture. I said:

"We have plain statements in the Bible telling us that people may be taught singly, in multitudes, in households—saints, sinners, or mixed multitudes. Here are the proofs: "Teach all nations" (Matt. 28:19); "every creature" (Mark 16:15); "one another" (Col. 3:16); "faithful men"

(2 Tim. 2:2); and 'others also' (2 Tim. 2:2); 'young women' (Titus 2:4). Thus it may be taught to all—old, young, little children, saint and sinner."

I then said, "How should they be taught?" And I answered, "In the very best way possible. God always requires the best." And I showed that in every case where we have a record of how teaching was done by inspired people, that is, when they taught an assembly, it was always done by one man speaking at a time.

1. Moses (Exod. 20) spoke to all Israel.
2. Christ taught the whole multitudes. Matt. 5, etc.
3. Peter taught more than three thousand which resulted in three thousand obeying the gospel. Acts 2. Another case, Acts 3.

And I showed that we were commanded, yes, commanded to teach one at a time; for "Ye may all prophesy one by one that all may learn and be exhorted." 1 Cor. 14:31. To this, Bro. Moore replied that "prophesy" always meant to give revelations and to foretell future events. To this I replied: Alexander Campbell, and Berry, in his Greek-English Lexicon, tell us that it has two meanings: one to speak by the impulse of the Spirit and the other to expound sacred oracles. Bro. Moore ignored Berry, but said, Campbell gives no such meaning." But I showed that he falsified in this, for Campbell says:

"Propnet. This word and the word prophecy, have two meanings in the sacred writings; the one is the foretelling of events yet future—the other is uttering the meaning of ancient oracles, or speaking from the impulses of the Spirit, to the edification and comfort of Christians: 1 Cor. 14; Rom. 13."—"Living Oracles," page 84, in the "Appendix."

I next showed that men only should teach in the public assemblies of the churches. For when Christ chose His Apostles, Evangelists, Elders, etc., he always chose men. And that men only should teach assemblies, is further shown by the fact that in every case where public teaching was done, men only did the teaching. Yes, men, not women. 2 Tim. 2:2.

And I showed that women are forbidden, yes, forbidden to teach in the assemblies of the church. Paul expressly says to the Corinthian men: "Let your women (wives) keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; and if they will know anything, let them ask, their husbands at home; for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." 1 Cor. 14:33-35. Brother Moore contended that the Corinthian women did not have spiritual gifts and that was the reason silence was enjoined upon them. But I showed that he was giving his reason, while Paul gave a different reason. Paul's reason is this: "For it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." And I asked the audience which they were going to take—Paul or Bro. Moore.

After showing that the reason the women are to keep silence in the church is because it is "a shame for a woman to speak," I then went to 1 Tim. 2:11-14 and showed why they are forbidden

to teach. And here is the reason as Paul gave it to Timothy, a young preacher, and thru him to us (see 2 Tim. 2:2): "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection and this corresponds to 1 Cor. 14, where they are forbidden to ask a question in the assembly, "for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church"). But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man, but to be in silence." Why, Paul? "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." This is Paul's reason as given in 1 Tim. 2:11-14. And there is as much difference in his reason and Bro. Moore's reason as there is between daylight and dark. And hence God or Bro. Moore is wrong. And I shall leave it with you to decide which is right.

And I showed that the lack of spiritual gifts was not the reason women were to keep silence in the churches, as Paul said, "As in all churches of the saints, let the women keep silence," etc. And I showed that Philip had four daughters who did prophesy; and that Priscilla helped Aquila (her husband) to teach Apollos "the way of the Lord more perfectly." They belonged to a church somewhere, did they not? And the women in the very congregation to which they belonged were commanded to keep silence when the church was come together, for "as in all churches of the saints, let your women keep silence in the churches." 1 Cor. 14:34, 35.

I stated that women were commanded to teach, but not publicly; for all examples on record show that they did their teaching privately, **not publicly, or in the assembly.** Titus 3:4; Acts 18:25-27. And I said I would affirm as long and as often as Brother Moore would that women must teach, but not in the church, for they are forbidden to teach there. Hence, their teaching must be done privately. Titus 3:4.

Brother Moore freely admitted that we were scriptural in teaching as we do. But he made the same arguments that all digressives make in defense of their innovations. And I answered them as we answer all digressives. And I made the same arguments against organizing the church into classes as I make against instrumental music in the worship, missionary societies, etc.

I showed that a tenet contrary to Scripture is heresy. And I further showed that preaching that an assembly of the church may be divided into classes and women appointed by the elders as teachers of some of these classes was contrary to 1 Cor. 14:31-35; 1 Tim. 2:11-14, etc., therefore heresy. And since this is heresy, the ones who teach it should be given "the first and second admonitions" then rejected if they did not quit their heretical teaching. Titus. 3:10.

I shall have more to say on this matter later, as I intend to review Bro. Moore's report in the Leader.

But before I close, I wish to say that I consider Bro. Moore a much sounder man than most of the class advocates in the brotherhood. He has not yet accepted the "International Sunday School Literature" advocated by so many of them. And

I rather think he opposes the pastor, the "in-cipient missionary society," etc.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

NEWS ITEMS

Jas. Douglas Phillips, 439 N. Drury, Kansas City, Mo., Dec. 26.—Bro. Homer L. King and I closed a meeting last Lord's day night at Harrodsburg, Indiana, after ten days preaching. Four were baptized and one restored to the fellowship of the church. The church there stands against the modern innovations—the Sunday School, the sect baptism heresy, the cups in the communion, and the "Pastor" system. We both preached in this meeting, and Bro. King is a true yokefellow.

M. Estep, Walters, Rt. 2, Okla.—We have recently moved here from Chattanooga, Okla. Change my address. I am sending "The Truth" to my father and hope to lead him to the truth of the Bible. We are 37 mi. from the nearest loyal congregation, but five of us meet here in a private home for worship. We admire your stand, and wish you a happy new year, and remain, Yours for the Bible way.

W. M. Hunter, Palacios, Texas.—We like "The Truth" fine. Wish there was more of it; but are glad it will come twice a month next year. A few of us meet for worship in Bro. Tompkins's house on the Lord's day. The S. S. church here is about dead. We oppose the Sunday School and the cups in the communion and we will have neither, for we can not do it and speak where the Bible speaks. We like "The Truth" for it has the gospel ring, and I can tell it as plainly as I can old Speck's bell.

J. M. Tuttle, Artesia, N. Mex.—In response to Bro. Reese's suggestion, we had Bro. Busgrave to hold two meetings in the Pacos valley this summer. There are many in this valley that will not fellowship with the cups and the Sunday School, and will not endorse a man that will not take a stand against these innovations on the Bible. The Bible plainly says to mark them that are causing divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine, and a man that will not fight the cups and the Sunday School is one who wears the mark of the beast, and life is too short and eternity too long to take any chances by upholding any such man.

J. Y. Morgan, Newcastle, Texas.—We here enclose \$5.00 for renewals and \$10.00 for "The Truth Fund." Bro. Pursley and Bro. Fenter are preaching for us, and Bro. Osterloh will hold us a meeting next July. We believe "The Truth" to contend for the Lord's way as it now stands, and shall give it our support.

W. H. Purlee, Pekin, Ind.—I have been confined home a long time on account of an accident that nearly cost my life, but the Lord has been good to me and his mercy endureth forever. I am now able to preach and can hold meetings where the church wants nothing but the Bible. Write me at Pekin, Ind.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida.

H. C. HARPER - Publisher

Entered as second class matter January 6, 1928, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year	\$1.00
Six Months	.50
Three Months	.25



LATCOCK & JACKSON, TENN.

On account of the extent of the flu, we were not able to mail out our issue for the 15th of January, as we hoped to do. So be patient with us for this failure—it was unavoidable.

To our writers we wish to say that your MS. is carefully filed and it will go to press as soon as we can find space for it under our agreement with the printers.

We shall be pleased to furnish free samples to those who write for them. Some are just finding out that there is such a paper printed.

HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF

We clip the following from the Firm Foundation of July 30, 1928:

"You ask about the activities of churches of Christ in missionary work, inquiring: If one man gathering and forwarding the funds is a 'reasonable safeguard against the formation of a missionary society, I am forced to say: In my judgment such a procedure is laying the foundation for a human Missionary Society. History will repeat itself, for human nature does not change."

—C. R. Nichol

Nichol then shows how, from little digressions the United Missionary Society developed, dividing and redividing the church. Just read it:

It should not be overlooked that the missionary activities of men in New Testament times was under the direct oversight of inspired men, or the local congregation. Missionary Societies, the outgrowth of human ingenuity were not needed then. If they knew it, they were not wise enough to organize them, for they did not exist. Without the humanly organized Missionary Society the gospel was preached to all the world in less than thirty years after the death of the Lord. In New Testament times the missionary was sent out by the congregation, and reported to the congregation sending him out (Acts 13:1-3; 14:2-17). Paul established the church at Philippi, and that congregation sent time and again to his needs while he was on the mission field, and was in touch with him, knowing of his needs (Phil. 4).

The Christian Church in its missionary activities has formed a Missionary Society. This Society was first formed when members from different

congregations met to discuss the work of missions—extending the borders of the kingdom, carrying the gospel to those who had not heard it. Its office was to forward funds to the missionary. Later the Society took in hand the work of raising funds for the mission work naming certain days on which "drives" would be made for a certain work, and telling congregations throughout the country the amount each congregation was expected to raise on that particular day. Soon after the first Society began to function there was a swarm of other Societies formed, each one having some particular work to feature, with "drives" for the specific work they were trying to put over. Churches began to complain that there were too many "drives". Then the idea was conceived, and executed that all the Societies be brought under one head, and there was created the United Christian Missionary Society, with its Board of Managers, etc. And now the Society determines who is to be sent to the mission field, how much he is to be paid, and when he is to be recalled. It is a human organization exercising an overlordship over congregations; an organization with a strangle hold on the congregations. It is another example of centralized power. Little did those of the Christian Church who formed the first Society dream that such a machine would be the outgrowth of the modest beginning. Be it said to the credit of a number of congregations of the Christian Church that they are trying to extricate themselves from the clutches of the machine which is the outgrowth of their folly. Indeed numbers of them now refuse to recognize, or function through the Society, and in some places the congregation has divided over the Society.

Remarks

That the Sunday School churches of Christ are drifting upon the rocks of humanism is evident to any thinking man. For what with their "Preachers' Meetings," and their "Young Peoples' Meetings," and their "One Man Pastor System," and their incipient "Missionary Society," and their "Sunday School" and "Sunday School Literature," they are disfigured by humanisms beyond recognition as New Testament churches, and stand forth as apostate bodies to be spewed out by the Son of God, who walketh among the churches.

Nichol heads his answer, "Is There Danger?" Yes, truly there is, for as he says, "Human nature does not change."

Truly one says, "What fools we mortals be?" When will we ever learn to be guided by the word of God and quit our rambling in the wilderness of humanisms and so fail to enter into "the rest that remains for the people of God?" And when will our leaders learn to quit their foolishness and "Speak as the Oracles of God speak," and not "Go beyond the things which are written?"

Yes, the Christian Standard began to howl, "Back to the Bible" when it saw the "lengths to which we have gone," and the Firm Foundation, the Gospel Advocate, et al., after seeing the wreck among the churches by their course, produced, are now beginning to call a halt; but you can not stay the avalanche of humanisms; you

have fostered any more than the 'Standard' can those they helped to set in motion.

Now let us take warning, and let those who have not followed "their pernicious ways" stand fast."

UNSPOTTED FROM THE WORLD

We hear people say that there is no harm in music and dancing; that they had music and dancing in Bible times, as we read about it in the Bible. Yes, we can read about it in the Bible, indeed we can. But read with me and we shall find music and dancing, not from God, however, but from Satan. When Saul was king and the spirit of the Lord had left him, they brought the son of Jesse, even David, who was skilled in playing instruments of music and who became a man of war, and he played before the king. But Saul was rejected, and David was anointed to be the king. David invented instruments of music and placed them. They played on all manner of such instruments: they praised the Lord with the tymbrel and dance, with stringed instruments and organs. But the Lord said they have set their abominations in the house of God, which is called by my name, to pollute it. God said woe to them that chant to the sound of the viol and invent to themselves instruments of music, like David did. (Amos) Jobe said my harp is turned to mourning and my organ into the voice of them that weep. God said all the daughters of music shall be brought low and their music render unto them a recompence according to the work of their hands: take away from me the noise of thy songs for I will not hear the melody of thy viol, the pipe, the wine, the harp, the viol, the tabret are in their feasts, but they regard not the work of the Lord, therefore my people are gone into captivity, therefore hell hath enlarged herself and opened her mouth without measure and their glory and multitudes, them that rejoice shall descend into it; they have rebelled against me; a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers. They have forsaken the Lord: Bring no more vain oblations, new moons, Sabbaths, when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you. Yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear. Put away the evil of your doings from before my eyes. The daughters of Zion are haughty and walk with stretched-forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mencing as they go and making a tinkling with their feet. Their children dance; they take the tymbrel and harp, rejoice at the sound of the organ. They spend their days and in a moment go down into mourning. Woe unto us, that we have sinned. Woe to them that call evil good."

Dear reader, is not this enough Scripture to convince you that there is harm and no good in music and dancing? They walked in the counsel and imagination of their evil heart. They did evil, and forsook the Lord, and followed other gods. God repented that he made Saul king over Israel. The Lord said my people have gone into captivity. And he said I will make a new Covenant with the house of Israel and with Judah. They continued not in

my covenant; said God; and I regarded them not. I will punish you according to your doings. They that lead thee cause thee to err and destroy the way of thy path. So take away the idols from the house of the Lord, brethren, and the false ways: the ways not directed for us in the word of the Lord. And let us worship our God as he directs. Think on these things, dear reader.

—Mrs. Litha Hansard.

COWAN'S CREED

Bro. J. N. Cowan has written his creed and has offered it to at least three congregations. Get your copy of "The Truth", Dec. 1, page 3, col. 1, and read it. It begins like this: To the First Street Church, Greetings: Then he proceeds to number out each item as a rule of action for the three churches. You will notice he does not see fit to mention one passage of Scripture.

I want every brother and sister that wishes to worship God to notice closely that to follow Cowan would be to quit the divine rule and take the creed of a man as a rule of the churches. Please notice how he expects to bind it, the creed, for all time to come. I will quote No. 3 in full: "That if such a union can be affected (effected) on the above basis that from that time on the question be dropped and that no discussion ever occur publicly about these questions over which divisions have been maintained."

So you see that wherever the creed is agreed to no one can ever be allowed to open it to free and public discussion. Yes, it is bound for all time on all his followers. How do you like this coming from a man who has been so anxious for public discussions?

Let us hear him in his fourth section of his creed: That if you can not accept the above arrangement permanently that for the sake of a big crowd just do as I tell you for this one Lord's day. You will notice that Cowan wanted his creed at least tried out on one Lord's day.

My brothers, you who have all along believed that Cowan stood for the law of the Lord on all things divine, I want you to take notice and see where he is leading you before it is too late.

Now let me present to you Bro. Bob Musgrave by way of a contrast as a leader and peacemaker to get brethren together. Here is his offer on the same subject. Look in the same issue of "The Truth," page 6, col. 1, under the sub-head "Preaching and Debating" and you find this, "So let us take the Book of the Lord. The Books says, 'And he took the wine-cup, and gave thanks, saying, You must all drink from it, for this my blood which ratifies the agreement and is to be poured out for many people for the forgiveness of sins.' Matt. 26:27, 28, Goodspeed tr. 'And they all from it.' Mk. 14:23."

Now which one is the safe leader? All should see at a glance who follows the Lord in insisting on others doing as the Lord directs, and not following the teaching and practice of creed—making teacher, but overcoming such teaching.

Here I want to call the attention of Cowan, the creed-maker, to how he is teaching Matt. 26:28.

Jesus, the law-giver, said, the cup ratifies the agreement. Paul says, "by which." Heb. 13:20; Goodspeed tr. Agreement with whom? His own; the ones that were with him that night. Bro. Cowan should know that to ratify is to sign. Then the cup is the signature of the agreement, or covenant. Then when you change the cup you change the signature. Then what have you? You have a covenant or agreement without a signature. What blessing do you expect from one when you have changed his signature? You may get a big crowd on Lord's day, but the Lord's fiat is not on your creed. ("Tubercular" bring your own cup. Shame.)

Cowan should know that the Lord made the agreement and signed his will with his apostles before he died so it could be put in force after his death. The Lord said that the cup ratified as all wills must be signed while a man is alive, not after his death, to be valid.

But Cowan cares it seems nothing for the cup or what it ratifies. See Matt 26:28—Heb. 13:20—Goodspeed tr. I told Cowan in debate with him that he did not care what was taught on Lord's day; that all he objected to was a woman teaching or dividing the congregation in the teaching. But a man could teach and do as he pleased and it was alright with Cowan. I told him I was more interested in the truth being taught by men on Lord's day than anything else.

In conclusion I challenge Cowan again to meet me on the same propositions that we discussed at Ft. McKavett, Texas (I challenged him then) at Robstown and Lometa, his home congregation and mine. Will he do it? I am for that which is written for my creed: the same rule of faith everywhere. May God help us to hold this worship in the face of all opposition, is my prayer. Yours for a ratified agreement, James T. White, Lometa, Texas.

THE CLASSES

In the Christian Leader, Cincinnati, Ohio, the following article in support of the classes appeared. Read it; then read the reply:

Others say "you are another" when we study the word of God in classes. They say it is the same as the modern Sunday school, Endeavor society, etc. But these are separate organizations. The Lord has legislated on organization. There is but "one body."

"The classes" is simply a manner in which the congregation obeys the command to study. But the objector will say, "The scriptures thoroughly furnish the man of God unto every good work." That is true, but they do not thoroughly furnish us with every manner of accomplishing the good work. The manner of studying the Bible as a book is not a matter of divine legislation. The command is to study, search, look into; but the manner is not revealed. The Bereans searched the scriptures daily. The manner of their search is not revealed. It is a good work to "go preach," there is no special manner of going revealed. The manner of going may be various. Auto, airplane, horseback, buggy, big waggon, bicycle, motorcycle, ship, wheel barrow or walk.

To ask for scripture for studying the Word of God in a class is just like demanding scripture for going in a Ford to preach. Those who assume to be super-loyal in opposing Bible study by the whole church are placing restrictions where God has not placed them. If we study the Bible, we must study it somehow, and there must be some manner adopted. If that manner is especially revealed let the objector point it out; then we will adopt that plan and oppose all others. Until then we shall take the liberty the Lord has granted us, to study it in the best possible manner, to be agreed on in any local congregation where it does not conflict with special divine legislation.

If you say some are consciously opposed to it and we should respect their conscience. There are some who are conscientiously opposed to a "baptistry," and others have such a peculiar conscience that running water only will do to baptize in. Must we do away with the convenient pool in the meeting house and baptize only in rivers and creeks, just because some poisoned consciences are against it? I think not. It would be the better course, both by theory and practice, to give their conscience a better education. Let them learn to discriminate between things which differ and not to differentiate between things which are alike.

But some one will say, "The prophets spoke one at a time." Yes, but were they studying the Bible as a book? No, they were giving revelations. This no teacher can do today. Then why refer to them as a plan by which to study the Bible? There were three brethren who opposed the classes, but each taught a class in his own house. There was nothing but the "plaster and lath" argument between them. What they taught could have been taught in one large room, by modulation of the voice, doing all things decently and in order. "And it came to pass that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions" (Luke 2:46). This plan is not followed in delivering a discourse. But it is one plan. Asking and answering questions and hearing others. See verse 47 also. This plan is generally followed in class study. Let the Lord's will be taught and done is our earnest prayer.

Thaddeus S. Hutson.

C. L. 8-16-27.

1. Bear in mind that at the close of the Phillips-Moore discussion at Chraleston, W. Va., Nov. 11-15, 1928, we presented the following to Moore, but he refused to sign it. He had said in the Leader that the Phillips-Moore debate might be turned into a "written debate so as to benefit all the more," but after he had met Phillips, it seems that he did not care for the brotherhood to see in a written discussion what a glorious victory (?) could be gained for the classes and women teachers, in open discussion. The agreement: "We, Ira C. Moore, senior Editor of the Christian Leader, and H. C. Harper, Editor of "The Truth," hereby agree to discuss through these two papers the propositions discussed by Jas. D. Phillips and Ira C. Moore."

We say Moore refused to sign this. Does Thaddeus Hutson dare to sign it? No; but "ha

will brow-beat and bully through the Christian Leader and evidently thinks he can stay out of reach of the "sword of the Spirit." Let him close in now if he dares.

2. Yes, the Lord has legislated on organization as well as on music. And he never provided for instrumental music in his legislation, nor did he provide for the organization of classes in the church. And if the use of instrumental music in the church makes one a digressive, the organization of classes in the church makes you "another."

3. You say the "modern Sunday school" is a separate organization. Will you tell us just what makes the "modern" one a separate organization, and yours (for you have a "Sunday School", I see by your testimony in the Leader) not a separate organization? Are the members of your Sunday School the members of the church? And if the Sunday School is the church, why not call it the church—Bible things by Bible names, as we profess? And if the Lord has legislated on organization, as you admit, in what chapter and verse of the Bible can we find the organization of the church into classes? If a Sunday School carried on by a church of Christ has a "Sunday-School Superintendent, a Secretary, a Treasurer, classes with both male and female teachers," and the "Sunday School Literature," as announced in "loyal" papers, is it a "modern Sunday School?" or is it one such as you call "Sunday School," as seen in reports of "loyal" preachers in the Leader? Now close in, brother.

4. You say, "The manner of studying the Bible as a book is not a matter of divine legislation." But organizing the church into classes is not a "manner of studying the Bible." This is done before your study begins. Are you trying to put something over us wherein you know better? Come clean now.

5. Yes, God gave the specific command, "Go." And one may ride, walk, swim, run (Acts 8:30), in going. But organizing a missionary society is not going, nor is it a manner of going. You did not say it is? No; but you said something just as ridiculous. You said, "To ask for Scripture for studying the word of God in a class is just like demanding Scripture for going in a Ford to preach."

Now you better brush up and oil your discriminator a little. The Ford is used to "Go." But God has legislated on organization, and unless you find your class organization in the Scriptures where God has legislated, you have a separate organization from that which God has legislated, and it is of man, as much as instrumental music is. This you can not escape.

6. You say, "If we study the Bible, we must study it in some way." Yes, and if we sing, we must sing in some way. But playing an instrument is not singing; neither is organizing the church into classes studying the word of God. Just rub up your discriminator a little more, brother. We can now see why you advise in the Leader (Nov. 27, 1928) to "ignore" us. And you must if you wish to blindfold the people and lead them into digression. God pity you weak-kneed preach-

ers. The organizing of the church into classes is neither a manner of study, nor is it a method of teaching. And God has legislated on organization, and you have no liberty to go beyond the word of God. 1 Cor. 4:6; 2 Jno. 9:

7. "Taught a class in his own house." Yes, and played an instrument in his own house. Therefore (this is your logic), he can play an instrument in the church, and he can organize the church into classes. Your discriminator is not working, brother.

8. The prophets were commanded to speak in the church "one at a time." We are not giving revelations, therefore we can speak two or more at a time. This is your logic if what you say means anything. It is lame. See: The man speaking in a tongue (1 Cor. 14:28) was giving revelations; but we are not giving revelations; therefore we can speak in the church in a tongue without an interpreter and be in order. Shades of tomfoolery!

9. Yes, "asking and answering questions" is all right in the church for the men, but the women are not to speak even in asking a question. 1 Cor. 14:33-35; 1 Tim. 2:11, 12. Now try your hand with us on the woman question if you dare.

10. Paul says, "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Rom. 14:15. But you virtually say kick him out and send him to hell.

THE MOORE-PHILLIPS DEBATE

I attended this debate. It was held at South Charleston, W. Va. It was interesting. The subject discussed was whether Elders have the right to teach the word of God in divided classes, and whether suitable women would be permitted to teach the Bible in a class or group if selected by the Elder or Elders to do so, if in their judgment the best results can be obtained that way. Brother Ira C. Moore affirmed, and Brother J. D. Phillips denied.

Brother Moore made it plain that we now are in the discerning class, and not in the revealing class, as those brethren were at Corinth who had spiritual gifts, and that we have the privilege of using any and all approved means of discerning and helping one another to discern or understand what has been revealed in God's word, whether in classes on Sunday or any other day, and that suitable women teachers may be selected by the Elders to teach the word of God in any group the Elders assign to them. And since we now have the Bible complete, the sisters that are suitable may teach the word of God and not be under condemnation of God for teaching all she can reach the wonderful works of God. I am convinced now that sisters that stand before a group of pupils with the Bible in their hands teaching them its great truths are not doing what those Corinthian women were doing, mentioned in 1 Corinthians 14:34-36. These were evidently trying to teach the word of God without spiritual gifts to instruct or guide them. They could not have been teaching the New Testament as we have it now, because the First

Corinthian letter is a part of the New Testament as we have it, and they had not received it at the time Paul wrote it. This ought to settle the question with all that heard the discussion. It did with me.

H. F. Lucas.

Charleston, W. Va.

REMARKS

Yes, Moore asserted that 1 Cor. 14:34 and 1 Tim. 2:11-14 do not apply to women to-day and that the reason why "those Corinthian Women" were commanded to be silent and to learn in silence and not to speak" (1 Cor. 14:34) or "teach" (1 Tim. 2:11) was because "they were evidently trying to teach the word of God without spiritual gifts to instruct or guide them."

But this was an assertion without proof. And proof was furnished by Bro. Phillips to show that the assertion is not true. Women were able to prophesy (Acts 21:9) at this time, and they were commanded to teach (Titus 2:3, 4), and did teach (Acts 18:26), but they were debarred from doing this in any church assembly (1 Cor. 14:33-34; 1 Tim. 2:11-14). And this was not only unto the church at Corinth but to "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 1:2). And the apostle says if any man claims to be giving the word of God, "let him understand that what I am writing you is a command of the Lord." And he says, too, "If anyone pays no attention to it, pay no attention to him! (1 Cor. 14:37, 38) And he also says, "Did God's message start from you Corinthians?" (1 Cor. 14:36). (Goodspeed).

No, neither did it start from Ira C. Moore, and we shall not pay any attention to him when he differs from Paul's "command of the Lord." And this included the whole bunch at Corinth, men as well as women.

Yes, Moore said, "We are now in the discerning class." But this is not so, for the discerning ones had a gift of the Spirit—"another discerning of spirits." (1 Cor. 12:10) Hence it says, "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others discern." (1 Cor. 14:29) Hence Moore's reason for not having the classes and women teachers then, is no reason at all for having them now. No one is now in the discerning class. Furthermore, Moore's reason for the women not being permitted to speak then in the church is as far from that given by divine inspiration as the East is from the West. Paul says it is because Satan can more easily deceive the woman. "Let a woman learn in silence with all subjection (Gen. 3:16). But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2:11-14). This reason is established in the difference of the sex and will exist as long as there are women and men, and is for all ages. And "it is a shame," as the apostle says, for a woman to violate this command of the Lord. Hence he commands the men, who

have authority over them. (Gen. 3:16; Eph. 5:22-25; 1 Cor. 14:34); saying, "As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home: for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church."

The woman was to "learn in silence" in the church (1 Tim. 2:11), not being permitted even to ask a question, by way of speaking, there.

The apostles were all men, the evangelists were all men, and the elders (bishops, pastors, overseers) were all men. And Paul said to Timothy, "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful MEN, who shall be able to teach others also." (1 Tim. 2:2)

Yes, the elders have right to any and all APPROVED means, and this is what we demand. Where does God, not Moore or any other man or set of men, approve of organizing the church assembly into classes for teaching and women teachers in the church. And Echo answers, Where? for Moore failed to tell us where. In fact Moore admitted that he had taken "an advanced position" here, bringing the women into the assembly as teachers and preachers, and organizing this assembly into classes at the "regular hour of worship." But he had to do this to save his argument, and thus headed himself for Babylon and utter digression, as Bro. Phillips pointed out.

But if Lucas was not convinced until "now," will he tell us how he could engage in this work and encourage others to do so before this time and serve God? If I had such a conscience, I could go to the Christian church, with all its digressions, and serve God. And when Moore says that personal matters as to a brother caused us or influenced us to take a stand against these innovations, the statement is absolutely false. Our stand was taken solely for the motive of serving God in his appointed way. And we feel able to defend our ground with those who have gone "beyond the things which are written" (1 Cor. 4:6) And we pray that they may return to the Book of God for guidance before it is too late. Let us turn on the light. And now if Brother Lucas sees in the debate at South Charleston church a victory for Brother Moore on his propositions, why not have Phillips and Moore repeat it next fall at 618 Virginia street, where the church is divided into classes for teaching and women teachers are teaching, and may preach? This will, perhaps, revive that work which seems now to be languishing since the Phillips-Moore debate. And we would also suggest here that you have T. Q. Martin hold that meeting so he, too, may be converted to Moore's "advanced position." Yes, here is indeed a "home" mission, Box 1025, Charleston, W. Va. —C. H. Williams.

BOOST THE TRUTH, SEND IT TO A FRIEND,
HELP US GROW!

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, FEBRUARY 15, 1929

No. 4

COWAN-MUSGRAVE DEBATE

Debate at Elk City, Okla., is to begin Monday night, May 27, 1929, and continue four nights, two nights on each proposition.

Proposition 1.—The Scripture teaches that in observing the Communion that one cup only (one container only) is apostolic.

Bob Musgraves affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

Proposition 2.—The Scriptures teach that in observing the Communion two or more containers may be used in the distribution of the cup is apostolic.

J. N. Cowan affirms; Bob Musgrave denies.

I want to say to all who may be interested in this subject that it will be our purpose to get before the people just what the Bible teaches, and not what learned, uninspired men think about it. If I can not prove my proposition by the words of Christ and his apostles, I will gladly acknowledge my defeat. If Bro. Cowan can prove by the words of Christ and his apostles that two or more containers for the cup is Scriptural, I will never oppose a plurality of cups any more; so I mean to profit by this debate.—Bob Musgrave.

Remarks

Take proposition 1. Of course the second that should be omitted; and the word "container" adds nothing by way of clearness, for the word "cup" is not, and never was, the name of anything but a solid. I have never wanted to debate bad enough to affirm a negative proposition. It gives an opponent an advantage not deserved in an honorable debate; but of course if my opponent wants to affirm a negative proposition and writes it that way, it is all right with me.

Take out the word "only" from this proposition, and there is no issue, for Cowan admits that the use of one cup, yes, one drinking cup, is apostolic. Then if there is an issue in the proposition, it arises over the question. Is the use of more than one cup in the communion apostolic? And Musgrave affirms that it is not apostolic to use more than one cup, thus affirming a negative. And this is what "only" in his proposition does for him.

I went over this matter thoroughly with Cowan in our correspondence. I said: "A church of Christ can 'speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent,' and use drinking cups in the communion service. I have offered to deny this. And I have offered to affirm that A church of Christ can 'speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent,' and use one drinking cup in the communion service.

"You say, 'I will affirm that a church of Christ can speak etc., and use only fermented wine in communion.'

"Well, if you wish to affirm a negative proposition, I suppose there is nothing to prevent your doing so; but I will say that if you think either proposition I have stated is a negative proposition, you are mistaken. I will deny your proposition if you wish to debate it. But I think you don't want to debate anything."

He replied: "You offered to affirm that 'A church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and use one drinking cup in the communion service.' I sent the following which is on a par with the one just mentioned. Viz: 'A Church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent, and use only fermented wine in the communion service.' I know that you do not believe that we have to use fermented wine, neither do I, but we can use either, and speak where the Bible speaks, and I insist that the same may apply to the 'cup' as used by our Savior."

I replied: "You seem to have an improper conception of the word 'only' in a proposition. Others have stumbled here. Example: Take the proposition: The Holy Spirit operates in the conversion of sinners only through the word of God. I will not affirm this. I will affirm: The Holy Spirit operates in the conversion of sinners through the word of God. It is illogical to affirm a negative proposition. And it is the logical thing to do for the one who believes the Holy Spirit operates some other way in such case, to affirm it.

"I will affirm with you that A church of Christ can use one drinking cup in partaking of the Lord's supper and yet 'speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent. 'Now if you believe that a church of Christ can use cups under these circumstances, it is your logical duty to affirm it if you wish to debate the matter. But you must go down as unwilling to do so. I do not care how you word your proposition just so it covers the issue between us and mentions the Bible as the standard of proof."—Sept. & Oct., 1925.

Now, if Cowan yet believes that a proposition without such use of "only" in it, is "on a par" with one that has "only" in it, I will suggest that Musgrave omit the word "only" from his proposition, and let Cowan deny it if he dare. But I know that he dare not unless he wants to meet himself coming the other way.

And by the way, I have a proposition which Cowan and I have had on hand, signed since 1925, namely, "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat.

26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. (His wording.) And I have one signed by Johnson and me, namely, "It is scriptural to divide the cup into as many containers as are needed to wait on the audience." And if Cowan and Johnson will agree to meet me in Elk City, either before or after—or I will take one before and the other after—the debate with Masgrave, I shall be on hand to meet them in four sessions of two hours each session, on each proposition. This will make it worth while for the brethren to attend. Now let us hear from you and let us be as game as we would like for the advocates of the Sunday School to be. Speak right out.

—H. C. Harper.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

What does the Word of God require in order to proper obedience in eating the Lord's supper? We are required to eat of the bread, and drink of the fruit of the vine, discerning the Lord's body. 1 Cor. 11:25. Whoever eats in this manner, eats worthily. They that eat of the bread and drink of the fruit of the vine unworthily eat and drink damnation to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body. *Ib.*, v. 29.

Whoever says that one container only can be used without invalidating the act, adds to God's Word, and is playing with dynamite. I have eaten and drunk where one vessel only was used by the assembly; and I have eaten where two or more vessels were used; also where each one had a separate glass to drink from. In each instance I ate and drank discerning the Lord's body; therefore scripturally ate the Lord's supper. If not, let some one show one scriptural requirement I left out.

Brethren, let us quit binding where the Lord has not bound, that we be not condemned. Yours for truth only, A. J. Bond.

Endorsed

Brother Cowan has published statements that I would not meet him in debate anymore on the teaching question. The fact is he has never tried to get a debate with me since I met him at Petersburg, Texas. I am fully indorsed to meet him, and I ask you to publish this.

To Whom It May Concern: "We, the church of Christ worshipping at the Main St. church of Christ in Petersburg, Texas, here endorse Bro. Ira Lee Sanders to meet J. N. Cowan or any body else on the teaching question. (Signed E. C. Reagon, R. J. Wigley, E. B. Shankle, leaders.

Comment

If Brother Sanders will get the church where he is endorsed on this question to have the debate there some time next summer, we will arrange for Brother Phillips to meet him there. He says since reading the report of the Phillips-Moore-debate, "Phillips seems to be so well prepared to discuss the question, I am willing to discuss it with him." Now if he will sign the propositions of the Phillips-Moore-debate, we shall be glad to arrange

the time for it. We believe Phillips routed Moore, and if Sanders thinks he can route Phillips, the way is now open. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." So let the people hear it.

GOOD FOR ALL

While scanning a recent publication, a good thing for us all to study came to my notice. It related to the "habitual use" of tobacco. There is a healthy nerve cell, and there is a tobacco-damaged nerve cell. Tobacco contains nicotine, a powerful chemical with which a human being can irritate the nerve cells. And many do this just to gratify a hurtful lust of the flesh. By the use of tobacco a person commits a direct assault upon the nerve centers which constitute the bases of the mind. And the fine sensibilities are dwarfed. As a result the willpower, the conscience, and the judgment are deranged. The nerve cell of conscience being weakened, the conscience fails of its poise of selfrespect; the will being deranged, the power to resist the temptation is weakened, and the person seeks again the poison nicotine. Oh, what a slave. The whole body is soon saturated with the deadly poison, and even the perspiration is poisonous to an insect, and it is said that a wolf or a vulture coming upon the dead body of the tobacco fiend will leave it in disgust.

"If any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." 1 Cor. 3:17.

A man asked a doctor to do something for his suffering baby. The doctor said to the man, after examining the baby, quit smoking where the baby is if you want to save it. But he did not quit, and the baby was killed by the nicotine poison. And men, yes, preachers of the gospel of Christ, will poison the air of a room with their filth for others to breathe into their lungs. And they will spit and slobber their filth where others can not avoid it. Years ago it was considered ungentlemanly to smoke in the presence of ladies, but now nothing is thought of puffing a room full of smoke where ladies are. And now some women—not ladies, however, will help to poison the air that decent people must breathe. Can a man or a woman with such filth be a Christian? Can you imagine Christ with a cigarette, a cigar, or a pipe in his mouth defiling the air for others to breathe? No, you can not think such a thing—it is unthinkable. And those who engage in the filth, soon have no remorse of conscience for their misbehavior to others nor the deadening effects of the poison upon their own bodies and minds. Some can not eat a meal without a puff at a "cigarette," the nervecells call for it, and the brain almost "destroyed." Men dropping dead every day called heart disease—"Nicotine-poison." Fifty per cent, in Texas, were "rejected" for service, because of "tobacco-heart."

God said, "My people are 'destroyed' for 'lack' of 'knowledge. Notice what Paul says in 1st. Cor. 6:19-20. "What! know ye not that 'your body' is the 'temple' of the 'Holy Ghost' which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore 'glorify

God" in "your body", and in your "spirit," which are God's. Notice! when you "destroy" this "temple" in which you live, with "nicotine poison," you have "destroyed" God's property; so says Paul, so reflect on this matter before you go too far with this "idol," of which you have made the "habitual" use of tobacco.

Go with me to Paul again in 2nd Cor. 6:16 and 17. "And what agreement hath the "temple" of God" with "idols"? for ye are the "temple" of the living God; as God hath said, "I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God and they shall be my people, wherefore come out from among them, and be ye "separate" saith the Lord, and "touch not" the "unclean thing," and I will receive you."

Now go with me to Isa. 35:8. "And an "highway" shall be there, and a way, and it shall be "called" the way of "holiness," the "unclean" shall "not" pass over it, but it shall be for those: the way-faring men, though "fools," shall "not" err therein.

Notice brethren, the Prophet said, "The unclean" shall "not" pass over this "Highway" of Holiness."

A year or so ago, I was talking with one of our preaching brethren on "habitual" tobacco using, and he is very "filthy" in chewing same, so he tried to "defend" its use by quoting "It is not that which goeth in, that "defileth" the man, but that which cometh out." I replied that I would accept his argument, but that "stuff you are "spurt-ing" out "defileth" the man. He was "whipped." I was talking with another preacher brother shortly after that, and he was a "cigarette" fiend.

He tried to justify its use, by going back to the beginning of creation, where God said, "He had created all things, and pronounced them "all" good." I can take the same argument, and prove it is acceptable with God to practice "habitual" use of "strong drink" if there is anything to his argument, but God said, "No drunkard" could enter the "Kingdom of Heaven." Why not "habitually" use "strychnine" if the above be true? God created all the "herbs" that go into the making of all things used by man. I think there is a use for "all" herbs, but not for "habitual" use, or to make an "idol" of. Jesus said, "They that are whole need "not" a physician, but those that are sick." Luke 5:31.

Now hear Paul again: "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us "cleanse ourselves" from "all filthiness" of the "flesh and spirit," "perfecting" holiness" in the fear of God." 2nd. Cor. 7: 1. We have only a short time here to prepare for that "Highway of Holiness," & "remember" the "unclean" are "not" to pass over it.

This is submitted in a spirit of brotherly love, and hope it shall be received as such. W. T. Jones.

Change of Address.—Brethren writing me for the Reese tracts will please not that my address has changed from Yuma, to Somerton, Rt. 1, Arizona.—L. C. England.

"Let me say to my friends who use the organ that if you would use it as a tuning fork, let it stop before we commence to worship God, I would not open my mouth against it. If, on the other hand, the introduction and use of the tuning fork or any other fork in the service of God were such as to divide people that ought to stand together, I would say: "Away to the bottom of the Cumberland River with every tuning fork in Nashville." —N. B. Hardeman, in "Tabernacle Sermons," Vol. 2, page 278.

Good, brother! And now I would like to ask you this question: If you are so free to give up the tuning fork and condemn it if it were to "divide people that ought to stand together." why do you not do the same on other things? E. g., the "Sunday School," the "our Pastor," the "Individual Communion Set," the "Ladies' Midweek Bible Class," the "Young People's Prayer Meetings," the "Incipient Missionary Society," etc? Yes, why? Is it because you love the praise of men more than the praise of God? I think so.—J. D. Phillips.

"I favor bringing into the church of God and having a part and parcel thereof anything and everything not specifically forbidden and directly condemned."—Martin Luther, the German Reformer.

"My platform is that in the matter of worship to God and service to the Lord we will accept nothing unless the Scriptures authorize it."—Ulrich Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer.

And thus the two reformers parted company, one favoring everything in the church not expressly condemned; and the other favoring nothing except what is authorized in the Scriptures. And which was right?

Upon the same principle as that upon which Luther stood, the Papacy was conceived, developed and brought forth, and it thought "to change times and the law," Dan. 7:25, for "a time, times and a half."—1,260 years.

Upon the principle of Zwingli, Paul said, "Whosoever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord." Col. 3:17. And upon the same principle he warns us against becoming "wise above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6). And upon this principle John says, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God." 2 John 9.

And upon these principles Thomas Campbell said, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," and thus brought into existence the greatest of all reformatory movements. But such men as Errett, Sommer, Hardeman, et al, have left the principles of Paul, John Zwingli and Campbell—I say they have left these principles and have brought in many things not authorized in the Holy Scriptures, and as a result, we are badly divided. And who is to blame? Daniel Sommer says, "He that drives the wedge splits the log," and he is right.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter January 6, 1928, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1979.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year	\$1.00
Six Months	.50
Three Months	.25



LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

"CONTRIBUTION"

I can't find a hint at "contribution" referred to in the scripture cited to by Bro. Chas. F. Reese in his last effort to prove that upon a table is the place to place your contribution in the service. His citation was Lk. 22:29, 30. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my father hath appointed unto me: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Not "one word" did Christ say about "contribution" in this passage. Now lets see what we find in Mk. 12:41. "And Jesus sat over against the treasury" and beheld how the people cast into the treasury—"not upon a table"—and many that were rich "cast in"—not upon—much. Please note this text tells "how" they gave. Christ said in verse 44, "For all they did "cast in"—not upon"—of their abundance: but she of her want did "cast in"—not upon"—all that she had, even all her living. Now let's notice what Paul has to say in 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come." in 2nd. Cor. 9:7, Paul said, "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give: not grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a "cheerful giver." In Rom. 15: 26 we find, "It pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution "for the poor saints" which are at Jerusalem. In Rom. 12:13, "Distributing to the "necessity" of the saints." Again we find in Acts II: 29, "The disciples every man according to his ability, determined to send relief verse 30, which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.

Have we located a contribution upon a table? no, but in the latter quotation we find it in the hands of Barnabas and Saul to deliver to the elders which dwelt in Judea, but "Stop! Look! Listen!"

Heb. 8:5. "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for See, saith he, "that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." Now let's see Acts 7:44. "Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses

that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen." In as much as we have not found in the New Testament the exact location of the "contribution," except in the apostle's hand, let's look in the "Old." We find in 2nd Kings 12: 9, language like this: "But Jehoida the priest, took a "chest" and "bored a hole in the lid of it", and set it beside the altar, on the "right side as one cometh "into the house of the Lord" and the priests that "kept the door", put therein "all" the "money" that was brought into the "house of the Lord." See 2nd. Chron. 24:8, 9, 10, 11, 12 & 13 and see what you think. Would a receptacle in the building by the door, be in the church or kingdom? Why put your contribution upon a table, and in so doing, create the confusion the mourners bench crowd do, gathering around their mourners? Brethren, think. Let us not violate one of God's commands to obey another. Yes, by all means, God's way of doing His business, is the only way, but He did not complicate it in a way that we can't obey one of His commands without dis-obeying another, in order to do all that is commanded.

—W. T. Jones.

TROTT'S TANGLES

Our attention has just been called to an utterance in the Apostolic Way, Nov. 1, 1928, and to help "keep the record straight," we call attention to a few "crooks"—not to say crooksters—that need to be straightened out. Now read it.

Liberties

I do not wish to be over-sensitive, but when I have reason to believe that the cause of Christ is being injured I feel it incumbent upon me to speak out. I care but little for what effect may result from the actions of others of a personal nature toward me as long as they do no harm to the body of Christ. When I was young it was considered dishonorable to publish abroad what was spoken or written in private conversation or correspondence without the consent of the one quoted. Times may have so changed that this is no longer considered, unethical, but I cannot think a moral principle can be changed by custom, if it be a custom. I have had occasion to speak of this matter in connection with Bro. Warlick's attempt to cover up his lack of scriptural authority for Sunday school by an expression of mine used many years ago, in a private and confidential conversation, concerning the feelings I had undergone years prior to that and now I find that my name has been exploited again by disconnected quotations of sentences from private letters to which my consent was never asked and most certainly would never have been given. I have never said or written anything in an underhand way, nor used such methods as this under any circumstances. Brother Harper had no right to publish parts of private letters without my knowledge or consent and I do not hesitate to say so. Many would think, for instance, that "I had it in" for Brother Clark, which is certainly not true: While I differed from Brother Clark on the cup question and thought Harper got the better of him in that dis-

cussion, I have always believed that Clark was absolutely sincere. In fact, there is no one I love better, or more sincerely admire than Brother N. L. Clark. I would not fail to speak out frankly and freely concerning any error I might think he was advocating, but there would be no personal animosity aroused in me. As a matter of fact, and to keep the record straight, I will say that I once held the same view as he now avows; but when the individual cups were introduced, I saw that I was wrong and that no man could use an argument for two cups that would not justify a hundred. Notwithstanding the many revolutionary changes that have taken place of late years, I am convinced that honorable men still hold to the doctrine that public utterances or writings may be publicly referred to, but that private conversations or letters should not be made public without the consent of the author.

G. A. TROTT.

You will notice that the Doctor cares but little for what effect may result from the actions of others of a personal nature towards him as long as they do no harm to the body of Christ. So unless telling the truth will harm the body of Christ, the Doctor has no complaint coming, and if the truth was not told, he is the one that is to blame, for we let him speak for himself.

As to the Doctor's "ethics" just turn to the following dates of the Apostolic Way and you will find conversations and letters freely used, to say nothing of the interim from 1923 to 1928: May 1, 1928; June 1, 1928; July 1, 1928.

Of course, as the Doctor sees it, it is all right to use what the other fellow says when it can be made to "squeeze" the digressive Sunday School, but it is all wrong when it pinches the digressive advocates, of the cups. But digression looks all alike to me, and I have good reason to know that God looks at it this way too.

Your name has been "exploited," and what did you say to it? Nothing. Here it is in black and white: "Dr. Trott and I (R. F. Duckworth) are the only editors of the Apostolic Way.—R. F. Duckworth." (Aug. 15, 1927). "I resolved when I resigned from the Way that I would appear no more in the role of editor of any paper.—G. A. Trott." (Aug. 15, 1927.) Now talk about your "exploited" name, will you? And when the prospectus of "The Truth" was published and Showalter made mention of the paper, you, to give it a slam and to please others who had wrested the Way from me,—you, Doctor, tried to make it appear that your name was linked "editorially" with that paper, which is an absolute falsehood. (See A. W., Oct. 1, 1927). When the truth is told about you as a "writer" for "The Truth," you tried to make it appear that it was a falsehood, and when a falsehood is told "in black and white" about your name as an "editor" of the Way, you say nothing about it. And when Duckworth broke his written contract with us, and said he would refuse to "publish anything, in part or in whole" that was sent to him for publication, and you wrote both him and me that in this "he was 'wrong,'" yet you have the gall to put it out to the

public that "there was no dissatisfaction with the management of the paper." And when we were gagged, then it was that the digressive advocates of cups rejoiced and soared off to prey upon the churches. We gave you the evidence, and you mourned such work, but would not lift a hand to remove the padlock from the paper—and you know it. You put on a sweet, sweet smile, and tried to make it appear that all goes well (for fear the enemy—God bless you when the enemy was right in the camp—would get an advantage). But you would write, telling how glad you would be to meet Clark, Johnson, and Cowan in debate, saying, "nothing would please me better," but you evidently did not want them to know it, as appears from what you say about "honorable men." Such a feint at fight as you are making does not take even the grin from the face of the enemy, who now lurks hiding right in your camp, as all can see. You would as well be dead so far as routing the enemy is concerned. If you have a medium through which to express your fight for the truth and will not use it, and help us, you are a religious coward; and if you have not and lie voluntarily bound, you are a traitor to the Cause you profess to love dearer than life. We need soldiers now that will stand to their guns. This is no time for pussy-footing, or gum-shoeing; it is time to fight. We have lost ten years by the last five years cowardice of the Apostolic Way.

When it comes through the paper, it is, "Trott and I are agreed." But when the truth comes (our "ethics" is to "tell the truth and shame the devil," Doctor), it is, "With my present mind I can partake of the loaf and the fruit of the vine where more than one cup is used, but I could not defend the use of more than one. This is a very untenable position for a man to be in. Harper and Trott insist that it is wrong to use more than one cup."—R. E. Duckworth, Sept. 2, 1925. What kind of "agreement" is this? It is just like right agrees with wrong. You say, "I prefer to do what little writing I am able to do for the paper I was instrumental in starting as long as its editorial department remains faithful to the word."—12-4-'28.

Is the man who thinks it is not wrong to use "two, four six or a dozen cups," faithful to the word, Doctor? Can you cite the Word for this, Doctor? If, point it out to Duckworth, and maybe he can then "defend the use of more than one." And I should like to see it done, too, Doctor. You surely do not want us to know that Duckworth will continue in a practice he knows to be wrong. So taking the more charitable view of it, Doctor, we feel free to say that "its editorial department" does not remain "faithful to word," and does not "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice."

You say in regard your reply to Cowan's "How Is This," which we published, "What I wrote you was only intended as a private letter and not for publication. I certainly made that clear."—12-21-'28. You did not.

Listen, Doctor. We wrote you and enclosed the matter, and asked you to give us your reply to it. This you did, returning the matter with your re-

ply and also a letter in which you said, "I am enclosing a few points on the one cup. I have not referred to the more obvious ones which have been brought out time and again, but I am not sure you will find anything new in this as far as you are personally concerned."—10-23-'28.

You surely had no thought of writing it for me, then, in so far as we were "personally concerned." And since we learned through the "Tucker incident;" when Tucker "spilled the beans" at Moody, Texas, and said that Duckworth was grieved because Trott favored "The Truth" as much as he did the Way, and you, a short time thereafter, wrote us that hereafter you would confine your writings to the Apostolic Way, and that there was no personal reason for this, but that you were not able to write for both papers, and yet you did kindly find time to make a brief but effective reply to Cowan's "How Is This," and sent it to us, and now complain that we published it— we say in the face of all this that you must have been acting the hypocrite when you at first told us that you would not write for "The Truth" because you were not able to write for both papers. What else can we make out of it? You did find time to write, and we were pleased to have it, why then complain at its publication? If there is not a "Nigger in the woodpile" here, what is it?

I, too, care nothing for personal matters—it is all the same to me whether they kick me or pet me: I please God, not man. And when I see the body of Christ being torn asunder, and mangled and romped on, I am ready to meet the opposition, and that without gloves. And if there is an open division again in the body, the church, it will be because some are willing to take a human creed, written or unwritten, rather than the word of God. And this is just what Cowan attempted with the churches in New Mexico. On this matter, God has spoken: let man obey.

You say, "There will always be some brethren who need correcting and even rebuking." Perhaps so, Doctor; and we see that you are continually "correcting and rebuking" the digressive Sunday School advocates in the Apostolic Way; but your "correcting and rebuking" of the digressive cups advocates—where is it, Doctor?—"it is conspicuous by its absence." And when the muzzle was put on us by that minister of Satan, and the cups advocates began to march forth in glee to make "havock of the church," you mourned the divisive work, but not deeply enough to step out with me and remove the muzzle—and you know it, and God knows it, and you'll meet it at the Judgment. And not until "The Truth" was started, were these digressive cups advocates made aware that their work was to be sternly met with an open Bible; and they mourned its birth, as did every other digressive element in the church. And you stepped forward in the Apostolic Way to give it its first slap by telling a falsehood—that your name was connected with it as an "editor." But they asked you to do it, did they? It does not take much discernment to see that you are their "tool." Just pat some people on the back a little,

and they are ready to kiss the big toe of the pat-ter.

We opposed linking the church up with a school, be it Sunday School or College, and use the paper to boost a school—and Clark knows it, and Freeman knows it, and Martin knows it. But no sooner was Duckworth in, than he went bowing and scraping to Gunter. And now they have a real-estate project to work out and a College to boost, and what with a printing press and a secular paper and a College hurrah, the church does not stand the ghost of a show, and they use you to toot the horn and swell the high notes, for it must have enough "religion" to make the suckers bite. And when they get "politics" going grand in the county paper, Duckworth will be in his natural element"—judging the future by the past. (Come to Georgia, and see.)

And when to make the Way float without Harper, they pinned to their masthead (we care not who did it), "This Paper Founded By G. A. Trott and W. J. Rice, A.D., 1913," they floated an unmitigated falsehood. Your letters, and Bro. Rice's and the files of the paper from the first issue are in my possession.

Yes, Doctor, it is now evident that you would rather the brotherhood should lie supinely under falsehood and deception, than that the truth should be told, and that too, not because it would hurt the church (the idea that the truth should hurt the church!), but because it would puncture the wind out of the cups advocates and spoil the schemes of the famous "wind-jammer."

And if this is your element, we gladly bid you adieu as one who is of no service to the church by way of bringing about the primitive order of things, and as one too weak to discriminate between a personal thrust at your family affairs, as was that of Warlick, and that of a manifestation of the truth in matters pertaining to the church, wherein falsehood was blocking the progress of truth. And if you are not now satisfied, come again—the Way is open to you, it seems, on all matters except the "correcting and rebuking" of the cups advocates. And if you do, it may be that we can get the brotherhood waked up as to what is really going on. But I venture the guess that they will advise you this time to pursue the "let them alone, and avoid them" policy, as have the Sunday School advocates and all others devoid of the truth. Farewell.—H. C. Harper.

PUSH THE WORK

I wish to urge all to push the work of preaching the gospel, as it seems from all indications that we have only a short period in which to work—about five years. When that time expires, I look for a greater period of trouble than that of the World War, and during such times it is hard, if not impossible, to get the attention of the people to divine things. Then let us preach with all our might while the opportunity is ours. Correspondents please notice that I have changed my address from Burnet to Route one, De Leon, Texas.

—W. T. Taylor.

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

PROPOSITION: "The first day of the week is the Lord's day, the day upon which Christians are required by the Lord to meet for worship."

Jas. D. Phillips, affirms.

Albert S. Hodges, denies.

Last Affirmative:

"And when the Sabbath was passed . . . very early in the morning the first day of the week; they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun," makes it clear from the word of God that they came to the tomb on the first day of the week; and when the angel told them, "He is risen," it makes it clear that the resurrection was past (yes, past tense, if you please); and "Now when Jesus was risen early on the first day of the week," makes it clear that Jesus arose on the first day of the week. Mark 16:1-9. And John, writing in the year 96, says "Lord's day," in distinction from "Sabbath," and so, too, Christian and non-Christian writers immediately following, as I have shown, e. g., Pliny, 104; Barnabas, 120; Justin, 140; Clement, 194; Tertulian, 200.

He says he is "patiently waiting for one text to be shown where Christians were 'required' by the Lord to meet for worship on the first day of the week." I gave the approved examples of Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; Rev. 1:10, did I not? I did. And he did not meet this.

The disciples were commanded to meet for worship, yes, commanded. Heb. 10:25. They were commanded to meet on the first day of the week—yes, 'every week,' says the Greek. 1 Cor. 16:1,2. They could not obey the command without assembling, yes, assembling on the first day of the week. Then they worshipped—"exhorted," Heb. 10:25; "broke bread," Acts 20:7; had "the fellowship," the contribution, 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. Acts 2:42 says, "They continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine, and fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in the prayer," thus showing that, in the Lord's day meetings, the "fellowship" (contributions), 16:1, 2, shows that the "breaking of bread" and "the fellowship" should be observed on "the first day of the week," or the "Lord's day." Just to provoke study, meet this if you can.

"Called Christians," Acts 11:26. I have shown that the Greek *chrematizo*, means a divine call, or naming. Let him meet it to provoke a little more study. Better listen to what God says and quit your derision of the word.

I met his challenge on "type and antitype," showing that both *tipos*, type; and *antitypos*, antitype, are in the Greek New Testament; and now he juggles around the "King James Bible" as though he thinks the original Greek is incorrect. Truly, "All kinds of twisting and turning," he does here. He better get a Greek testament with that \$5.00—he needs it.

Mosheim is right: the Christians converted from Judaism abandoned entirely the Mosaic rites, as not of Christ. See Acts 15.

If what he quotes from "Dr. Isaac Wise" is correct (He gives no book nor page), Dr. Wise falsifies. Matthew was written about the year 42, and

especially for the Jewish Christians. And most of the N. T. was written before the year 70. And these Scriptures were read in the churches, e. g.; see 1 Cor. 14:37; Col. 4:16; 1 Thess. 5:27. And their faith and practice is found in the N. T. books, and not in the Old. See 1 Tim. 3:15.

Christ met with His disciples at least twice on the first day of the week. John 20, 19, 26. The disciples met on the first day of the week to "break bread," Acts 20:7. Paul met with them. He exhorts us to follow him as he followed Christ, 1 Cor. 11:1. Therefore we should meet for worship on the first day of the week. And no man can meet this.

The positive "orders" that Paul gave the Galatians and Corinthians (1 Cor. 16:1,2) to "come together" on the first day of the week should not be lightly considered.

Please re-read my first affirmative on this proposition. Mr. Hodges has not met any of my arguments. The first affirmative alone will convince truth seekers that the first day of the week is the Lord's day.

Jas. D. Phillips,

439 N. Drury,

Kansas City, Mo.

Fourth Negative

Remember there was more than one visit to the tomb, the first of these being "in the end of the Sabbath" (sunset Saturday) Math 28:1 "He is not here for He is risen."—Verse 6. The other visits followed and the testimony in each instance was: "He is risen, He is not here."—Mark 16:6.) "He is not here, but is risen."—Luke 24:6. Mary saw the place "where the body of Jesus had lain."—John 20:11. Now when Jesus WAS RISEN (past tense) early the first of the week, HE APPEARED FIRST to Mary Magdalene,—Rev. 1:10, makes no "distinction about any day but simply states a fact. To hook this on to the First day of the week is on a par with "Judas went and hanged himself" "Go thou and do likewise."

As to the "Early Fathers," we quote Adam Clark the noted commentator: "But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority; nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine their authority with me is nothing. The Word of God alone contains my creed. On a number of points I call to the Greek and Latin Fathers to know what they believed and what the people of their respective communities believed; but after all, I must return to the Word of God to know what He would have me believe. We should take heed how we quote the Fathers in proof of the doctrines of the Gospel; for he who knows them best know they blow both cold and hot." One of these "Fathers" (Barnabas, Chapter 10, says): "Neither shalt thou eat the hyena * because that creature every year changes its kind, and is sometimes male and sometimes female." This is a sample of the fanaticism that prevailed soon after the martyrdom of the Apostles.

Acts 20:7 says not one word about the com-

munion service but it was "breaking bread," which was a daily affair—a common meal together, as Acts 2:44:45 shows—their communistic custom. 1 Cor. 16:1, "Concerning the collection." "Let every one of you lay by HIM (self). Not one word about worship, but it was collections that were "required" and not worship. Rev. 1:16 has already been referred to, so this answers his main proof texts for assembling on Sunday, erroneously called the Lord's Day. It does not look like courtesy and reverence for the Son to rob the Father of the name He gave His people—Israel.—Exodus 4:27; Jere. 31:9; Rev. 2:9; 3:9. There is absolutely no authority for calling followers of Christ Christians. God never authorized, nor did Jesus sanction it. "They were called Christians first in Antioch"—by their enemies and Peter consoles them to not be ashamed of such persecution. Agrippa probably sneered when he said, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

Brother Phillips says he met my challenge about "type" and "anti-type" being in the Bible. I have not received the chapter and verse; his juggling about "tupos" and "anti-tupos" avails nothing. Cannot some of our readers come to his rescue, and not let the \$5.00 Bible go a begging? Brother Phillips makes the astounding statement that the faith and practice of God's children is found in the New Testament Books and not in the Old. Listen! "I have committed nothing against the PEOPLE OR CUSTOMS OF OUR FATHERS,"—Paul; and the Jewish brethren replied, "NEITHER ANY OF THE BRETHREN THAT CAME SHOWED OR SPAKE ANY HARM OF THEE,"—Acts 28:17-21. Dr. Mosheim (Vol. 1, Page 385) says "It was a maxim of the church that it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by that means the interests of the church might be promoted."

With the Jews crushed and Jerusalem razed to the ground and the Roman government threatening death to all who upheld the Law of God (Dan. 2:40) it was easy to see how the Church, after the martyrdom of the Apostles, injected certain teachings into their worship detrimental to the Laws of God, substituting "Lord's Day" for the Sabbath. Dan. 7:25.

"Let us inquire for the good paths of the Lord and walk therein." Jeremiah 6:16; Isaiah 8:20.

Yours for Truth and Righteousness,

ALBERT S. HODGES.

Orlando, Florida.

GOOD TRACTS

Two good tracts have recently come into my hands; one, Lecture to the Young, I consider exceptionally good. It is true to the Bible in its teaching, and I advise that it be circulated and read widely; the other is a debate between Brother W. N. Abernathy and a Mr. Parker of the Primitive Baptist church. Brother Abernathy is the author of the Lectures, which sell at fifty cents, and the debate sells at twenty-five cents. Order from W. N. Abernathy, Westport, Tenn.—W. T. Taylor, Rt. 1, De Leon, Texas.

"A man's heart must be pure when he comes to baptism. The faith that brings him to baptism purifies his heart in the bringing."—Apostolic Way, May 1, 1928, from D. Lipscomb.

This is false in toto, and there is not a man that dare to affirm it with me with an open Bible. As a matter of truth one is "in sins" before baptism until baptized. Col. 2:12,13. And one's heart is not pure while in sins and before being saved from sins. And one is not "dead to sin" until one is baptized. Rom. 6:1-II. Hence one has not a pure heart when faith leads one to baptism, but when faith carries him through baptism. Now if any man feels himself able to meet this, let him take hold of it. This paper is open to him.

ERRORS RECTIFIED

In the Christian Leader of Jan. 15, Ira Moore says that C. H. Williams and others made false statements. He says that Williams stated that Moore backed down from a written discussion with Harper on the cup question. But Williams said no such thing. But he did say that Moore backed down from a written discussion with Harper on the classes and women teachers in the church. It was to be an oral discussion with Harper on the cup question, and you did back down from meeting Harper on it, and you know it and the audience there that might know it, and there is no use for you to be acting on the double rule of twistification to try to get out of it now. You simply backed out on all the propositions Harper read to you, and you can not twist out of it now.

Moore also says that somebody told a falsehood on Reed Robinson, who debated the Sunday school at Staniford, W. Va., with Phillips before Phillips met Moore, and that they had falsified on Moore, too, in saying that they had gone Digressive. Well, if they have not gone Digressive now, they were Digressive before they went. And Moore publicly acknowledge that he had changed, and Robinson, in his debate with Phillips, held up a Sunday School Quarterly and tried his best to defend it, and he said that Moore had convinced him that the classes and women teachers were scriptural. However it seems that he has gone back on Moore since Phillips gave them both a good trouncing with the word of God.

Now brace up Ira C. and tell us what it is that ails you that makes your spine so weak in the face of open discussion. You say you have not known fear. Then what ails you. You act just like the Digressives and the sectarians do when you used to say they were afraid. Why not meet Harper on these issues and not wiggle around like a religious coward?—W. G. Terry, Maynor, W. Va.

Geo. A. Moore, Lexington, Nebr.—Enclosed is \$1.00 for "The Truth"—the paper that is not afraid to rebuke every digression and sin. This is a fine farming country and we are trying to build up a church here of Christ. I should like to hear from brethren who would like to locate where there is a good farming country. I have no land to sell and am no land agent, but I will do all I can to see brethren locate here.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MARCH 1, 1929

No. 5

BROTHER HUTSON'S PARAGRAPHS

The following paragraphs from the pen of Bro. Thaddeus Hutson appeared in the Christian Leader of May 4, 1926. Let us examine them.

1. After quoting Matt. 26:27, 28, he says: "They drank the contents of the cup and not the literal vessel."

Reply: Yes, they drank the contents of the cup, and not the contents of the cups, as you do, my brother. The master had his table set with "cup," and not cups, as some have it nowadays; and this makes it their table, and not the Master's table. And the Master commanded: "You must all drink from it."—Matt. 26:28, G. tr. "And they all drank from it."—Mk. 14:23. Bro. Hutson knows that "the literal vessel" here was the cup, and he knows that nobody ever thought they drank "the literal vessel." But this is the nearest he could come to an argument for the use of cups—just nothing at all.

2. Hutson: "The contents, Christ called 'my blood' and not the literal vessel."

Reply: "The contents" of what, brother? You have shown us in (1) above that it is the contents of "the cup." Christ never called the contents of cups "my blood." Neither can you dispense with "the cup" or substitute cups, and call it "the Lord's table," and speak the truth, for Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood."—Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:26. This should settle the matter with those with whom the word of God has any weight. You have simply done nothing to sustain the use of cups, my brother.

3. Hutson: "Therefore the fruit of the vine, and not the vessel in the communion, is the blood of the New Testament."

Reply: Jesus never said that the fruit of the vine apart from the cup on the Lord's table is the blood of the New Testament. And no "cup," no "Lord's table," no "Lord's table" no "communion." Jesus did not say: The fruit of the vine is the New Testament in my blood; he said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Your "therefore" has miscarried. You can not dispense with "the cup" (See 1 above) or substitute cups and set "the Lord's table" to save your life. Nobody can follow the Bible and do such a thing any more than he can sprinkle for baptism and follow the Bible.

4. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10:16) The vessel was not the communion of the blood; it was the wine in the cup that was the communion of the blood."

Reply: Thayer cites this passage as one containing the literal use of the word "cup." "The cup of blessing." He says, "The consecrated cup

(for that this is the meaning is evident from the explanatory adjunct) 1 Cor. 10:16." It was just as much the cup with wine in it that was the "communion" as "it was the wine in the cup that was the communion," for the fact is that neither is the communion apart from the other. And you can not use cups instead of "cup" any more than you can use water and have "the Lord's table." The more Bible you quote the more the use of cups is condemned as not of God, but of man, that is, of Satan. You can no more use the wine apart from the cup and have "the Lord's table" than the fellow Jesus called a fool could the temple from the gold or the altar from the gift.—Matt. 23:17.

5. Hutson: "The fruit of the vine (whether in four cups or four hundred is to me the communion of the blood of Christ."

Now you said it—just what every Catholic, every sectarian, and every digressive says. The priest drinks all the wine, and to him it is the communion of the blood of Christ; the sectarian sprinkles, and to him (whether a drop of water or an ocean) it is baptism. And the digressive sings (whether with the organ or without it) it is to him worship of God.

And Brother Hutson takes the cups, and to him it is the communion of the blood of Christ. And some have taken water for "the fruit of the vine, and to them it was the communion of the blood of Christ.

Bro. Hutson has twisted and dodges and fudged, but finally had to "shell down the corn"—"is to me," But is it to God, my brother? If so, how do you know? His word does not so teach you.

Now if Brother Harper only had taken hold of the Apostolic Way when Brother Teurman fell asleep in Jesus, how we might have curbed this digression. May God bless "The Truth" and all its supporters. We have spent thousands and thousands of dollars only to be linked up with a College, a real estate boom, and political machine. Let stand by the man that has ever been on the firing line against digression and stands four-square on the word of God. Why fight the Sunday school digression and stand with folded hands while another really more serious in its results is being foisted upon the churches? Some have bravely met the Sunday school digressive and then turned around and advocated another digression from the word of God. I am glad that West Virginia now stands tried on "The Truth" list, and we—yes, we have many loyal preachers and churches in West Virginia yet who have not bowed the knee to Baal—are going to make West Virginia first on the list this year if we can, and we throw out the challenge to Texas and Oklahoma to vie with us. "To the work."—Ira B. Kile.

"WHAT WE ARE DOING AT LITTLEFIELD"

Loyal Brethren Must Stay Away

John R. Freeman, President of "Littlefield College", which The Apostolic Way boosts so highly, quotes some statements from "Miss Katherine Henderson, supervisor for the High School Division of the State Department of Education," concerning the work at Littlefield. And he says:

"This statement, without comment, will in a measure inform you as to what we are doing at Littlefield."

You are right brother—it will "inform" us "in a measure" only. You did not tell us that you are debarring all sound brethren from your school, unless they will submit to be muzzled.

Bro. Chas. T. Cook, of Indiana, wrote Bro. Freeman, telling him that his son-in-law, Bro. Perry Jarred, was thinking of changing locations; and he asked him about his opportunities at Littlefield. And Bro. Cook told Bro. Freeman that Bro. Jarred "might practically agree with you unless it is on the cup question." Bro. Freeman replied in part:

"We should be glad, of course, to have all the help possible in the church. But the body here is somewhat unorganized, due to rapid inflow of people coming for school. Various commotions are liable to arise and disturb the weak ones. If your son-in-law is unchangably fixed and inclined to be contentious on the 'cup question,' I doubt if he would be of any benefit to the cause here, and he could be a serious hinderance. A few even now are somewhat offended in others because of undue agitation of this and other untaught questions."

"A hint to the wise is sufficient." And this strong "hint" of President Freeman "is sufficient" to keep all brethren of sterling worth away from "Littlefield College," if they don't want to be muzzled.

Perhaps, now, Cowan will go to Littlefield with his CREED and offer it to the brethren, as he did at Roswell, N. Mex. When brethren leave the Bible and go off after humanisms we can expect almost anything out of them. And when brethren contend for "two or more cups" to the division of a congregation of disciples of Christ, something is wrong. But this is exactly what the cups preachers are doing all over Okla. and Texas.

John says the "cup question is an "untaught question." There is some difference in John Freeman and Jesus Christ. Jesus took the cup (Greek *peterion*, "drinking vessel." Young's Any. Con.) and said, "Drink ye all out of it"—the "drinking vessel." Matt. 26:27. But you say, The cup has nothing to do with it. But you falsify in this, for "cup" means "a drinking vessel." But you may say, He did not say to drink out of a cup. But he did. The Greek reads, "He took the drinking vessel . . . and said, Drink ye all out of it."

Goodspeed translates it: "And he took the wine-cup and gave thanks, saying, Ye must all drink from it." And the Emphatic Diaglott reads "out of."

And Paul says, "The cup of blessing which we bless." 1 Cor. 16:16. Again: "And let a man prove himself and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of (Greek, *ek out of*) the cup." (Greek *peterion*, "drinking vessel."). 1 Cor. 11:28. *Peterion* here is "a drinking cup."—Thayer.

Bro. Cook truly says: "God sent the Holy Spirit to guide the Apostles into all the truth, and the Holy Spirit guided Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul to mention the cup twelve times in connection with the Lord's supper, yet Bro. Freeman says it is an untaught question."

Had Bro. Freeman been with the Lord when he instituted the Lord's supper, he could have said, "Now Jesus, you are wrong in making a taught question of this. You know we are going to establish "Littlefield College" over in Texas, and we are going to magnify your name if you will just let us have our own way about your supper. Why, you should not command us to "all drink out of the one cup—that will make it a taught question you see. You see I am John Freeman, a college president or renown, and I can tell you lots of things you need to know Jesus. (Yet, John has refused to defend the cups in debate, we are told.) If you take a drinking vessel, a wine-cup, and tell us all to "drink out of it. why, Trott, Harper, Musgrave, Reese, Phillips, King and others will have no more sense than to take you at your word; and that will just ruin Littlefield College, for some of those fellows may want to attend. And we don't all agree on it, and its agitation will ruin our College. But, now, Jesus, if you do put it that way, we will just say, It is an untaught question and tell all those old fogies who think you mean what you say to stay away unless they will submit themselves to be muzzled."

"And Paul Why Paul, you quote Jesus *verbatum*, saying, I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, This is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also he took the cup," etc. Now, Paul, you should not have done this. And to cap it all, Paul, you exhorted those Corinthians not to go beyond that which is written (1 Cor. 4:6). Paul, you should have known better than that: you should have known that such teaching would ruin Littlefield College, for some of its supporters have little enough gumption to take you and Jesus at your word. And since Jesus took one drinking cup and commanded all to drink out of it, as the Greek text reads, and you have given it your endorsement, you have just about ruined us at Littlefield. Some are already agitating this question, basing their arguments upon what you and Jesus have to say. So, I am very sorry you put it this way, Paul. Why, Paul, there is old Dr. Trott, and there is H. C. Harper—both scholarly men—and they are teaching that you and Jesus mean just what you said. And they are ready to meet Cowan, Clark, Johnson, et al., in debate. And these renowned debaters are having to back down on this proposition, and it is ruining their prestige

as debaters. Now, Paul, aren't you ashamed of yourself? But since you and Jesus have taught it as you have, all we can do at Littlefield is to teach that this is an untaught question, so good-bye, Paul. I hope you will learn better than to be guided by the Holy Spirit—you should take Cowan's creed. Cowan is a great debater, and creed-maker, and he doesn't say to follow Jesus as you do, especially by giving the very language of Jesus for church at Corinth.

I wonder what Dr. Trott and Duckworth think of Freeman's way of answering brethren who write them about the church at Littlefield and its position on the cup question? Which is of more importance—the church or Littlefield College. Do you say to let the church go, and save the College?

It is high time the brethren were awakening out of their long slumber and help us to save at least a remnant of the church from digression.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

“FIGHT THE GOOD FIGHT OF FAITH”

“The Truth” is coming now twice a month, and The Truth Fund has been showing up better than ever before, being \$49.00 in the issue of January 15th. Isn't that fine? Let all renew immediately when time is out, or give notice that you will soon do so, and not miss an issue. The enemy is being pressed as never before, and there will be important articles and notices in every issue. Another essential thing, and do not neglect it, brethren, is to send in subscriptions to the paper. Let every reader send at least one subscription a month. Let others know about the paper. Call attention to it wherever you may be. And give liberally to The Truth Fund. We have started the year fine, and let us keep ahead with the funds.

The Primitive Christian has suspended, and we shall have to work to keep “The Truth” before the people; but a “long pull, and a strong pull, and a pull all together” will do it. We propose to steer clear of all entanglements such as supporting schools, colleges, fine church houses, pastors, costly printing plants and equipment for running secular work; but press the evangelistic work, the building up of N. T. churches, strengthening the weak, and helping the needy. We expect to meet the enemy, in the church and out of the church, at every turn, and he must surrender to the truth, fight, or run. God's word is our weapon—a powerful weapon. By “it is written” Jesus put the evil one to route; and by it we conquer. On to the front. Those who can not preach can pray and help by giving, remembering the words of Christ, “It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

We feel encouraged as never before. Let truth and error grapple, and truth will win. When a paper has to be padlocked to shield the false teaching of any man “because he is on our side,” it is time to set the paper aside.

Take your stand now, and don't go off gazing into the air, and then come dragging to the front

after the battle is won with you? “Betsy and I killed the bear.” Will you stand for “Where the Bible speaks”? —“A thus saith the Lord” for your faith and practice? If not, get ready to run—we're coming, and not maybe. If we have not a “Thus saith the Lord” without fudging, for our faith and practice, we want you to give us a trouncing with the “sword of the Spirit,” and not spare us. Who is on the Lord's side?—Stand forth, every one of you. Quit you like men.—Jas. Douglas Phillips.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

“The believer who is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is scripturally baptized.” Gospel Advocate, Dec. 27, 1923.

We will deny the foregoing proposition put forth by the Gospel Advocate with any man they will indorse, in either oral or written discussion.

The truth is, they dare not come before the people with their wicked perversion of the gospel. The foregoing statement is made evidently to clear the way for receiving into our fellowship those who have been baptized because of the remission of sins, yes, as “An outward sign of an inward grace,” already secured. And the Gospel Advocate does not hesitate to pervert the gospel by omitting from the command of Christ the phrase “for the remission of sins,” or as Thayer, in his lexicon of the New Testament Greek, puts it, “to obtain the forgiveness of sins.” And the scholarship of the world tells us that the command here in Acts 2:38 includes “All the words between ‘repent’ and ‘sins’; and including those two words in the English version, “as James H. Ropes, Professor of Greek in Harvard university asserts. And any man of sense knows this is the truth. To obey this command the sinner must be baptized not only “in the name of Jesus Christ,” but also “to obtain the forgiveness of sins,” or “for the remission of sins,” which means the same thing, as the scholarship of the world agrees. Then why not each it so and practice it so, and quit pussy-footing around the sectarian camp and leading sinners to destruction? But if you just will teach it or practice it that way, why not be man enough to defend it? We stand ready to meet you. Now, affirm the proposition if you dare. And what we here say of the Gospel Advocate, we say to any other paper, to any man or set of men.

DETHRONING CHRIST

“To use it (the communion set with its cups) because man says do it is to dethrone Christ as legislator and divide the rule of Christ with “the powers that be,” and that, too, in the worship of God. I'll never do it.”—J. W. Denton.

Neither would Peter do it, brother. (See Acts 4:18, 19).

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER Publisher

Entered as second class matter January 6, 1928, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year	\$1.00
Six Months	.50
Three Months	.25



LATOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

UP FROM BABYLON

I.

In The Cradle of Sectarianism

As I take my stand upon the hilltop of retrospection and look back along the vistas of the past, seeing the winding ways taken through the labyrinth of conflicting human theories, I cannot help but thank God for bringing me from darkness to light.

If I followed the dictates of the natural man, I would keep as an eternal secret the record of my life up to now. Yes, if in that frame of mind and equipped with power to do so, I would dip the sponge of forgetfulness in the water of oblivion and wipe from the slate of memory all the past deeds of my life inscribed thereon.

But Jesus said on one occasion when the Pharisees requested Him to rebuke His disciples for praising God, "I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." (Luke 19:40) So in order that the stones may not put me to shame in praising God and, with hopes of perhaps guiding some soul now tempest-tossed on sectarian seas into a harbor which is safe from the storm, and also to give readers and supporters of "THE TRUTH" an idea of the far-reaching effects of said publication, I humbly unfold the story of my experience in and exodus from the toils of spiritual Babylon.

My childhood and early training was the best that could be expected outside that true church of which Christ is the head. Mother taught me the gospel in those tender years in the best way she knew how and according to the light she had. Father was sincere and well-meaning, never neglecting to read his Bible and pray every morning and evening. Often I have seen him rise from his knees with tear-stained cheeks. Father and mother did not believe in the sectarian churches, but they had no other light and knew not where to turn. They had little faith in the Sunday School, but when I became eligible to membership in that institution, mother said, "Well, we will let him go." Thus it was that I was placed in that cradle of sectarianism, popularly known as the Sunday School.

When twelve years of age, I was influenced to attend revival meetings conducted by a sect on the Baptist order in a city twenty miles away. Looking back over the twelve intervening years,

I can distinctly remember the nature and much of the content of that Evangelist's sermons. They were largely composed of "sob-stories" which I have lately learned were mainly of his own manufacture. There was practically no Bible teaching in them. Of course I did not then possess any powers of homiletical analysis nor of spiritual discernment, and so I was deeply impressed with his performance.

One night I was urged to "go forward." I felt it was my duty to go and there as I kneeled in front, I began crying, for I felt I was a miserable sinner. They told me that I was to ask God for forgiveness and my salvation would be completed. I had perfect faith in what they told me and so, after sobbing out a prayer, I rose from my knees and went away, confident that what they promised had happened. A few days later I was informed that I must now be baptized as an outward sign of what had already taken place within. I was soon immersed and felt happy for a time as I had implicit faith in what they taught me, but my elation was of short duration, for the wild beasts of sinful indulgence were already preparing to pounce upon me.

Oh, what a joy and blessing these thirteen intervening years could have been had I, at the time I was attending those Baptist meetings, been brought into contact with the truth as it is taught in the New Testament Scriptures. But I accepted the dogmas of men as being the Word of God and thus I was led into sectarianism from which I was a long time coming out.

Shortly after I had been immersed according to the Baptist formula, I became conscious of unrest and dissatisfaction. I prayed and prayed, but still it did not leave me, and instead of diminishing, it steadily increased. I did not then know what it was nor did I know until I procured the June issue of "THE TRUTH." I know at last after twelve long years that it was unforgiven sin.

Remarks

Yes, "The Truth" stands for the word of God: it calls attention to the word of God for man's guide, and there are many being led to the Bible way by it. This young man who had become a Presbyterian preacher had his attention called to the Word of God through the circulation of "The Truth" and came from Minnesota down to Iowa and was "baptized into Christ" by Brother King. Who will donate to the support of "The Truth" which "contends earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" in both doctrine and practice? Help us by getting up a good list and sending it in from your neighborhood. —Ed.

TRUTH FUND

Otis J. Haynes ----- \$1.00

WITH THE HARE OR HOUNDS

"Not a bird, and not a rat—
What it is, is just a bat."

Were I a cartoonist, I would draw Cowan with an anti-Sunday-school broom, together with Duckworth, Clark, and Johnson, chasing Showalter, Sommer, and Rowe from the field into their shelter through the gates marked Firm foundation, Apostolic Review, and Christian Leader, with a big lock on each gate marked "safe at last."

Then I would draw "communion table" with cups a-plenty for the "occasion," and place Cowan on Sommers' bosom; Duckworth on Showalter's bosom; Clark on Rowe's bosom, and Johnson "poring the cup into as many containers as were necessary to wait on the audience," and write above it in big letters—"ALL TOGETHER ON THE CUPS"—BUT OFF THE BIBLE.

Then I would draw Harper, Musgrave, King and Phillips, each with a big paddle marked "ONE CUP" and chasing Showalter, Sommer, Rowe, Cowan, Duckworth, Clark and Johnson over the hill into the "big woods" for shelter. And I would write above it—ALL DIGRESSION GOES THE SAME WAY.

—Evergreen.

"MY STAND"

It is very common for some to ask me, How do you stand on the use of an organ in the church or the "class work," or the use of the cups, or sect baptism, and many other things too numerous to mention here?

My answer is now and always has been to consult the word of the Lord, the teaching of the Apostles, and if they authorize the things when they are right and I stand for them, and if they do not authorize these things, they are wrong, of human origin, and should not be brought in to pollute the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

This is safe ground to occupy, and I am confident that if all preachers and churches would apply this simple rule, we would soon be one united brotherhood. Otherwise, as long as men will exalt their opinions above the inspired word of God, churches will be divided and torn asunder, for the word of God plainly tells us that such churches cannot stand. The word exhorts them to repent, and warns that if they do not do it, the candlestick will be removed.

The road that leads to eternal life is "narrow". Some, "few," will find it, and enter therein; others, "many," will take the "broad" road, and looking back will see great crowds traveling with them in the "more convenient" way made by modern preachers and leaders. Yes, the temptation is great to follow with some popular preacher or leader and be with the big crowd. These modernizers—Warlick, Duckworth, Showalter, Sommer, Allen Moore, for instance—who are not willing to test the things that come up by the word of God, but put up this excuse or that excuse for refusing to meet with an open Bible and inquire of the Lord, but close up like clams with

sh-sh, are leading away from the Bible, not to it. And in the end there will be "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

The word plainly tells us that evil men as seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. And it just as plainly says that "many" shall follow their pernicious ways. We are living in trying times, and men's souls are being tested out. Have you a conscience that can teach it "round or flat"? Have you a conscience that can let you practice it when you know it is not right? Are you afraid to stand for unity on a "Thus saith the Lord?" Brethren, let us watch and pray that we may not be led into the error of the wicked. Let a "Thus saith the Lord" be your guide. If you preach it, have the courage to defend it. If you teach it, let the whole world know why you teach it thus and so. And let the word of Jehovah be an end of all controversy. The unity that Christ prayed for is the unity of the Spirit, and the unity of the Spirit is unity on the word of God. And every Christian is in duty bound to endeavor to keep this unity.—Otis J. Haynes.

THE NEW BIRTH

John 3:5: "Except (unless) a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

To be born of a substance one must be begotten in and quickened in the substance or subject of which it is to be born; hence one must be begotten and quickened in water and the Spirit before one can be born of water and the Spirit. Water is the medium employed by the Holy Spirit in the new birth otherwise it would be a birth of the Spirit only; and if it be a birth of the Spirit only, one would have to go into the Spirit and then come out of it, which would mean to go into God and Christ and then come out of them. (Continued) —C. A. Crutchfield, Alabama City, Ala.

DAY APPEARING

In Heb. 10:25 what day is it that is said to be appearing (drawing near)? Some say it is the first day of the week; some say it is the judgment Day; and some say it is both days. The Bible says day, not days. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more as you see the day approaching." We meet and exhort one another in view of the Judgment Day? so it seems to me that we, the Lord's people, are to prepare thus to meet God in peace at the Judgment Day. Dear reader, there is a day coming in which all are to be judged and I fear that some will not be prepared? Will that day come to you and overtake you as a thief in the night and unprepared. May God help us all to be prepared to stand uncondemned. With best wishes for the new year. I am old and may not see many days yet. "Prepare to meet thy God," said the old prophet. I am watching and praying and exhorting and waiting for my change, with the full assurance from God's blessed word that "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."—Jackson Howton, Brownwood, Texas.

HOBBIES—HOBBIES

The church is being torn asunder over hobbies. The most recent hobby is the "Communion hobby." We have those who are publicly preaching that we can not commune scripturally without using the "Individual communion set." How smart (?) some men are! The "Individual communion set" was not known until a few years past. I suppose no one had ever communed only in a dangerous unscriptural way until very recent years. Of course God and the Holy Spirit knew it was dangerous to drink from one or two "cups," but said nothing about it—just let the danger run on for hundreds of years. Then when God wanted the "Individual cups" used, He had the legislative bodies to enact the law to compel us to use said cups. Thus ignoring Christ as head of His church.

Christ is God's sole—only legislator, lawmaker and law giver for the church of God.

But Paul says: "Be subject to the higher power . . . for they are ordained of God." We pay tribute, tax, to support our government—not to enact laws to control our worship—(God did that thru Christ) but to restrain the passions and acts of evil ones, and meet out proper punishment to them. Has God permitted man or any set of men to enact laws for the church of Christ, and endowed them with power to punish (a law without a penalty is a nullity) when the church violates said law? Of course I speak of things pertaining to the worship. If so, then we serve two masters religiously instead of one.

How can our constitution grant to all, "religious liberty" and at the same time permit men to enact laws to control the religious acts of worship and make it compulsory or be punished, after church is tried before our courts? Why did not Paul submit to the powers that be while at Philippi? The charge was "That these men teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe being Romans." Paul was teaching customs ordained of God. The Roman's customs were ordained of men. Paul did not submit to the "powers that be" in things pertaining to Christ and his government, for God does not permit man to legislate for the Kingdom of Christ. God permits man to legislate in regard to earthly governments, but never for the Kingdom of Christ.

To permit man to legislate for the Kingdom of Christ is dividing the rule of the Kingdom of Christ—hence Christ is "head over all things to the church."—Eph. 1:23.

Besides, that is uniting church and state in religious matters, such teaching is Roman Catholicism, the very essence of it! As a citizen of this government I pay tax to uphold the government in controlling the evil passions of men.

As a citizen of God's government, and in worship of God, I submit to no authority except as revealed through Christ, my Captain, Priest and King. I'll never ignore Christ my leader, my Savior by permitting men to say how I am to worship the Father through him. For "no man can come unto the Father" but by Him.

Dethrone Christ as legislator and divide the rule of Christ with the "powers that be," and that too in the worship of God. I'll never do it.

Yes, some men are awful smart to the hurt of the church, its peace and harmony.

(G. G., 1925)

—J. W. DENTON.

MOORE AGAINST PAUL

Paul:—"Let your women keep silence in the churches . . . for it is a shame for a woman (any woman, whether single, married or a widow. Thayer) to speak in the church." (1 Cor. 14: 34, 35). "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man, but to be in silence." Why, Paul? "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2: 11-14).

Ira C. Moore: "The possession of a spiritual gift would carry with it the right to use that gift. The Spirit would not work against himself by forbidding the exercise of one of his gifts. This forces the conclusion that gifts were not bestowed upon the women and that this lack of spiritual gifts is what made it 'shameful for a woman to speak in the church' and 'permitted them not' to speak."—Christian Leader, June 24, 1924.

Now, we have Moore against Paul, for Paul gives one reason why the women were to keep silence in the churches, even to "learning in silence", while Brother Moore gives another. Who are you going to believe, Moore or Paul? Here are two great men and they disagree. One says for the women to keep silence in the churches, giving as a reason, that "it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church" and "Adam was first formed, then Eve," and the other one giving as a reason, that "the women did not have spiritual gifts." Paul was an inspired man. He ought to have known why the women were to keep silent in the churches, for he is the one that gave the command. And he did know, for he tells us why. I am sorry Bro. Moore is not willing to take Paul at his word. But instead of doing this, he assumes something that the context does not teach nor even suggest. It is enough for any God-fearing woman to take Paul at his word (for he wrote as the Spirit guided his pen) regardless of what Brother Moore or any one else says.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

"To make a law where God has made none is as sinful as it is to transgress the law God has made."—Creacy, in P. C., Oct. 4, 1928.

Yes, and that is the reason we object to your Sunday-School law—God never made it, but man did, and those who follow it make void the law of God by their tradition. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," and to speak where God has not spoken is sinful, and we should learn "not to go beyond the things which are written," my brother. But you of "the Primitive Christian, the Gospel Advocate, et al, "type, like the digres-

sives No. 1, find "a broad field where God has not spoken" in which to roam as you please, and hence you are leading them a close race on many innovations. But we do not propose to follow you, for Jesus says, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." Hence we do not follow men: to do so would be to "think of men above that which is written." 1 Cor. 4:6.

You truly say, "Errorists don't like to be disturbed—they want to be let alone!" If you think you are not one, we ask you to meet us in oral or written discussion on the differences between us religiously, with the Bible as the Book of proof, and "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Now, will you do it, like a "man," and quit your mud-slinging? Will you? Just say the word now, brother.

QUERIES

1. Harmonize 1 Jno. 1:8 and 3:9—W. T. J.

The "Nocolaitans" (Rev. 2:6) in the time of John taught that man could reach a state in this life of sinless perfection and that no matter what he did it was no sin. Hence John exhorts that the child of God confess his sins that they may be forgiven, and not be deceived by such teaching and die in his sins. In 3:9, the apostle shows that the child of God finds in the "seed" (the word of God—Lk. 8:11) a safe guide, hence he is exhorted to let it dwell in him richly. Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:18. And he can not sin so long as this word guides his course; but he can reject this word or be ignorant of it, and take the word of another or his own course, and go into sin, as John shows in 1:8. In which case he must go to God in confession for forgiveness. Jno. 1:9.

1. Harmonize 1 Jno. 1:8 and 3:9.—W. T. J.

The "Nocolaitans" (Rev. 2:6) in the time of John taught that man could reach a state in this life of sinless perfection and that no matter what he did was no sin. Hence John exhorts that the child of God confess his sins that they may be forgiven, and not be deceived by such teaching and die in his sins. In 3:9, the apostle shows that the child of God finds in the "seed" (the word of God—Lk. 8:11) a safe guide, hence he is exhorted to let it dwell in him richly. Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:18. And he can not sin so long as this word guides his course; but he can reject this word or be ignorant of it, and take the word of another or his own course, and go into sin, as John shows in 1:8. In which case he must go to God in confession for forgiveness. Jno. 1:9.

CHRIST, THE SEED

If Christ was David's seed at all, his lineage must come on the natural line; for it cannot be traced on the line of Joseph's predecessors—and there is no other line than these two—and Paul says plainly: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead" (II Tim. 2:8.) And Peter affirmed that God had sworn with an oath to David "that of the fruit of his

loins he would raise up Christ" (Acts 2:30.) Joseph (by marriage only) was the son of Heli (Luke 3:23) and on this line Christ is traced back to David: for Joseph was begotten by Jacob (Matt. 1:16), and not by Heli; so Heli was Mary's father—Joseph's father by marriage—so we trace Jesus back through Heli, the father of Mary.

ONE THOUSAND NEW SUBSCRIBERS

If the friends of THE TRUTH will just put forth a little effort among their friends, in behalf of the paper, this number and more may be obtained very easily. You will not only help the publisher to give us a better paper, publish more frequently, help bear the financial burden, but you will be influential in benefiting those who read the pages of the paper. Let every subscriber of the paper act now, and send in one or more subs., and the work is done. Perhaps, all who are now taking the paper could afford to donate the paper to a friend or two, and thereby do some very much needed mission work.

Remember, brethren, that the object of publishing THE TRUTH is to aid in the complete restoration of primitive Christianity, which was begun by the Campbells about a century ago. It is the desire and prayer of the publisher and writers to see the Church of Christ freed from all humanisms and innovations that are now sapping the lifeblood from that blessed institution, purchased by our blest Redeemer's own blood, and to see it shine forth in all of its splendor, grandeur and glory of a "city set on a hill." Why fight one innovation and advocate others just as serious and far from the truth? Brother, can you afford to stand idly by, and see some of our so-called "loyal brethren" force their unauthorized innovations into the Church of Christ? What are you doing to stay the tide of digression?

One of the saddest things and most difficult, for me to understand, is to see the very same brethren, who fought so valiantly and faithfully, in ridding the church of one innovation, take the lead in advocating others, even to the division of the body. Oh, shall we never be able to see our inconsistency and awful blunders!

So far as I know, THE TRUTH is the only paper that has opened its columns to the exposition of all false teachings and practices. Others are open to the exposition of some, but closed to others. So, why delay? Act now.

Brotherly,

HOMER L. KING.

ZERR TRIES HIS HAND

E. M. Zerr, 141 Redding Drive, New Castle, Ind., query man of the Apostolic Review ("a viewing again (re) of the teaching of the apostles of Jesus Christ" they say), published at Indianapolis, Indiana, tries his hand on the use of cups in the communion. Read it.

P. E. O.—You have need of Abraham. Years ago there were hundreds of people drinking from one cup. Sickness and sin was here in time

of Jesus same as now. (Answer)—This is culled from a lengthy letter, but the amount of it is the inquirer is advocating only one cup in the Communion. This would mean that if there was a congregation of 500 members all should drink out of the same vessel. The very silliness of this is sufficient to defeat it, if nothing else. Suppose we do ignore the question of disease, yet the matter of sanitation would still remain. Paul commands to do all things decently and in order. It would not be decent for 500 people to drink from one cup, even if it were possible. How des he know several drank from one cup? This is his assertion without proof. In trying to be straight some folks make themselves into a parallel with the Indian's tree:

Remarks

He does not take even a "squint" at the teaching of the apostles of Jesus Christ on the subject, much less "a viewing again" of their teaching. Better rename the old paper again, calling it by its proper name, "Devil" Review, not "Apostolic" Review, unless they intend hereafter to give what "the apostles of Jesus Christ" say, and not what man says on the matter—"disease"—"sanitation"—"Indian's tree". Where is the sectarian or the digressive that cannot prove (?) his practice by just such stuff. It is just this stuff (the commandments and doctrines of men—Col. 2:21, 22) that supports baby sprinkling, the priest drinking all the wine, the organ in the worship, —yes, every false doctrine and innovation that has cursed the church of the Lord. The Devil has not put forth a plea in modern times for perverting the communion that has not been used in the past in deflecting the church of Christ to produce "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."—Rev. 17:5.

"Would not be decent," says the digressive Zerr, on the communion; would not be decent, chimes in Tucker, in trying to meet the scriptural arguments on "The Form of Baptism." Just read it: "However immersion may seem to those who are accustomed to it, there is nothing solemn or religiously impressive in it in itself; and many good people will not go themselves nor permit their children to go to witness it as a spectacle, because of the impulse to other emotions than reverence."—The Form of Baptism, p. 207. And so immersion as well as the communion goes by the board, on the same ground, when the Devil has his say in "the commandments and doctrines of men," and the word of the Lord is ignored. (If you do not think the Devil is behind this work of discrediting the word of the Lord, just read—"then cometh the Devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.")

"Too difficult." Yes, the Devil has worked on this line, too. Again we quote Tucker in The Form of Baptism—"And that result, when attained and carried into practice—what does it accomplish but to make an ordinance of the Lord difficult in all cases and impossible in others." And immersion must go together with "the cup of

the Lord" at the behest of the Devil and the setting at naught the word of the Lord.

Right to change it. Clark said: (See Harper-Clark Debate, sec. aff.): "You translate ek 'out of' (v. 26); make the pronoun 'it' refer to the 'cup' (container), and draw the conclusion that Jesus designed to command all the disciples in any assembly till the end of time to drink from the same cup." I replied: "Brother Clark, unless he is going with the Pope, must admit that the commands and approved examples of the New Testament are for us to follow 'till He comes."

Clark stepped right out on Papal and sectarian ground. See here: "Rites and customs are altered; therefore men do not think that apostolic practice doth bind."—Bishop Stillingfleet (The Form of Baptist, p. 255) Again: "The change which has taken place in regard to baptism should not surprise us; for, although the church is but the dispenser of the sacraments which her divine spouse instituted, she rightly exercises a discretionary power as to the manner of their administration."—Bishop Kendrick, Ib. Yes, and take this from the Presbyterian Board of Publication: "Suppose I admit that Jesus was plunged would that prove that no other mode is valid. By no means. We know, for example, exactly how another ordinance, equally important and divine, was administered by Jesus and the Apostles—the Lord's supper. Do you mean to tell me that unless all partake of the supper after the pattern set by our Savior and followed by the Apostles, it is invalid? None now administer the supper as the pattern was set at the beginning. Then how do you prove that the pattern is to be followed in the case and may be ignored in the other?"

And there you go—on to Babylon.

But, says Zerr, "Paul commands to do all things decently and in order." Yes, and the affusionist uses this scripture for the same purpose that you do—to cover up your disobedience to God. And we say to you as we say to him, that the same apostle says, "If any man thinks himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14:37. And Bible precepts and examples are not to be set aside. You may call the doings of the "silliness," as both you and the affusionists do, or you may call them "indecent," as they do, or you may say they are "unsanitary," as they do, or you may call them "inconvenient," as they do. And still I say with Paul, "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

And now to test the matter out before the brotherhood, I will affirm with any man the Review will put up and run the discussion in "The Truth" in six articles each of not more than 800 words to the article, That a church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent, and use one drinking cup in the communion. Or if the Review man wants to lead and will omit "one" from the proposition and add "s" to the word "cup," I will deny it.

If this is not fair, what will be fair?— H. C. Harper.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MARCH 15, 1929

NO. 6

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that man is wholly mortal.

ALBERT S. HODGES Affirms

JAS. DOUGLAS PHILLIPS Denies.

In discussing this subject I take man as he came from the plastic hands of God at Creation and as he is now in his natural state and not what he will be tomorrow or a thousand years hence. I believe man is destined to be immortal, like his Maker in character, and that **IN THE FLESH**. The Breath of Life, the Spirit of God, are attributes of God toward man to animate his sentient being like steam to an engine. The natural or mortal man inhaling the breath of Life is capable of directing his ways—thinking, choosing and deciding problems coming before him, God **REVEALING** to man the course he should follow to develop in his nature the characteristics of his Maker. The Scriptures depended on to prove this proposition are: "God who quickeneth all things, (mortal man included) * * **WHO ONLY HATH IMMORTALITY.**"—1st Tim. 6:13-16. As a matter of fact those to whom the Father imparts immortality have it and are immortal, as we all hope to be. But we are discussing man as he is **NOW**, and not at some future date.

The godly of past ages understood this. The theory of natural immortality is of more modern origin and did not come from God. Good King Asa, a man who had power with God, cried in his prayer (2nd Chronicles 14-11) "Let not mortal man prevail against Thee." Eliphaz's testimony: "Shall mortal man be more pure than his Maker?"—Job 4:16.)

Paul in Romans 6:12: "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies." Then again in Chapter 8:11: "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken your **MORTAL BODIES** (and make them immortal.)

Then again in 1st Cor. 15:53: "This mortal (man) shall **PUT ON IMMORTALITY.**" There would be no sense nor logic in talking of **PUTTING ON** immortality if it was inherent with man.

Our hope is like Paul's: "That we may be **CLOTHED UPON** that **MORTALITY** (of man) may be swallowed up of Life."—2nd Cor. 5:4.

At Creation God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," and suiting actions to His words, they took clay and fashioned an image of themselves, and on its completion the Lord God the Chief One drew near and **BREATHED INTO** this image's nostrils and Presto! a change, this clay image is transformed into a "living soul," whereas it was lifeless prior to this breath imparted by the Divine Creator.

The very statement concerning the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," is sufficient evidence that man in his nature was mortal.

It is a most interesting and thrilling study to look at the works of God and see how man starts with a body of clay and ends with a glorious immortal body qualified for association with his Creator.

All flesh where not preserved by the Spirit and Breath of God is like the grass and flowers of the fields that fades and withers and rots when cut off from its life-sustaining Spirit of God that animates creation. The very first action of this life-giving Spirit is given in the second verse of the Bible: "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

The Spirit of God fills the universe and when it is withdrawn from any plant or animal death and decay takes place. Stop man's respiration, breathing God's breath and in a few minutes he is dead; and vice versa, the dead come to life when this breath is restored. We quote the Lord: "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live."—Ezekiel 37:9.

"If He (God) set his heart upon man, if He gather unto Himself His Spirit and His breath; all flesh shall perish together and man shall turn again to dust."—Job 34:15. Proving man is wholly mortal.

Albert S. Hodges

Orlando, Florida.

First Negative

It is Bro. Hodges' duty to define the terms of his proposition—the Rules of Debate require it. "Mortal" means "subject to death." And man was not subject to death when he came "from the plastic hands of God." Proof: "The sting of death is sin."—1 Cor. 15:46. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."—Rom. 5:12. "Wholly" means "entirely, totally." Man's "body" is mortal. Proof: "your mortal body"—"your mortal bodies."—Rom. 6:12; 8:11. "Our mortal flesh."—2 Cor. 4:11. But it takes more than a "body" to constitute "man." Proof: "And fear not them that kill the body"—the "body" is subject to death, being "mortal"—"but are not able to kill the soul."—Matt. 10:28. Therefore man is not wholly mortal. Only the body of man is mortal (Rom. 6:12; 8:11; 2 Cor. 4:11), and only the "body" dies (Matt. 10:28), and only the "body" will be resurrected—"with what body do they come?"—1 Cor. 15:35. "It (the body) is sown in corruption; it (the body) is raised in incorruption . . . it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."—1 Cor. 15:42,43. Then, it is sown a natural, corruptible body; it is raised a

spiritual, incorruptible body. And in the resurrection, when "mortality is swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. 5:4), the body lives again. But the spirit has never been dead. Matt. 10:28; Jas. 2:26; Rev. 6:9-11. No other argument is needed to show that Bro. Hodge's materialistic, "wholly mortal" theory is wrong. It was taught by the Sadducees, and Christ said to them "Ye do err."—Matt. 22:29.

His quotation from Job (4:16) proves nothing for his theory—it is the "body" that is referred to as "mortal man," as we have shown from the Bible, and he has used no Scripture that shows any more of man to be "mortal," and I venture the assertion that he can not do it. A brute has a body," but a brute is not "man." The brute "inhales breath," but that does not name it man. There is something yet that man has that a brute has not, and Jesus calls it "the soul" (Matt. 10:28) and since man cannot "kill" it, it has life, and is not subject to death, hence not mortal.

Yes, "Man shall turn again to dust," his body is mortal (Rom. 6:12) and can be killed (Matt. 10:28), and will be resurrected a "spiritual body" in "incorruption."—1 Cor. 15:42, 43. But man "can not kill the soul," hence man is not wholly mortal, mortality pertains just to his body.

"Winds . . . breathe." It takes more than air to bring the dead to life (John 5). Winds have blown over many battlefields, but the dead remained dead, the body was dead apart from the "spirit" (Jas. 2:26), and the spirit is not wind. 1 Cor. 2:11.

James says, "The body apart from the spirit is dead" (Jas. 2:26), and Peter says, "In that which is incorruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit," which he calls "the hidden man of the heart."—1 Pet. 3:4. Jesus said in His death, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."—Luke 23:46. "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."—Acts 7:60. Just the "breath," was it? No, for Paul says, "having the desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far, far better, yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."—Phil. 1:23, 24. And Jesus said, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Luke 23:43. "The time of my departure is at hand" (2 Tim. 4:6)—"To depart and be with Christ."—Phil. 1:23.

And Peter says, "After my departure." 2 Pet. 1:15. And Paul again tells us, "Knowing that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. . . . We are . . . willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord."—2 Cor. 5:6-9. "The garments which Dorcas made, while she was yet with them."—Acts 9:29. Dorcas' body was there yet, but she was not there—her spirit had departed (Jas. 2:26) and was not dead (Matt. 10:28), but was yet alive (Rev. 6:9-11). Hence, man is not wholly mortal, and the Scriptures he uses do not teach it.

Jas. D. Phillips,
439 N. Drury Ave.,
Kansas City, Mo.

"CHRISTIAN WORKER" ADVOCATES THE CLASSES"

It seems to have been the policy of the above paper to steer clear of taking any open stand on the "class system" question, but it seems from a recent issue of the paper that the editor has decided to allow the "class" advocates to promulgate their false teaching through its columns. Why not give both sides of the question, Bro. Moore? That would give your readers a chance to learn the truth on the question.

In the December 13th. issue of the Worker Bro. W. Curtis Porter comes out for the "classes." He begins by the following statement:

"Whenever God commands a man to do a thing and gives instructions as to how the thing is to be done, man, in order to be faithful, must not only do what God has said, but must do it in the manner prescribed."

That's fine, Bro. Porter, but just apply this to the question of teaching, and see what becomes of your man-made system of teaching. But he says that the Lord has not legislated as to how the teaching should be done, and cites the commission as proof, reasoning that in as much as the Lord just said "teach," but didn't say how, we are left free to use a way of our own. There might be some consolation for Bro. Porter in the commission, if that were all that is said about the subject of teaching, but "it is written again". Let us see, Christ told the Apostles that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth. Certainly it guided them into the best possible way of teaching the Word of God, when there were so few to carry the message to the entire world. Did it guide them into the "class system"? It did not. What then? In every instance they spoke one at a time to the undivided assembly, and so did the Savior before them. Was it effective? It certainly was. There has never been a time when the Gospel made greater progress than in the days of the Apostles. But not only is the example to speak one at a time to the undivided assembly, but the Lord has commanded it. See 1 Cor. 14:31-33. The question is, are we willing to do as the Bible directs? But the denominations about us have the Sunday school, and it appears that a great number of our brethren are determined, as Israel of old, to be like the other nations about them.

Bro. Porter will, I believe, agree that for one to speak at a time to the undivided assembly is scriptural and, therefore, safe, or unquestionable. Then why practice a thing that is questionable, to say the least, when you can practice that which all agree to be safe? As Bro. Rue Porter, in the same issue of the Worker, said, "Who can possibly call in question the position of one who refuses all man-made systems and does everything in religious matters just as it is written." No one, I am certain. But Rue was talking about the other fellow when he asked that question, for I am informed that he, too, advocates the "class system" of teaching. Better give up the man-made systems, Curtis and Rue, and do "everything in re-

ligious matters just as it is written." How can we consistently oppose man-made system among the denominations, and at the same time practice and advocate the same ourselves? May these brethren have the courage to give up the man-made systems, and to come out boldly for the Bible way of doing things, is my power.

—Homer L. King,
Lebanon, Mo.

"QUARTETTES"

Under the above caption, Sister Joe S. Warlick has some fine things to say in the *Gospel Guide*, for Jan., 1929. The *Guide*, as many of our readers know, is in favor of the Sunday School and many other modern innovations. What a sharp rebuke this ought to be to those of the "loyal" brethren—those who oppose the Sunday School—who have these "quartettes." I know of some congregations that have them occasionally. These "quartettes" not only debar those who are not the very best singers in the church from singing, but it tends to other departures from "that which is written." I see but little, if any, difference in the principle of this "quartette" or "special song" business and the choir. In fact, there is no difference.

Among other good things Sister Warlick says is this: "Quartettes are a form of entertainment in the church, borrowed from our sectarian neighbors. Quartettes give opportunity for self glory and aggrandizement in the church when God wants all the glory; hence has arranged his worship so simple that not a chance is left for man's glory. The quartette singers, when performing, say to the other members who do not, and often cannot, thus perform, but who go to church to worship, to be quiet. That is what I am told each time I am present at church, when the quartette is engaged in. I can sing and like to sing but like many others, would never be asked to sing in quartettes, even though it were known that I was in favor of them, because they always call on those present having the best voices. This shows a spirit of preference; whereas, 'There is no respect of persons with God.'"

But we are sometimes told that Paul authorized solo singing in 1 Cor. 14:26, and that if it is right to sing solos it is right to sing quartettes. But Paul did not authorize solo singing in the passage mentioned. Read the Living Oracles translation, and you will see that Paul is condemning such a procedure. Then read Col. 3:16 and Eph. 5:19 and you will see that Paul enjoins congregational singing. And when John saw the 144,000 redeemed out of Israel (Rev. 14) he says "and they sang as it were a new song," thus showing that they all sang—not a "quartette" nor a "solo." And when John described the restoration of Primitive Christianity, and the seven last plagues following the restoration,—the plagues to be poured out on the surviving enemies of the church, he says,

"And I saw a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that came off victorious from the Beast, and from his image, and from the number of his name, standing by the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb." (Rev. 15:2, 3).

There is absolutely no authority for what is called "the special song" and there is no authority for solo singing. And I am glad that some of the papers that led out in the Sunday School movement have arisen to shame some of the brethren who oppose the Sunday School and at the same time favor the "solos", the "quartettes," the mis-named "special song," etc.

The "special song," falsely so-called, is offensive to many of the brethren. And it is pleasing only to the worldly-minded. Paul says, "If eating meat cause a brother to offend, I will eat no meat as long as the world stands." And again, "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." See Rom. 14. And Christ says, "For it must needs be that offences come, but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh!" Matt. 18:7. "Offence" here is from the Greek skandalon, meaning "a stumbling block." Young. So let us be careful, brethren, lest we offend good brethren and cause them to stumble.

Again Sister Warlick says: "The congregations seem more spiritually-minded where the "special songs" are not in use; hence I have yet to find wherein they have proved helpful. But a step toward digression. Then I would have as much right as they do, for quartettes, to ask to have arranged a musical program, like the sects do; and then a choir, having, of course, a few congregational songs. They all do that.

"Better stay with the simplicity of the gospel way, not hindering another in worship he or she came out to render, thus making our way as sure as we can."

If this "special song" business is not stopped among the "loyal" brethren, it, like D. A. Sommer says of the "pastor", will soon be "paving the way for another Christian church." When will the brethren ever learn to let digression alone?

This is not written to "gouge" any one, but it is written as a voice of warning to some brethren the author loves dearly.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

HIT 'EM AGIN, DOC

"I am convinced that honorable men still hold to the doctrine that public utterances or writings may be publicly referred to, but that private conversations or letters should not be made public without the consent of the author."—G. A. Trott, A. W., Nov. 1, 1928.

"The foregoing letter was not written for publication, but the sentiments therein are so splendid, suggestions so pertinent, that we feel that our readers will appreciate it."—R. F. Duckworth, A. W., July 1, 1928.

Hit him again, Doctor. And we have more of it.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00



LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

HARPER CHALLENGES-TROTT

I challenge Doctor Trott to affirm in debate with me to be published in "The Way" and "The Truth," in articles of such number and length as he may stipulate with me, the following proposition: A church of Christ in its use of cups in the Communion is "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice."

Or if he considers the College church at Littlefield, Texas, as one "of more than a thousand churches that reject all doctrines and commands of men and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice," I will deny the following proposition:

The church of Christ meeting at the College in Littlefield, Texas, in its use of cups in the Communion "rejects all doctrines and commands of men and contends earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice."

It is a well known fact that when a church can not be manipulated in a town to suit a digressive set that invariably follows up a College that it is an easy matter to get what they want by way of digression to establish a church at the College. It has been done time, and time, and time again.

And it is a well known fact that the church at Littlefield were using one cup in the Communion before the College was established there and that they still use one cup. And it is well known that the ones that went to the College put in the cups there. And it is just as well known that there is a well laid plan by the College element to control the old congregation and turn it in the way of digression by putting over it a set of Elders to "Lord it over the congregation and "bring them to time."

Now you will have to reject the College Church at Littlefield, Texas, as one "of more than a thousand churches that reject all doctrines and commands of men and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice," or you will have to defend them—or run!

Now take your choice; but if you will allow me a guess, it is that you will "run" just as the Sunday School digressives do. And I will say more: If "The Way" refuses to publish the debate, we

will run it in "The Truth" alone. And I repeat what Duckworth says to the digressive Ramsey: "Just smile and face the issue. We are ready, what do you say?"—H. C. Harper.

"A faithful witness will not lie; but a false witness will utter lies."—(R. F. D. in A. W., Mch. 1, 1929) True; just see.

"Dr. Trott and I are the only editors of the Apostolic Way."—R. F. Duckworth, in letter to Tom E. Smith, Aug. 15, 1927.

"I resolved when I resigned from the Way that I would appear no more in the role of editor of any paper."—G. A. Trott, in letter to H. C. Harper, Aug. 15, 1927. Who is the "faithful witness" and who is the liar, here? "Some will deliberately misrepresent us"—your foot! Boosting the Way, eh?

"The Apostolic Way is the only periodical that has in recent years carried a debate of that (cup) question through its columns. We have had two debates on the question and many articles on both sides."—A. W., Mch. 1, 1929.

Yes, Harper cleaned up Clark, and Stark cleaned up Howard. Now if you let Dr. Trott clean up Cowan, who, "as the old saying goes," he thinks "has got too big for his breeches," it will be just fine. Then we will be convinced that you are not like Showalter, et al, who "manage to convince themselves that it is more advisable to keep such discussions out of their periodicals." You would not publish the Clark-Harper discussion until you saw the brethren raising money to have it printed without the Way, which you had padlocked.

"However, I understand that Bros. Harper and Cowan are going to discuss this (the cup question) in the Truth, so perhaps we will both learn more about it by reading their effort."—G. A. Trott.

We wrote Cowan (2-24-'29), telling him we would forego the oral debate if he will do this. Otherwise, I expect them both to meet me at Elk City before or after the Cowan-Musgrave debate, both Cowan and Johnson.

E. V. Hilfield, Center Point, Oreg.—No congregation when we located here. Now have 30 to 45 each Lord's day. One baptism, one from Christian Church, one from Seventh Day Adventists. Expect more to obey the gospel soon. We use one cup in communion and oppose all innovations on the Bible way. P. O. order for three subs enclosed.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—(Cowan says he has word from a friend at Elk City that Musgrave did not consult the church about having the debate there, but M. says: "I signed propositions with J. N. Cowan to debate the cup, and I had to name the place, so I went to see the Elders at Elk City, and they said have it at Elk City and at Berlin, if Berlin will, and if they will not have it at Berlin, we want it at Elk anyway." (Jan. 14, 1929) —Ed.

EDITORIAL VIEWS AND REVIEWS

By Ira C. Moore.

The Individual Communion Cups

In the Leader for Dec. 9 may be found a copy of the law of West Virginia relative to the individual communion cups. It is plain that the law requires churches to use the individual cups—one for each participant at the Lord's Supper. This makes a few observations on the scripturalness or unscripturalness of this arrangement necessary. True disciples of Christ will follow the teachings of the Holy Spirit, rather than a law of man, where the latter requires a violation of the former; and if to adopt the individual communion cups and use them is to violate the teachings of the Scriptures in any particular, we would advise that it is still true that "We should obey God rather than to hearken unto men." (Acts 4: 19). If the law of West Virginia requires the individual cups (and it does unequivocally) then one of three things follows: (1) Each congregation must adopt the individual cup; or, (2) Cease to have the Lord's Supper; or, (3) Be violators of the law and possibly be apprehended and imprisoned.

Let us study the subject impartially for a time to ascertain, if possible, if to adopt the individual cups is a violation of divine law or any principle in it. 1. We can learn nothing about the number of vessels to be used, or that may be used in the communion, from the fact that it is said that Jesus "took a cup or the cup and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye, all of it" (Matt. 26: 27); for all concede that it was not the vessel containing the fruit of the vine that he "blessed" and told the disciples to "drink"; but that it was the contents of the vessel. The contents of the "cup" was the significant emblem, not the vessel. Then we can conclude that there is no significance in any number of cups or vessels.

2. The wine has to be divided among the participants some time by some one or by all the participants themselves, either before it reaches them or after. In the use of the single cup for a deacon, the participants themselves take part in the dividing; but in the use of the individual cups, the wine is divided by one for the many. If there is any significance attached in who divides it, one or all, then it is important that we ascertain who is to do the dividing. If there is anything to indicate that there is any significance attached to who does the dividing, it has escaped my notice. In Paul's discussion of the communion in 1 Cor. 11: 25, as well as in the teaching of the Lord himself, the significance is attached to the eating and drinking and not to the dividing. According to Paul in 1 Cor. 11:27-30, it does make a difference who eats and drinks of these emblems; but if dividing the fruit of the vine has any significance, it does not appear. It is true that Jesus gave instruction to the disciples when they were eating the passover, before the Lord's Supper was instituted, when he gave them the wine and said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves" (Luke 22:17). This would seem to favor the single

cup, if there is any significance attached to dividing the wine of the Lord's Supper. As no importance is attached to who does the dividing, nor to the dividing itself, my conclusion, contrary to my former views on the question, is that it violates no Scripture example or principle for one member to do all the dividing of the wine into as many parts as there are members present, before it is taken to the participants, provided, of course, that, as the Saviour did, thanks are offered for the wine before it is divided.

3. In nearly every congregation there are at least two deacons called to wait on the congregation; and usually after thanks are offered for the wine, it is divided by the one "officiating at the table" into two cups for the convenience of the deacons, and I have seen it divided into six or eight where the crowd was large, as at an annual or mass meeting. On the same principle that this is done the wine may be divided into as many cups as there are persons present to partake of the Lord's Supper, and no principle is violated, if we follow the Lord's example and give thanks for the fruit of the vine before the division is made. So therefore churches can adopt the individual communion cups and do no violence whatever to divine law, and comply with the law of the state at the same time.

Let every one who reads this and thinks of taking up his pen to find fault or to provoke an argument, calmly sit down and think these things over for a time first. While I prefer the old way—the use of only one or two cups—my study of the principle and customs involved has led me to the conclusion stated in this "view," and I advise the churches in West Virginia confidently that they can adopt the individual communion cups with no fear of departing from the teaching and principles of the New Testament in doing so. It is dangerous and very wrong to do anything just for style. So do not adopt them for style.

The foregoing article appeared in the Christian Leader for Jan. 6, 1925.

We shall let F. L. Rowe answer the "view" advocated by Moore. This "view" advocated by Moore was advocated fifteen years before by the Digressive "Christian Standard", and Rowe replied to it then, so we shall let his reply to the Digressive Standard now apply to the Digressive Leader. He says in the Leader, issue 1910:

More Inconsistency

The Christian Standard, in its issue of May 4, 1910, publishes an article by W. P. Keeler, on the individual communion cup question that is certainly most astonishing in its statement, which is evidently indorsed by The Standard, as they offer no editorial criticism of the same article. Mr. Keeler states that when the question came up in the Englewood church, Chicago, whether or not they should adopt the individual communion cups, there was a division of sentiment among the members. And the matter was left to a "vote by ballot" resulting in the ratio of about seven favoring to one opposing the change.

The next question was how to satisfy the feelings of the minority, who desired to continue the use of the "common cup." It was finally arranged that on each tray should be placed a large (common) cup, thus permitting those who preferred the "common cup" to drink out of the same cup, while those who preferred the individual cups could be served from the same tray.

The Standard writer thinks this a very happy solution of a perplexing question, and freely commends their course to other churches where the issue is forced upon them.

We now call attention to The Standard's inconsistency again. They have been most intolerable in their criticism of the Hyde Park church and others that have expressed a willingness to admit members to the congregation who had not been immersed, in which position The Standard is, of course, scripturally correct. But now, in the case of the communion service, they virtually sanction it, knowing the apostolic practice and teaching of the Scriptures and they encourage each member to exercise his own will or act from personal choice.

Immersion is right, or it is wrong; sprinkling is right, or it is wrong; and the individual cup is right, or it is wrong. And it should require no more time for The Standard to decide the question of scriptural deportment in the use of the individual cup than it took them to decide the unscriptural course in receiving the unimmersed.

The manner of participating in the Lord's supper is stated in Holy Writ just as plainly as is the "mode" of baptism. And after the very pronounced stand taken by Prof. McGarvey on this very question, we are astonished that The Standard would permit an article like this one by Keeler to appear unrebuked.

This is not a matter of opinion nor a matter of expediency. It is a matter of scriptural fact and the Standard has proven indifferent to its opportunity to rebuke something that is at entire variance with scriptural precedent.—F. L. Rowe, in *Christian Leader*, 1910.

Now if the Standard was Digressive in 1910, the Leader was in 1925, and it has not changed for the better, but for the worse, since 1925.

Truly, "The manner of participating in the Lord's supper is stated in Holy Writ just as plainly as is the 'mode' of baptism." And "This is not a matter of opinion nor a matter of expediency. It is a matter of fact." And the Leader has gone Digressive with the Standard, and Ira C. Moore has led the way, and the churches have followed these "pernicious ways," "2 Pet. 2:2, caring nothing for 'Holy Writ' and 'scriptural fact.'"

"I advise . . . "Look at the audacity of the big "I". The Bell-Wether scents no danger and leads on the herd. "I advise the churches in West Virginia confidently that they can adopt the individual communion cups with no fear of departing from the teaching and principles of New Testament in doing so."

If ever a Pope assumed more to himself as a leader in religion, it is not recorded; no, not even of the one who confidently advised sprinkling for baptism. For as Rowe has truly said the Bible is, as plain in the one case as in the other.

"Be violators of the law and possibly be apprehended and imprisoned." And what of it since "True disciples of Christ will follow the teachings of the Holy Spirit, rather than a law of man." And why hold up the "law of man" as a bugaboo to induce the flock to follow you away from the Word of God when you knew and have so said that such a law can not be enforced. Then why mention it? Why stress it? And why not back up your advice to the churches to take up the individual cups? You are not do it? You have in your own town, Charleston, backed down from defending such a practice as scriptural. Where is your grit now. Where is that big "I"? You are a pretty leader of the flock, yes, flocks, "the churches of West Virginia." Your very actions in the matter stamp you DIGRESSIVE. And you dare not, it seems for you have had a chance, attempt to remove your brand.

You once said, "Submitting to the authority of Christ and ignoring all other will bring about the keeping of the ordinances as they were delivered by Christ and his apostles."

This is true, and as long as there are those who will stay with the "authority of Christ" and others that will follow the advice of man, be he Pope or just a big "I", there will be division in the ranks.

You pretend to have made an impartial study of the subject, but if your study has not been superficial it is different from your writings on the subject; and if you are sure of your ground, why play the baby and not stand up and defend it? Yes, why? And echo answers, Why?

If "We can learn nothing about the number of vessels to be used," from the Scriptures, why do you say, "No principle is violated, if we follow the Lord's example and give thanks for the fruit of the vine before the division is made"?

A "principle is violated," then, if more than one cup contains the fruit of the vine during the giving of thanks. Where did you learn this about the use of one cup if not in the "Scriptures"? If "There is no signification in any number of cups or vessels," as you say, why have one at the giving of thanks? Is it to follow God's way, or is it just to suit Moore? Jesus "took a cup." You surely know "a," one, from two. And we can learn this from the Scriptures, too.

"The contents of the 'cup' was the significant emblem, not the vessel," you say. But it is "the cup," and not cups, and it then takes the "cup," not cups, to make it the significant emblem, granting for argument's sake what you say.

The Bible says, "This cup is the New Testament," so it seems that "cup" does signify something, and that, too, a very important thing.

Yes, the liquid, the fruit of the vine, is to be "shared" or divided among them as it was in the "cup." Obeying the Master, "They all drank from it," for he said, "All drink from it." The contents of the cup was not poured into other cups,

neither before nor after thanks for the cup. And if there is no significance to be attached to obeying a divine command, we can sprinkle for baptism. You are simply rattled. And because there is significance attached to the eating and drinking is no reason why there is not significance attached to other matters connected with the communion—one cup during the giving of thanks, as you point out to us. And it does make a difference whether we obey the Lord or not.

If you mean by "dividing the fruit of the vine" pouring it from one cup into others, there certainly is no significance attached to it in the Word of God any more than there is significance attached to sprinkling for baptism, for it is not mentioned in the Word of God. And if it signifies anything, it signifies damnation, for it is man's teaching (Col. 2:21, 22), not God's.

You have "seen it divided into six or eight." Yes, and others have seen the priest drink all of it. And one man's way is as good as another—if not, why not?—Ira B. Kile, Sistrerville, W. Va.

BELTHASOR HUEBMAIER

The following is a copy of a letter which was written to Mr. Albert Spence, pastor of the 1st. Baptist church at Samson, Ala., and of which I did not receive any reply. I will say, that I have heard Mr. Spence preach, and know him to be a man of ability as a preacher in the church which he represents.

Kinston, Ala., 3—15—28.

Mr. Albert Spence,
Samson, Ala.

Dear Sir:—

In looking over the Baptist Enlister (3—10—28.) I notice something (Page 3) that it seems to me, to be misleading. Of course this was from the Sunday School board, but it seems that you should not have let it go through your paper without correction, as it may mislead some.

Commenting on the death of Huemaur and wife, they say: "On March 10, 1528, four hundred years ago, Belthasor Huebmaier, leader with Luther, Calvin and Zwingli of the Protestant Reformation, was burned at the stake in Vienna by Catholic state authorities because of his steadfast devotion to the truth of the gospel as understood by Baptist.

"This was the price these Baptist ancestors were willing to pay for their evangelical faith."

Now, Mr. Spence, Baptists of today would not recognize one of Huebmaier's faith and practice as being a Baptist—Would not let such an one eat the Lord's supper with them, because Huebmaier did not believe nor practice immersion. And: "There can, according to the Scriptures, be no visible church without baptism."—Church Manual, Pendleton, Page 12.

Again: "Immersion is so exclusively the baptismal act, that without it there is no baptism."—Church Manual, Page 64.

Now listen to Mr. Vedder: "Hubmaier both practiced and taught affusion."—Church History Handbook, Book IV, Vedder Page 14.

The facts are, Mr. Spence, (And Baptists should know the facts) that there were no Baptist churches previous to the 16th century. The first Baptist church that we have any history of, is dated from A.D. 1608. And these so-called Baptists practiced affusion. See History Handbook, Book IV Page 21, Vedder.

The first Baptist church in America is dated from 1644. Neither Holliman nor Williams was baptized according to Baptist doctrine, being not baptized by a regular ordained Baptist Minister. See, History Handbook IV Page 54.

I am only desiring truth, Mr. Spence, as all should know the truth, and if I am wrong, would be glad you would let me know. Would be glad to have a personal letter from you.

Yours for truth,
W.H.Reynolds.

FORTY REASONS WHY CHRISTIANS SHOULD NOT DANCE

By Walter H. Jones

1. Dancing church members are called hypocrites.
2. It brings shame on the church and Christ.
3. Three-fourths of the fallen girls in America were ruined by the dance, according to the testimony of dance experts.
4. If dancing didn't hurt me it might cause some weaker one to be lost.
5. Dancing Christians make the poorest church workers.
6. Thousands of young people have chosen the dance in preference to Christ.
7. Dancing is contrary to the spirit of the whole Bible.
8. The dance is the only place where the vilest of men can embrace the purest of girls in the closest familiarity with the approval of society.
9. Dancing is the only amusement that depends solely upon the mingling of sexes for its existence. Separate the sexes and the dance would die in a few minutes.
10. The dance has been more harmful to the church than the saloon.
11. There are no soul winning dancing Christians.
12. I couldn't pray at a dance—could you?
13. I wouldn't enjoy reading my Bible at a dance—would you?
14. I couldn't speak to any one at a dance about Christ—could you?
15. The girl with the most modesty makes the poorest dancer, and vice versa.
16. No young man will go through the motions of the modern dance very long without impure thoughts.
17. I would be miserable if I knew God was watching me at a dance.
18. Dancing destroys a Christian's influence and usefulness.
19. I can't think of one good reason why a Christian should dance.

20. Dancing would not be tolerated in a preacher of the Gospel and what is wrong for a preacher is wrong for any other Christian.

21. Thousands of men have used the dance as the surest and best way to trap a girl.

22. Dancing arouses the worst passions in man.

23. The girl who dances cheapens herself in the eyes of the best people.

24. Dancing is at least a doubtful indulgence and anything doubtful is dangerous to a Christian.

25. Dancing dulls and deadens the spiritual life of a Christian.

26. Dancing is the favorite pastime of the underworld.

27. A man can embrace a girl while the orchestra plays, but couldn't do so when the orchestra stopped. What is wrong without music is certainly wrong with music.

28. The Roman Catholic confessional reveals the fact that nineteen out of twenty of their girls who go wrong attribute it to the dance.

29. Dancing has been used as the last but successful means of ruining girls.

30. Dancing has a secret language by which a man can learn if the girl in his arms is pure or not without a word being spoken.

31. Dancing has created a condition in the public schools that is almost as bad as the white slave traffic.

32. The greatest attraction of the dance is the embrace and would be permitted nowhere else in decent society.

33. If a man embraces his neighbor's wife in the modern dance attitude any place where there was no music he would very likely get shot.

34. I wouldn't dance because Christ wouldn't. Would He?

35. Christians cannot dance and keep themselves unspotted from the world. (Jas. 1:27).

36. Christians cannot dance and abstain from the appearance of evil. (1 Thess. 5:22).

37. Christians cannot dance and not love the world for dancing is of the world. (1 Jno. 2:15-16).

38. Christians cannot dance and still deny themselves ungodliness and worldly lusts. (Titus 2:11-12).

39. Dancing is forbidden in 1 Cor. 10:7. See reference in Exodus 32:6-19.

40. I wouldn't want to die dancing. Would you?

Remarks

The above appeared in the Nov. 15, 1928 issue of the Peoples Bible Advocate, and I think it worth passing on to the readers of The Truth.

To my mind, the Church to-day is very much in need of such lessons. Especially, is this true of the congregations in the cities and towns in the West, and occasionally we see a young member in some of the Eastern congregations that talks and acts as if he thought there was no harm in the dance. True and devoted Christians never talk and act that way, for they know there is harm in the dance, and I might add, the picture shows, pool rooms, card tables, swimming pools (mixed),

ball games, and etc. A whole hearted devotion to God and Christ will lead us away from these worldly amusements. See Jas. 1:27., and 1 Jno. 2:15, 16. Christian friends, read your Bibles and pray to God daily, and a love for the world with its allurments will pass from you.

Homer L. King.

"DIVIDE IT AMONG YOURSELVES"

"And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, take this and divide it among yourselves."—Lk. 22:17. Or "share it among you," as the Living Oracles, the Bible Union, Goodspeed, and others have it. The "cups" advocates try to kid themselves and others into believing that this Scripture proves the practice of the use of cups in the communion, while the truth is, it is one of the strongest passages in the Bible against their practice.

To whom did Jesus give this command? "The twelve apostles."—v. 14. There are some things here that it does not take a Solomon to see. It was not "divided," or "shared," when he gave it to them, for they were to do this "among" themselves after he gave it to them, therefore a unit. Jesus was the administrator in this case. This is too plain to need comment. Does this fit their practice? No. To fit their practice the Lord would have commanded one of them to pour it into another cup or cups, in part, for them. And then commanded to drink them, and not "it." But we do know how they "shared it," or "divided it," for Mark says, "And they all drank of it."—Mk. 14:23. And this is just what Jesus commanded them to do in sharing it among themselves, for Jesus commanded, "Drink ye all of it."—Matt. 26:27. And this fits our practice exactly, "thereby fulfilling every requirement; and we know we have obeyed the Lord as did his apostles, and as Paul gave it from the Lord for the churches. 1 Cor. 10 and 11. They all took part in that "sharing, or dividing it." It was common, a communion then.—J. S. Bedengfield, Lorenzo, Texas.

J. W. Fenter, Jacksboro, Texas.—"The Truth" is the only outstanding paper in the brotherhood for the New Testament order of things. When others are not on both sides of the fence, they are on the fence, trying to bick from both sides. I'm glad we've found the man with a backbone and not a yellow streak. Find \$8.00 enclosed, and when you need more, let us know.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—In March I will go to Roswell, N. Mex., for two meetings; one at L. F. D., and one at Greenfield. Then to Somerton, Ariz., and from there to El Centro, Calif.

The Truth Fund

A. W. Fenter	-----	\$8.00
Ed Swindler	-----	1.00

THE TRUTH is growing. Help us carry on the good work by lending us your co-operation and support.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, APRIL 1, 1929

NO. 7

NAIL HIT ON HEAD

Brother Ludlam, in the A. W. Mch. 1, 1929, quotes Srygley, of the Gospel Advocate, as follows: "The New Testament furnishes a word for every thing which is in the New Testament; and if a church has anything to-day for which there is no New Testament word, it has something which is not in the New Testament."

This hits the nail on the head: it is God's truth. Now let Cowan or any other man affirm: That a church can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and use cups in the communion.

Any one who has read the New Testament knows that there is not a word in it in connection with the communion for cups. And since the Lord has given us a perfect guide-book and forbids our adding to it or taking from it, what right has Cowan or any other man to introduce a practice to the division of the church and offend his brethren? It has not a Bible word for it. He has simply gone the way of the Sunday School perverters of the word of God.

The Lord gives us precept and example as to when and how to observe this, and these exclude all others, Cowan, Freeman, Clark, and Johnson being off the Bible here.

Some argue for cups because it is more convenient; but I proclaim that is not all—it is also an addition to God's word. Hence it is sinful and should not be practiced, but if it is, how can such expect to escape the plagues of God?—Rev. 22:18.

All can see that the use of cups is rebellion against the authority of Christ. Just before our Savior ascended, he said, All authority is given unto me in heaven and on earth." He was crowned King of kings, and Lord of lords; angels, principalities and authorities being made subject unto him. From the throne in the skies the Holy Spirit was sent to the apostles to guide them into all truth and to establish and guide the church upon earth as the Lord wanted it to be. By inspired men the New Testament was written to be the guide-book to the church, being profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work. And this, too, throughout all ages. And for this Faith, we are to contend earnestly.

It is in the New Testament that we find the church of Christ faithfully portrayed in its teaching and practice, and to the New Testament we must go for our guidance in work and worship and that, too, without adding to or taking from it. Paul gives us a good thought that is timely just now. He says, "I fear lest by any means, as the

serpent beguiled Eve through his subtility, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."—2 Cor. 11:3.

The use of more than one cup in the observance of the Lord's death is a plain departure from that which is written, just as much so as is the Sunday School; yes, a departure from the simple worship in which Paul and others engaged, and hence it is to be feared as from the wiles of the serpent, and must be rejected by all good, honest Christians. On innovations Paul wrote: "Though we or an angel from heaven preach unto you any other gospel, let him be accursed—(Gal. 1:8, 9. Yes, and he said the same of "any man."

This is a timely warning for those who claim to take a Thus saith Jehovah for their faith and practice. We are not law-makers in the church or kingdom of Christ. Christ is our King, and we should be humble, obedient citizens. We are Christ's subjects. We must seek his ways and walk therein. He that adds to God's eternal truth does so against the authority of Christ and actually wrests from Christ the glory which alone belongs to him as the only law-giver in the church or kingdom of heaven.

I see no way to effect a unity and still use one cup and also cups unless the editor of the Apostolic Way can teach us how to engage in a religious practice that we know can not be defended by the Bible and yet not defile our conscience. He should furnish the prescription or the recipe, which ever it may be, so that all may get it filled, and not keep such a good thing to himself. He surely didn't get it from Dr. Trott.

—Otis J. Haynes.

THE CALIFORNIA WORK

I came to California at the urgent request of brethren in the State, wanting me to work in this part of the country. The brethren expect to keep me in the field while they support me. We hope to make it possible for all isolated brethren in the State to have the Gospel preached to them if they see a chance to build up the cause in their community.

To do this work successfully, we must have the co-operation of all faithful Christians in the State. I hope all who see this will write me, giving me their address and the address of all other Christians you know of in the State. Do this now, please.

The brethren at Los Angeles, Montabello and Long Beach will have fellowship in this work. And we hope to find others who will help.

I am preaching each evening this week to large and interested audiences at the Siskiyou Street

meeting house, Los Angeles. I expect to go from here to Montabella, Pomona and Long Beach. Other brethren wanting me to visit them should write me at once.

The brethren supporting me in this work are opposed to both the Sunday School and the cups. I rejoiced when I learned of their loyalty.

Later

I am now in a fine meeting at Montebello, Calif., with eight baptized, one to be baptized tonight, and others expected soon. Some from the Christian church are coming all the time and seem to be extremely interested. Some sectarians have expressed themselves as being thoroughly convinced. The meeting will continue all this week, and very likely all of next week. Any brethren in California, wanting a meeting, write me. Remember, if you are isolated from the church and want a meeting in your community, and are not able to support it, the Montebello and Los Angeles congregation will support it. So write me.

—Jas. D. Phillips, 8127 Walnut Drive, Los Angeles, California.

“And from your reply I see that you are determined to have your unauthorized ‘Sunday School’ (your term) at the cost of the unity of the body of Christ.”—President Freeman of Littlefield College to President Baxter of Abilene Christian College, A. W., July 1, 1928.

And from your attitude at the College Church at Littlefield I see that you are determined to have your unauthorized CUPS (your term, for it is not found in the Bible in connection with the Communion) at the cost of the unity of the body of Christ. “Let us hope and pray that we may yet be united upon the one basis of Christian Unity—the Bible,” which authorized one CUP in the communion. —Ed.

THOUGHTS FOR WISE THINKERS

Hardness of heart and blindness of mind are often found to a great extent in the disciples of Christ.

Those who think some other course would be better than that of Christ takes, savor not the things which be of God, but those which be of man.

If men would be owned by Christ in the day of judgment, they must now be governed by His Will—must not be afraid nor ashamed to acknowledge him before men, and must perseveringly obey his commands.

The way to be great in the kingdom of Christ is open to all; and all who take this way and perseveringly pursue it, will obtain the prize.

Those who hope to be great in the kingdom of Christ by being exalted to worldly authority and power will be sadly disappointed: their seeking greatness by such means shows that they are governed by the spirit of the world, and not by the spirit of Christ.

It is not enough that man follow the dictates of his conscience in religion. His mind must be enlightened as to the Will of God; and when he understands that Will, he must be disposed to do it, or his conscience will not be a safe guide.

The knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ is as important to men as is their eternal salvation; hence it is the duty of those who have this knowledge to aid in imparting it to the people.

There is a great difference between the spirit of the world and the spirit of Christ; one leads us to seek chief good in earthly things, the other to seek it in learning, and doing the Will of God.

Increasing the union of views, affections and efforts among the disciples of Christ will furnish increasing evidence of divine excellence of his religion, and will lead to increasing numbers to embrace it.

“MONEY-MAD RELIGION”

Floydada Conference

Amount to be raised for the College, \$75,000.00; amount raised, \$4,000.00. Copeland: “We are supposed to give all that we have and are to the church. I am willing for my family to sacrifice our milch cows for the school. I want to say to the Board everything I have is at your disposal to keep the school from going down.”

Comment: So unless the church and the school be the same institution, the school gets the lion's share—yes, worse than that, the school gets it all, and the institution for the salvation of man and for which the Christ died, is not in it at all with the school. “Great is Diana” of the plains: she has eclipsed the church, the pillar and ground of the truth.

Johnson: “Some congregations wouldn't be alive in ten years if this school dies.”

Comment: So shell out the money to the school, the life-giver of “some congregations.” It is evident that the College, like the Sunday-school, has to be nursed and fed on the lap of the church to live; but the “some congregations” that can not live without the College would better be dead, else the apostles should have ben led by inspiration to found Colleges to keep “some congregations” alive. Did Diana come down from heaven?

Duckworth: “The congregations all over the United States will be hurt if this school fails. . . . There never has been a time that any work of the church of Christ has attracted the world as has the building of this school.”

Comment: “The world” is a big place, brother. Aren't you “blowing” a bit here? And is “the church of Christ” really making itself felt by building “this school?” Do you mean that you are going to saddle the building of “this school” on the church of Christ? Now, talk about the “Money-Mad Religion” of the “Baptist Campaign Drive,” will you! You have no room to talk now. The whole thing is rotten from start to finish.

Watkins: “I'll boost the College all I can in my meetings.”

Comment: Why not have the churches observe "College Day?" Drive, drive, drive. Money, money, money—for the College. Bleed the life-blood out of the church and let the lost go to torment.
—An Observer.

WALKING IN THE LIGHT

This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is Light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth. But if we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin."—Jno. 1:5-7.

And Paul says, Eph. 5:8: "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye Light in the Lord: walk as children of Light."

Where is the Light, that we may walk in it? "Thy Word is a lamp to my feet and a Light to my path."—Ps. 119:105. "The entrance of thy Word giveth Light, and it giveth understanding to the simple."—Ps. 119:130.

Now hear Paul: "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 that believe not, lest the Light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them: for God, who commanded the Light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts to give the Light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."—2 Cor. 4:3-6.

These Scriptures teach us that Light comes from the Word of God, and when we walk by the Word of God, we walk by the Light. And if we do not walk by the word of God, we walk in darkness.

In this age all know that we need good lights on our cars to prevent our running into the darkness, where we will meet with a wreck. Paul says that those who will not take the Gospel as the Lord gave it as their Light, are in darkness and their minds are blinded by this darkness. Satan blinds people by keeping the Gospel from them. And we also need strong lights on our cars to prevent our being blinded by opposing lights that we may meet. And since Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light and his ministers into ministers of righteousness, we need the strong Light of the Gospel to prevent the opposing lights from blinding our spiritual eyes. Nothing but the Word of God will overpower the false lights of Satan and his ministers.—Heb. 4:12.

There is no true reason why Christians should be in darkness on any Bible subject pertaining to life and godliness. But if people will not be guided by the word of God, in other words, will not walk in the Light, the Light will not do them any good. I have heard some say that they were undecided on the music question; some on the Sunday School question; some on the cup question; some on the divorce and adultery question. Why be undecided? Why not take the Word of God, and walk in the Light? When you see some like the F. F. refusing to consider openly the S. S. question, you

may know that they are not wanting to walk in the Light, for they are afraid that their deeds will be made manifest, or like the Apostolic Way, refuse to open to the "cup question" as well as to the S. S. question. You can easily see where they stand by reading John 3:19-21. "Men love darkness rather than Light, because their deeds are evil."

They may close their papers to an honest investigation of vital issues; that may play shut-mouth for policy's sake to get a little more money; yes, they may keep the truth, the Light, from the people for a season, but even Rome had her day, and so will these: the light will come, and let all true Christians work and pray that it soon may break upon the people and that the nightmare of delusion may be shaken off, that they may see where they are going before it is too late. It is astonishing how easily some people can be fooled into things. Christ said "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The Jews could not realize that they were in bondage under deceptive religious teaching. And here it goes again: Money-Money-Money—scheme-scheme, and scheme to get it. Yes "Money-Mad religion. And they wax worse and worse. And the "money barrel" has no bottom, but still they blindly toss in the—not dimes, not pennies, but "thousands". And what for? The church? No, it gets the pennies of such people: it is some "scheme" that has a financial fascination—it is like some sectarian "drive." And that brethren drive like dumb brutes.—Tom. E. Smith.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIVING

I'd rather have one little rose
From the garden of my son
Than to have the choicest flowers
When my stay on earth is done.

I'd rather have the kindest words
Which may now be said to me
Than to be flattered when I'm gone
And life has ceased to be.

I'd rather have a loving smile
From friends I know are true
Than tears shed round my casket
When I've bid this world adieu.

Bring me all your flowers to-day,
Whether pink or white or red;
I'd rather have one blossom now
Than a truck-load when I'm dead.
—From Dad to Sonnie Sam, with love.
(N. D. Frye, Shelburn, Indiana).

THE TRUTH FUND

J. A. Bond	-----	\$1.00
Otis J. Haynes	-----	1.00
Ira B. Kile	-----	1.00
W. W. Musgrave	-----	1.00
Chas. T. Cook	-----	7.00

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00



LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

AS IT NOW STANDS

Hatchel, Texas, 3-4-'29

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Fla.

Dear Brother:

Yours of 2-24-'29, reached me at Oklahoma, City. I have not received the one you wrote to Robstown yet.

In reply beg to state that I do not know who informed Brother Trott that I had decided to discuss the container question in the paper called "The Truth." I certainly have not given out such information. I do not care to give the paper the prestige that such discussion would give it, and besides, when we need another discussion through the papers, The A. W. is the proper medium for such discussion. It has not been a great while since we had a discussion in the Apostolic Way on the cup question.

I did say, as you well know, that I was ready to meet you or any one else in public oral debate on the question where there was contention over the question, and where your adherents would put you up. This I am still ready to do, notwithstanding the fact that you are advertising me in your paper as running from debate.

There is not a man in the brotherhood whom I had rather meet than Brother Trott, for I love him dearly, and know that we could discuss the question in brotherly love. And when we think this question should be discussed through the paper, the Apostolic Way, we will do so.

I desire to compliment you in being able to collect enough private correspondence, parts of which you have published, to make filling for your paper.

If you fear the results of the debate with Musgrave, probably you should take his place at Elk city. Yours in Christ, J. N. Cowan.

Remarks

So long as these things concern the brotherhood, they should know what is going on, and we shall continue to give them through the paper, and Cowan and his dupes may howl all they wish.

He will not discuss the question through "The Truth," which is open to him, and he knows that Duckworth will protect him from a debate through The Way by keeping it padlocked. So he is safe—as safe as ever was any S. S. Advocate through the F. F.

Trott has said time and again, as I have shown, that he is ready to meet Cowan "at any time" in a written debate, and all can see that C. is not only running, but is also dodging "to beat the band" to keep out of such a debate, and he has been at it since 1925, when he signed his name to a proposition to meet me. He has put up one subterfuge after another to keep from debate.

He does not want to "give The Truth that much prestige," he says. And this is just the dodge of Nichol to keep out of debate. What is to hinder our publishing the debate in "The Truth" if it ever appears in The Way? Will they copywrite it to keep it from the brotherhood? Time will answer.

But C. is ready to meet us in oral public debate—maybe. Just read and see.

Hatchel, Texas, 3-11-'29.

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Fla.

Dear Brother:

Yours of the 25 Ult, received and noted. In this you express a desire to meet me in debate at Elk City either before or after the debate with Musgrave. I cannot exactly understand why you want to debate at this time and place. If you were to meet me before I met Musgrave, I would think you were jealous of the notoriety Musgrave was getting and you wanted to beat him to it. If you met me after the debate with him, I would think you were not satisfied with his effort and wanted to patch it up. If you met Johnson either before or after the debate with Musgrave, I would think that you thought you and Johnson could do a better job than Musgrave and I.

If those who stand with me are satisfied with my debating in the bout with Musgrave, I can see no good reason for another debate at that time and place. The only thing that would cause me to consider another debate at that time and place would be for those who stand with Musgrave to say they were not satisfied with his work, and that they desired to put you in his place. Or, to put you in his place to start with, which would eliminate the debate with Musgrave.

You have my permission to publish this private letter in The Truth (?). Yours for space and harmony, J. N. Cowan.

Remarks

"Yours for peace and harmony", eh? Yes, just like the organ advocate, who says, Yours for peace and harmony—with the organ. And just like the Sunday School advocate, who says, Yours for peace and harmony—with the S. S. (we will not give it up). And your position now is, "Yours for peace and harmony,"—with the cups. (We will not give them up, neither will we furnish a "Thus saith the Lord" for them.

The proposition you have signed with me, namely, "The Cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same,—is wholly different from the Musgrave proposition, and involves a different issue, as does also the one Johnson has signed with me. And you

may "I would think" and "I would think that you would think" all you please; but you can make nothing but "running from debate" out of it. And if those "who stand" with you are satisfied with your "bout with Musgrave," they will gladly put you up at Littlefield, Texas, where President Freeman tells Bro. Cook there is no contenton over the question, and where the CUPS were put into the College church. We want another just such whipping at Littlefield as you are able to give us at Elk City. Why refuse to whip us when we are standing for it? Musgrave will (D. V.) debate his own proposition with you, and I shall (D. V.) be in Elk City in May to meet you and Johnson—unless you keep on "running from debate."—Ed.

MAKING MERCHANDISE OF THE GOSPEL

Why should we make merchandise of the Gospel? This "preaching for so much pay," is an unscriptural practice, and there is not any defense for it except greed, and the want of faith.

Very many of my brethren will quote with great zest, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," and the very next morning write to some congregation, "I will come and hold you a meeting for fifty dollars a week."

"I will preach for you for One Hundred Fifty Dollars per month, and be allowed two months off in summer to hold meetings, my salary to continue." "Well brethren, I have been praying over the matter of staying here or accepting the call to Jericho, and I think it is the Lord's will for me to go there, as I have been here thirteen years." "Any way they are willing to pay more at Jericho, and wife and I have concluded that we can do more good there. We would not make the change, but we are satisfied it is the Lord's will and we must not "resist the Holy Spirit."

And this is the only quotation he can remember to use that will suit his purpose. And then he will quote, "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent WE are silent."

This preacher just a few years ago held up his hands in horror at having "Rev." attached to his name, but today, he submits to it with rather proud feelings. Greed, avarice, and sectarianism, are rampant in the church today and if we do not stop, think, and rightabout face, we will indeed have earned the title "Digressive No. 2."

Brethren, why will you go on in this way when you know absolutely that you have no authority in the Bible for such a course? Why do you sell your services for so much? But be assured of this: you are not serving Christ in doing so, but Satan.

"O, that terrible, terrible Day, It's coming to me, it's coming to you, That Day is coming to all! "Yes, and when it comes and we all stand before the Bar of God, what can you say in defense of your extortionate practices here? Will you use the same excuses you use her? "Lord, your way was a way of selfdenial; too slow and old fashioned to suit the twentieth century; we had to keep up with other religious people or lose our membership."

Then the Lord will answer: "I promised to be with you to the end of the world, could you not trust me?" "Speaking of temporal blessings, I asked you to seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things should be yours. Could you not trust Me?"

There can be no better way than that followed by Paul, Barnabas, Silas, Peter, Timothy and Titus, in the first century, and the Campbells, Franklin, Stone, Smith and a host of others in the Restoration, in going from place to place, and house to house, preaching the sweet story of the Cross.

These men, inspired, and uninspired, were ordained and sent out from a certain congregation, made their rounds, and returning, reported to the congregation which sent them, and all rejoiced in the Lord and trusted in his grace.

When many of the brethren read this (if it is so fortunate as to get into print), they will say: "Bro. Lowry is too old fashioned for anything." Maybe so and that is why Bro. L. is not preaching more today. The churches taught by "new fashioned preachers," want new fashioned preachers who preach new fashioned doctrine, because "they have itching ears."

So a man who wants a preacher ordained and sent out from a congregation, consecrated men, men who trust God for his grace, and Christians for their fellowship, and who cannot partake with them of their fashionable feasts, is hooted at, called a moseback, and a hobby rider.

All right. I have a God made hobby, a Christ made saddle, and a salaried, a modern preacher for a horse. So gid-dap old fatty.

E. A. Lowry,
Dayton, Tenn., Route 5, 2-3-'29.

BROTHER ELSTON'S TIMELY ARTICLE

By Jas. D. Phillips.

The following article, written by Brother Ben J. Elston, a son-in-law of our lamented brother, Alfred Ellmore, appeared in the Dec. 25, 1928, issue of the Christian Leader. I pass it on to our readers for two reasons: 1. I want our readers to know that one of the editors of the mis-named Christian Leader is opposed to the Sunday School advocated and practiced by so many of the Leader's supporters. 2. The article contains such valuable information that our readers need to read it.

I hope this article has done good among the readers of the Leader. And I wish I knew that other such articles would appear in the Leader. But it has gone so far in its march toward Babylonish Rome that I fear no more articles like this one will appear in it.

Ben's Budget

The restoration, in its faultless entirety, of the church revealed on the Sacred Page, "in this present evil age," is no trival affair. The effort I believe to be obligatory, therefore always to be commended. Happy he who has sane ideas as to its possible accomplishment.

It is interesting, even as it is also pathetic, to "stand off and watch" those apparently trying.

One urges in one direction; another in another. Not conceding both intelligence and honesty to others, some fly at them with a zeal that could probably be well exerted in more fruitful ways. The "ways of Zion mourn." "The whole world lieth in the evil one."

"Justification by faith" (if not "by faith only") is yet "a most wholesome doctrine." I fear some rather "appeal to reason". But it is too much to expect that the vain reasonings of some will convince and silence others. They, also would "show their opinion." In our frailty, issues dissolve into personalities.

I feel safest to take earnest heed to the things commanded, then attend closely to the history God has preserved for us, to get the certain interpretation of those things commanded, so far as interpretation is necessary, to find how God's inspired workers understood, builded and taught. Beyond this I hope not to press or be pressed.

Benjamin Franklin once observed to A. Ellmore. "Some questions will have to be settled at the judgment." Questions of a nature not certainly general, if publicly discussed and published, should be treated in dignified manner. Otherwise, they are productive of ill effect. So I think.

Now, if allowed, I shall try to say that:

1. I believe the family to be as divine as anything, and that God will hold it, as he does all other institutions and individuals, to strict account.
2. As an elder, I would understand myself to possess no authority to assume the teaching of such children as were legally and scripturally under their parents, whether these parents be in or out of the church.
3. So far as I know no inspired interpreter ever made appeal to such youth, except through their parents—those first and finally responsible to God and men for their training and conduct.
4. This seems the more abundantly evident to me from the facts that (a) if such an appeal were made, either then or now, the fundamental authority of the family would be effectually broken; (b) Some record of it, in some faint fashion, would have been preserved in God's history. (c) Such appeal carries the implication that some parents are not, or could not be made, with the tactful help of these very much endowed (?) elders, competent to do the thing God commands them to do. (d) If elders will do what they are unquestionably commanded to do, there will be

(Continued on page eight)

CONTRIBUTION

In the Truth, Feb. 15, appears an article by Bro. W. T. Jones in criticism of what Bro. Chas. F. Reese had to say in regard to The Contribution, in a former issue of the paper. I suppose that Bro. Reese is capable of handling the subject but he has not seen fit to make any answer.

I will offer a few scriptures for the benefit of the ones who care to read. It seemed that Bro. Jones cannot see any reason for placing the con-

tribution on the table (communion table) or Lord's Table. Remember that this is a New Testament institution and if New Testament authority cannot be found, and we have to look back to the old for our authority, as Bro. Jones suggests, we had better drop it from the worship on Lord's day, seeing that it is a new day, a new worship, in a New Covenant.

Now let us begin with the new worship where it began. Acts 2:42, "And they were constantly attending to the teaching of the Apostles and to CONTRIBUTION and to the breaking of bread and to prayers," Emphatic Diaglott. Now the Lord said, in Luke 22:29-30, that he would appoint unto them a kingdom with a table in which to eat with him.

Let us examine the word "contribution," or fellowship. We find it comes from the Greek word "koinonia" defined, "fellowship or contribution, a partnership." Now let us take a look at 1 Cor. 10:16: "The cup of the blessing for which we bless God, is it not a participation (koinonia) of the blood of the anointed One? (Emphatic Trans.)"

Now where do we put the bread and cup? On His table. What are they? A joint fellowship. Now what is the contribution? A joint fellowship. What is the Lord's Table? The Joint fellowship. Without these things it is not the Lord's Table in the new order of things. Can anyone who has the remotest idea of what the Lord's Table is object to placing the fellowship together with that which makes it His Table?

But the Brother has a mourner's Bench confusion if the contribution (koinonia) of the money is placed on it. Then I suppose he could see the mourner's bench confusion when the cup and bread, (fellowship, koinonia) was put on it; if not, why not? You do not have to sing while you make the contribution. There is nothing in it to suggest a mourner's bench or to make me want to get a box and bore a hole in it and place it at the door of the building; appointing a priest to look after it as Bro. Jones suggests. I want to have fellowship with my Lord at his table in his Kingdom, where he said he would be in fellowship or communion with me.

In conclusion I will suggest to all; let us study the N. T. closely before we recommend to the brethren to turn back to the O. T. for our practices. I have thought that the main cause for the cups was because they saw no fellowship or communion in the cup.

Enough now but more if necessary.

Yours for a N. T. order and fellowship,
JAS. T. WHITE,
Lometa, Texas.

WHY THE DIFFERENCE

I have been reading some in the Apostolic Way, and notice the articles written by Dr. Trott, and I see one in which he criticises Harper for letting the brethren know how the Dr. stands in regard to debating with Cowan, the cup question and how the Dr. was willing and wanted the Clark-Harper debate published in the Way, but Duck-

worth would not have it, and how the Dr. said Clark was bested by Harper in their debate. It seems that the Dr. is trying to play a two-faced game with the brethren. I have noticed that he has been very bold in declaring that God would not accept the worship of the brethren who use the class method of teaching and has advised brethren not to worship with them; yet according to his own statements he thinks the use of more than one cup on the Lord's table is as great a sin as the other—the classes. Now I am wondering why he doesn't come out openly and tell the readers of the Apostolic Way that God will not accept the worship of those congregations that use more than one cup, and advise the brethren not to worship with them. If he really thinks that such brethren are "wrong," as Duckworth says the Dr. does, and are going to be lost with the class advocates, why does he not put forth as much effort to get the Apostolic Way to give as much space to the discussion of the cup question as it does to the S. S. question? Is it because he loves and admires Bro. Cowan and Bro. Clark more than he does any of the brethren who hold to the class method of teaching? Why can he not fellowship the one the same as the other? He says they are both "wrong".

Now it seems to me that it is very inconsistent for the Dr. to continue to fight what he considers to be one unscriptural practice and fellowship another. I am afraid he is lined up more with "policy" than he is with truth. He tries to hold to the truth and yet stick to the Editor of the Way, who sits on the fence when he is not on one side of it or on the other—with the cups or with the cup, in all good conscience if it can be said that he has any such thing as conscience. He is afraid to take a stand against the cups brethren for fear he will lose their support. He is "making merchandise" of the Gospel of the Son of God, just as he did in his anti-war campaign in pulling the money out of brethren who believe in the class method of teaching to propagate his bubble of "keeping brethren out of war," but in fact to support the publication of his paper. These are cold facts, and we know more evidently than he likes for us to know about it.

He says he has articles on the cup question, but thinks best not to publish them now. Why? Surely it was not because he did not have the space, for he publishes articles after article on the S. S. question. Some of these he could leave out, for the paper has been gorged with such all the time. No, the truth is, he and Dr. Trott are trying to keep on good terms with those brethren that use the cups in order to hold their support for the Way, and to do this they are willing to make merchandise of the truth and sacrifice their conscience.—I. C.

"NOT YET PREPARED"

At an old brother's funeral a few days ago, his son said, "Oh! why couldn't I have gone instead of father?" And his mother (who is not a Christian) said, "Son, you are not yet prepared to go! Your

father was. We will have to prepare to die!"

If all sinners would think seriously of their lost and undone condition, and would cry out in the spirit of humility, as did the publican in the Temple, "God be merciful to me a sinner," I am sure that more of them would obey the gospel.

Mercy's Door Is Now Open

Mercy's door is now open; and hence Jesus says, "Come unto me . . . and I will give you rest." "He that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." "I am he that came down from Heaven—to seek and to save that which is lost." "I came to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance." "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

And Paul says, "Today is the day of salvation—to every one that believeth." "Today if you will hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

And John says, "And the Spirit and the bride say, come; and let him that heareth say, come; and he that is athirst, let him come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

Paul says, "By his mercy he has saved us." And, "By grace have you been saved thru faith."

"Prepare to Meet Thy God"

Isiah tells us (Isa. 59:2) that our sins separate us from God. But Amos tells us (Amos. 4:12), "Prepare to meet thy God." But how shall we prepare to meet him? Believe on the Lord (Mark 16:16). Repent of your sins. (Acts 17:30). Confess your Savior (Matt. 10:32). Be baptized in His name for the forgiveness of sins. (Acts 2:38). Have you done this? If not, do it now! It will soon be too late! "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God" unprepared!

—Jas. D. Phillips.

"FIGHTERS"

The brethren who are contending for a "Thus saith the Lord," for their faith and practice are being misrepresented by some who claim to be 'loyal' to the Book. They call us "one cup hobby riders," "fuss makers," and "fighters."

How many cups did the Master use when he instituted the Supper?—Ans.—one cup.

How many cups did Paul bind on the church at Corinth? Ans.—one cup.—We are unable to find a "thus saith the Lord" for more than one.

"Fuss makers," are we? "We deny the allegation and defy the allegators." But when you call us "fighters," we just simply can not deny it; however we do not have the least objection to being called "fighters,"—for history bears unmistakable evidences to the fact that the evangelists in this and past centuries, who have done most to convert souls and build up churches, have been of that class which some whitewashed, milk-and-honey sort of Christians now stigmatize as "fighters." The most direful calamity that can befall any cause founded on truth is for its advocates to cease to be "fighters," and virtually agree to disagree with unconverted neighbors, who mutually let each other alone for the sake of policy, and cry, "let us have peace, where there is no peace." The curse of the churches to-day, is

a set of preachers with maudlin piety and no backbone, whose highest ambition is to occupy an easy pastorate, (located Preachers) draw a salary and preach to please men rather than God."

These "would-be" popes, with the help of impious leaders have so blinded, and intimidated some brethren with imitation "priest-craft," that some of them act like they thought it would be wrong and sinful for them to make the acquaintance of a preacher who stands foursquare on the word of God. I know of a congregation that had an opportunity to hear a man who preaches the "Word" without addition, subtraction, or substitution, who teaches the Bible and the Bible alone. But the leaders (?) decided the matter for the whole church. They said: "We do not want to have anything to do with a preacher like that."—Just like Diotrephes, "prating against us with malicious words," will not "receive the brethren, forbiddeth them that would."

There are some who pose as elders who have no more regards for what the Holy Spirit teaches than they do for a last years almanac. If they can not "muzzle" the preacher, they lock the door in his face. More than four thousand years ago, Moses said: "Be sure your sin will find you out." This is true,—and sooner or later these "overlords" will have to face the music. The fight is on,—and men of undaunted courage and unwavering faith are thrusting "the sword of the Spirit" into the avery heart of sectarian theology. Subscribe for "The Truth," it is a fine medium through which to fight digression, and help in the restoration of Primitive Christianity. "How long halt ye between two opinions, if the Lord be God, follow him," and quit eating "at Jezebels' table."—Ira. B. Kile.

THE ROMAN HIERARCHY

"The Papal supremacy rests on three pillars—1. That Christ invested Peter with supreme authority, and made him his vicar on earth. 2. That Peter was Bishop of Rome. 3. That he bequeathed his power to his successors.

"The first pillar is destroyed by the New Testament, Peter himself disclaiming all authority—(1 Pet. 5:3)—and Paul withstanding him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

"The third pillar is destroyed by Church History, which demonstrates. that the Bishop of Rome, in the second and third century, were elected by the congregation of Christians. The second pillar is also destroyed by the united testimony of the Scriptures and Church History, and we devoutly hope the tottering edifice may soon fall into ruins, and the Christian world be relieved from the terrible insubus of centuries."—Alexander Campbell, in the Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 5, No. 6, 1855.

Comment

It will be remembered by all who "have understanding" (Rev. 13:18) that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy is the Apostate Church of Rev. 17 and rests on three assumptive pillars, as Brother Campbell has shown. And since he has shown by both Scripture and Church History that these

pillars are false, we know that this Politic-Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which is the very essence of all apostacies—being the "Mother of Harlots" and parent of all "Abominations of the Earth" (Rev. 17:5)—is built upon the "sand" (Matt. 7:21-24). And hence we know that it shall fall "and great will be the fall of it." And we know, too, that the church of Christ, "buildd upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Cornerstone" (Eph. 2:20), shall "stand forever" (Dan. 2:45), for "the Gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16:18). Paul says, "The foundation of God stands sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his."

It is not only the old Roman Hierarchy that shall fall, but her Protestant daughters will fall, too; for they are no better in the sight of God than the Roman Hierarchy—they all have apostatised from the ancient order of things. God did not plant them. And truly, "Every plant, which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up," says the Master, in Matt. 15:13.

God's people should separate themselves from this adulterous brood of Catholicism and Protestantism, which is "Mystery Babylon," by obeying the call—"come out of her, my people, that you have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" Rev. 18:4.

What a grand time it will be for the saints of the Most High, when God judges this adulterous brood and gives them over to the burning flame! See Dan. 7:21, 22, 26; Rev. 18th Chapter.

"And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in Heaven, saying, Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power unto the Lord, our God: for true and righteous are his judgments; for he hath judged the great whore (Babylon, false religion. Rev. 17), which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever." Rev. 19:1-4. Thank God, she is going to fall! —Jas. D. Phillips.

Brother Elston's Timely Article—Con. from p. 6 no call for the things divisive and questionable. (e) If parents and elders are not now competent, there has never been serious question as to the authority and manner of enlightening them. Get commanded things done before fussing and dividing over the reasoned matters.

While this might be extended, I close by saying that this teaching matter affects both delegated and original authority. For those who interfere with the proper working of authority in the home, strike at the source of that authority. Elders and other brethren (some one point out where any sister ever publicly taught) may "publicly and from house to house," encourage obedience to parents and help parents in the accomplishment of their mission. Something has about broken the family down. Faithful apostolic teaching and practice, I venture, did not. Let us all seek to find and fill our places. (Perhaps more.)

Ben J. Elston.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, APRIL 15, 1929

No. 8

PASTORS, TAKE NOTICE!

I want all you men to read this from Bro. Reynolds. It appeared in the Gospel Advocate of February 28, 1929:

"WILL THE 'PASTORS' COME?"

By A. S. Reynolds

"I appreciate what is being said through the Gospel Advocate on the "pastor" question. I do not know any place in the New Testament where a "located evangelist" is mentioned. When will the churches get back to the practice of the church in its beginning? There is a vast territory here in West Florida in need of the gospel. Why will the strong and wealthy congregations sit idly by and see the people perish, and make no effort to send the preacher to the lost? I am reading with much interest the sketches of the work of the "pioneer preachers." O how we need more of their kind to carry the good news of salvation to the lost! My prayer is that the faithful will stand by those who are out on the "firing line." Time is flying and souls are dying. Will our money cry out against us in the day of judgment? (See James 5: 3.) Yes, if we hoard it up for worldly pleasure. Keep up the agitation; it will arouse some who are asleep and save some souls."

And now read this from Bro. Jas. A. Allen in the same issue of the G. A.:

"ABOUT 'THE GREAT DAYS.'"

"Because a church has an overflowing crowd and has to use chairs in the aisles on Sunday morning does not necessarily mean that the cause is growing in that neighborhood. The "pastor's" report of a "great day" may be more of a compliment to the pastor than an indication that the church is really growing along Scriptural lines or that the neighborhood is really being evangelized. Sensible people sometimes find themselves ready to laugh at the "great days" the "pastors" have. Because a church wants to tear down a moderate-sized house and worse than waste a staggering sum on a modern cathedral is no indication whatever of a growth of spirituality in the membership or that that church is abounding in the work of the Lord: It is quite the reverse and shows a growth of worldly-mindedness that means that that church is lost to the cause of Christ if it is not headed off from its desire to ape the world. When a church grows to a size that it is too large for all its male members to have a chance to speak in public; and all its members, both male and female, have a chance to personally do some of its

work, it is overgrown and should follow the example of the bees and swarm. Such "swarming" and establishment of several smaller congregations may not be to the financial interest of "the pastor," but it is inestimably to the interest of the church and the spread of the truth."

No; the "pastors" wont come—when they hear the "Macedonian call," they are "too busy" to pay any attention to it. Sometimes they will hold a meeting when they get their "paid vacation," if the church where they hold the meeting will pay them \$150.00 or \$200.00 for it.

These "pastors" are very "busy"—so "busy" they have but little time to do anything—except to have a big time.

It is common for them to tell about "my church" and what a "great day" it has had. They will not "Go." (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15)—they stay with their "pastorate" and their "salary." And there they go—on to Babylon and an easy timē here—and to hell in the end. The Book says so. Matt. 25:41-46.

What good would these "pastors" do if they should go out to hold a meeting? They would do nothing but pussy-foot, soft-soap and sugar-coat. They would not "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching."

I am glad the G. A. is fighting this "pastor" system in the churches of Christ and I wish them success in ousting these "pastors." The church will never develop any spirituality as long as they keep these pussy-footers among the congregations.

The love of popularity, the love of an easy time, and the love of a "salary," is sending the souls of many preachers to hell.

Jas. D. Phillips.

"THE FRUIT OF THE VINE"

In "The Truth" I notice an article on the use of grape juice. The proof is if the juice was not wine at the time of its being pressed out of grapes it could not have been a wine-press. Such a proof worth notice.

Now, listen. The syrup mill is a syrup mill, and the cane is run through the mill and the juice is caught in a vessel and is now ready for eating. No, you need not cook the juice for it is syrup just as soon as it is run through the mill. Now, reader, you can see what kind of proof has been put up by these grape juice users. Just because the wine-press is called a wine-press, does not make the juice wine. And also the syrup is called syrup when it is cooked, and not before. If the brother's proof be true, a man would be foolish for losing time in cooking the juice, to make syrup, when it is already syrup at the time it is run through the

mill. Now you can see the proof they have to offer. No sense in the brother's proof.

I notice Bro. Harper is trying to get Musgrave to change his proposition on the cups question about the word "only." It seems to me like he is afraid of his position on the cups question. They have been after Bro. Cowan for some time, boasting through "The Truth." Now if Bro. Harper is an honest man, he will publish my article on this question. The truth is what I am looking for, and this the brother failed to give on the wine question.—A. Comfield.

(This is his "article").

Remarks

As Dr. Trott said in reviewing Cowan, I say to this brother. His "trouble is in not being able to properly define his words." "Syrup, a saturated or medicated solution of sugar in water; liquid refuse of sugar."—Webster's Universal Dictionary (Morris). "Cane mill," "syrup mill," "syrup kettle," and "syrup pan"—the "mill" for pressing out the "saturated solution of sugar in water," and the "kettle" or "pan" for boiling or evaporating the "saturated solution in water."

And "wine-press" is the proper expression when the unfermented solution is referred to. And as Bro. Watson has abundantly shown in his article, not only is the solution when it comes from the wine-press translated "wine" in the Bible, but it is so translated even "in the cluster."

We will here say that if any one wants to take up Bro. Watson's article and review it for his reply, "The Truth" is open for equal space to each. Or if any one can induce Bro. Tucker to take up in the paper the proposition he has signed with me for a written discussion, the paper is open for equal space to each.

Harper afraid to trust the truth in the hands of Musgrave—Never. He believes that Musgrave can uphold the truth even with one hand tied behind him, as in this case; but he believes it is cowardly for an opponent who stands for a "fair field and no favors" to enter a contest under such circumstances. No, Harper is not afraid for Musgrave to meet Cowan even with one hand tied. And Harper will be there, D. V., to meet Cowan and Johnson on the propositions they have signed with him, and they will debate or back out. And if you want the truth, you should be there.

NO CONTRADICTION

"On my servants on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit and they shall prophesy."—Acts 2:18.

Here the Lord said that women should prophesy. But Paul says for women to keep silence in the churches.—1 Cor. 14:34. So we find here seemingly a contradiction. The Lord said that women should prophesy, and Paul said for women to keep silence in the churches.

Now to one who can't see the difference in building a house and living in the house after it is built, these scriptures seem to contrary one against the other. But not so. We use carpenters, masons, and plasterers in building the house—skilled labor in building, but a common laborer

can live in the house. Just so in building the church: the Lord poured out his Spirit, on men, and they did prophesy in the church; also we find that women did prophesy in the building of the church; but Paul says when that which is perfect is come, prophecies shall fail (cease.)—1 Cor. 13:8.

Now let me say that every woman that did prophesy was endued and guided by the Spirit directly from the Lord and separate and apart from the Scriptures. There is not one word or example where a woman ever preached or prophesied in the church. Why can't men see that we have in the book of Acts and the twenty-one letters the perfect plan of salvation? Why will men not believe that inspiration ceased when the "Amen" was said to the book of Revelation? And Paul said it would cease when that which is perfect is come.

But an objector says that Paul was the only apostle who said for the women to keep silence in the churches. Yes, and Paul is the only one that said a word about the collection for the saints; the only one that speaks about the Lord's supper; and the only one that said for women to keep silence in the churches. And when Sunday school advocates show me an example in the twenty-one letters where a woman ever taught a class or preached a sermon in the church, I will agree to show that it is wrong to eat the Lord's supper or contribute to the saints.

Why does Daniel Sommer say that 1 Cor. 14:34 means for only the elders' wives to keep silence in the churches when the word elder is not in either book of Corinthians and the word wife is not in the 14th chapter? Does he think the whole brotherhood will follow him and reject Paul's teaching?

Bring up a child in the Sunday school, and when he is old, all you will make of him is a Sunday school teacher or Sunday school advocate. But if we would teach as verse 29 tells us, we would learn to preach and defend the cause. And Daniel Sommer never would have committed that offense of charging brethren so much per head to read the New Testament through with them to make preachers of them. He is a great man to be fighting Gunter College. I can't believe a protracted Sunday school is as good a way to make preachers as the Lord's in 1 Cor. 14:29-31. He objects to Gunter College because there is no Bible for the College, but he charges his young brethren so much per head to read the Book through with them to make preachers of them. Shame. "Thinkest thou, O man, that judgest them which do such things and doest the same that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?"—Rom. 2:3.

But says one 1 Cor. 14:29 says let the prophets speak two or three and we have no prophets now. The word prophet means one who speaks for another, and prophet, preacher, or proclaimer are all one and the same. All prophets were not inspired. Surely no one will say that they of the school of the prophets were inspired. But the Lord endued men and women to build the church. Paul said for women to keep silence in the churches after the church was built.—W. M. Pickler, Orleans, Ind.

PLEASING GOD

"Without faith it is impossible to please Him."—Heb. 11:4. Hence "That which is not of faith is sin."—Rom. 14:23. And "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of the Lord."—Rom. 10:17. Then "Faith is the understanding of things hoped for: the evidence of things not seen."—Heb. 11:1. Hence the child of God must "walk by faith" to please God.—2 Cor. 5:11.

This requires a "Thus saith the Lord" for our work and worship, faith and practice. Are we following this "rule"?—Phil. 3:16. This requires us to follow the motto: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent" in our work and worship. Anything else is "vain," for Jesus says, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—Matt. 15:8, 9. And Paul says that we should not let "the traditions of men" spoil us, so that we "perish."—Col. 2: 8 & 21, 22.

The Catholic church says that the Pope is the mediator between God and man, but the word of the Lord says, "One mediator between God and man: the man Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. 2:5. The Pope says for the Priest to drink all of the wine in the communion, but the word of the Lord says, "All drink," and "all drank."—Matt. 26:27 & Mk. 14:23.

The Protestant, generally, says that the babe is born a sinner, totally depraved, but the word of the Lord says, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." And "except a man be converted and become as a little child he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven." And we are ready to expose such errors. But how about ourselves? Do we constantly examine ourselves whether we are in the faith? 2 Cor. 13:5. If we do, we do not seem to profit much by the examination. Here comes a Baptist or Methodist or Presbyterian for membership in the church of Christ, and we say, "Are you satisfied with your baptism?" The sprinkled one we reject, but the immersed one we receive. Why do we sit in judgment in these cases? You say, "We do not, for God has judged in this matter, and we take the word of the Lord." But do you? I say no, for the word of the Lord you follow as to the "form" but ignore on the "design." And you enter your judgment against the Lord's word. You seem to know that one in being sprinkled is not baptized, and you should know that one in being baptized as a child of God is not baptized "for the remission of sins" (to obtain the forgiveness of sins—Thayer), as the word of the Lord commands.—Acts 2:38.

"Well, what can you find against our classes? Is it a sin to have them?" Yes, if they do not come by the word of the Lord. Can you find them in the word of the Lord?" "No, but our best preachers say we need them for more efficient work." But the word of the Lord says for one to speak at a time, and for the women to keep silence—1 Cor. 14:31 & 34. And you let the "traditions of men" spoil you, and you shall "perish."—Col. 2:21, 22. You are a "worker," but a worker of "iniquity."—Matt. 7:23.

"But how about our instrumental music, my brother?" Well, the word of the Lord says, "sing."—Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15. Hence instrumental music is without divine warrant, the word of the Lord does not authorize it. "Well, we do not use instrumental music in our church, but Brother C. tells us we can use the cups. What about it?" The word of the Lord says "one cup" and it says "one baptism." It is only the teaching of man that says to take sprinkling, pouring, or immersion for baptism; and it is only man that teaches the use of cups in the communion. Hence you follow the "commandments and doctrines of men" in the use of cups just like the one who uses sprinkling or pouring.

"Well, just tell me now whether to use leavened or unleavened bread in the communion." My brother, Jesus set the example for us by using the Passover bread, which was unleavened. There was no other kind among Israel at this time.—Ex. 12:15.

"And should the bread be broken?" Yes, for Jesus took the bread, gave thanks, and broke it."—Matt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22; Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. And Paul says, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"—1 Cor. 10:16. And again we read: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them."—Acts 20:7. So to follow the approved example and command, we must break the bread and eat. And so far as I have seen, the disciples have done this, that is, they break the bread and eat, each one for himself.

"Now, brother, one more question: what about the fruit of the vine—should it be fermented?" Brother, since they were to put away all leaven, or ferment, from them before and during the Passover, as we have seen, how could they use fermented fruit of the vine? The fermented element has the yeast ferment in it. "But they tell me that the unfermented element is full of leaven, and that is driven out by fermentation." They may tell you that, but it is not so. If the ferment, yeast to make alcoholic fermentation,—is kept from the liquid, it will not ferment. "But did the people at that time have any way of doing this?" Yes, as you will find by reading any good Bible dictionary, encyclopedia, or the World Book. "But is it wine before it is fermented?" Jesus did not say wine: He said the fruit of the vine." However, there is fermented wine, and there is unfermented wine. Unfermented wine is the fruit of the vine," while fermented wine is the product of yeast; no yeast, no fermented wine. Fermented wine contains a toxin (poison), called alcohol, which is not produced by the vine. In fact the fruit of the vine" by the action of yeast, a living thing which has entered it and produces fermentation (putrefaction), destroying its gluten, gum, sugar, and albumen, is changed into a narcotic poison. It is thus seen that fermented wine is not the fruit of the vine.—Fred Hogland.

THE TRUTH FUND

J. Holler ----- \$4.00

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00



LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

SUGGESTION

We wish that those who send in donations would accompany them by a list of names of persons to whom we can send the paper,—at least a few if not enough to cover your donation. We have retained more than half on our list who received the paper gratis.

NOTICE

If any one receives the paper who did not subscribe, it is already paid for. No one will ever be dunned for subscription. We stop the paper when subscription has expired, intending to give notice and in most cases sending a paper or two to make sure you get the notice. A thousand more will give us a weekly at the same price. Will you get them for us? This means work and sacrifice, but it is for the truth of the gospel.

NOTICE

I expect to be in the West in May and spend June and July in Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and brethren wishing me to visit them or hold a meeting can address me at Sneads, Florida.—H. C. Harper.

EDITORIAL VIEWS AND REVIEWS

By Ira C. Moore

Time, thought, study, sincerity, experience and a careful weighing of our own arguments on any position are necessary to enable us to see the end of our own contentions. I like that spirit in a brother who, when he sees the fallacy of his own contention, will give it up at once. A certain brother was causing some contention and trouble over the individual communion cups; but when shown that the wine has to be divided some time after thanks were offered for it, either by one person or by all, and that it might as well be done by one before given to the participants, he yielded the point at once, and acknowledged his error before the congregation, and caused no more trouble on that point. He was told also that in large congregations we admit and use two cups, and sometimes four or six, depending on the number of deacons to wait on the congregations, and there is no difference in principle between taking two, four or six, and using as many as there are communicants, just so thanks are offered before the

wine is divided in each case. For a long time I myself was opposed to using as many cups as there were communicants, and I prefer only as many cups as will accommodate the deacons who wait on the congregation; but the foregoing reasoning—following up the principle of using more than one cup—drove me to the above conclusion.

Remarks

Why is it that Duckworth, Cowan, Johnson, Clark, and others, of the Apostolic Way, who say that they are opposed to the individual cups, do not manifest that opposition to them as they are continually doing with the Sunday School? When has Clark ever written, opposing the individual cups as unscriptural? Was it when he says they may be used on special occasions? When has Duckworth ever opposed the use of "two or more cups." Was it when he was contriving to use in the Dallas church without causing trouble? Do these men "reject all doctrines and commands of men and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice"? Let Dr. Trott tell us. These fellows do not go to "the faith" for the "doctrine and practice" of "two or more cups" any more than Moore goes there for the "doctrine and practice" of the "individual cups," and the Doctor knows it. And had that brother called for Bible, as the Bereans did (Acts 17:11), as to whether those things were so, where would Moore have been? He would have been found in the list of "false" teachers.—Matt. 7:15. He admits that it was done as the Bible says, but he says "it might as well be done" some other way. And the Pope admits that it was done as regarded in the Scriptures, but he too says "it might as well be done" some other way, and so he drinks all of it, not sharing it with any body else. And the Protestant says we do not any of us observe it as it was given; then why should we be held to baptism as the Bible gives it? So he too says "it might as well be done" some other way. And Moore stands with them in this. He turns down the word of God just as they do for his faith and practice, and takes what man says.

PROVING WHAT IS ACCEPTABLE UNTO THE LORD

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thes. 5:21. "(For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth;) proving what is acceptable unto the Lord." Eph. 5:9, 10. "And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." Rom. 12:2.

Seeing that it is a command of God for us to "Prove what is acceptable unto the Lord," one would naturally inquire, how must I do it? One says, it can be proved by the thoughts, feelings, and actions, of man. Let us see if it can. Prov. 14:12. "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Prov. 28:26, "He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool... but whoso walketh wisely, he

shall be delivered." Acts 26:9, "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth."

Seeing that a man is a fool if he trusts in his own heart, and that Saul of Tarsus thought he was doing the Lord's service when he persecuted the church (1 Cor. 15:9; Acts 23:1), then it follows that men can not be guided by his feelings, thoughts or actions in matters pertaining to religion.

How then can we prove what pleases the Lord, or is acceptable unto Him?

Jesus pleased the father by doing what the Father taught Him to do. Jno. 8:28, 29. "I do nothing of myself; but as my father hath taught me, I speak these things . . . for I do always those things that please him."

Therefore, we please the Father by doing what he has taught us to do. Peter says, "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps." 1 Pet. 2:21.

We have learned that we please the Father by doing what he has taught us to do; it is now our duty to see what he teaches us to do. Let us turn to the Bible and see.

Here we find the will of the Father (Matt. 7:21), and we are admonished "not to go beyond the things which are written." (1 Cor. 4:6).

And we are commanded to MARK and AVOID them that are causing divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine, or teaching.

One says, "Yes, but show us where it says not to use instrumental music in the worship."

The command to do one thing forbids our doing something else not commanded. We are commanded to sing, and this excludes any other kind of music.

Another says, "The Bible does not say not to have a Missionary Society, and we need it to carry out the commission."

Jesus gave us the WILL of the Father, and he left out the M. S. The primitive Christians had none, and we go beyond that which is written when we work through such a thing, and thus sin.

"But I do not see any harm in a good Sunday School, or Bible School." Is there any Bible command for it, brother? "No." Is there a divine example of it? "No." Well, then, this is enough to exclude it, if we wish to do the Will of the Father, as Jesus did; but it actually violates two distinct Bible commands—1 Tim. 2:11, 12; 1 Cor. 14:33, 34, 35, where it says that "women" are to learn in silence and not to "speak," or "teach" "in the church." And 1 Cor. 14:31, where it says to speak "one by one," that is, one at a time.

"But we use the cups in our congregation, and you are not going to call us digressive for that, are you?"

Yes, for you have gone beyond what is written. The Bible says "cup." And you do not know that you do the Will of the Father in using CUPS. In fact, we know that is not the Father's Will, for it is not in the Will. It is not of faith, and is, therefore, sin.—Jas. D. Phillips.

QUIT SPECULATING

Why have so much speculating? Why not abide in the teaching of Christ, and have peace and harmony among ourselves? We are told that the true position about the cup is defined by Christ himself is saying, "This cup is my blood of the new testament." But where do we find this? The reference is not given, and I do not find it worded that way in any thing I have examined. As a matter of truth, there is but one true position about what the cup is, and that is defined by Christ himself when he says, "This cup is the new testament in my blood."—Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25, R. V. And so we read, "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of transgressions that were under the first testament, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."—Heb. 9:13-15.

Here we see that Jesus is the mediator of the New Testament, and as such, he states the term: "This cup is the new testament in my blood" "Drink ye all from it." . . . "This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me."

It is for us to accept as he gave it, or reject it to our sorrow. For Paul says, "Though it be but a man's covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void or addeth thereto."—Gal. 3:15.

Christ chose "a cup" for this, and blessed it; and commanded all present to drink out of it, and "They all drank out of it," without questioning, but trusting their Lord and Master above all others as having the words of eternal life. And we should implicitly follow their example and his command.

We are told by some that the container was not what Jesus called the cup. A liquid can be referred to by naming a cup only when it is in a cup. If Jesus referred to the contents by naming the cup (as we do by metonymy), then we know that "the fruit of the vine" was in a cup, and not in a jug or bottle, nor cups. For example, we say, "The kettle is boiling," naming the kettle to refer to its contents. Now put part of its contents into another kettle, and heat both to boiling, then we say, The kettles are boiling. Now take pan and pour the contents of one of the kettles into it, and cause both to boil, and we say, The pan and the kettle are boiling.

One brother has written at considerable length on this matter, but if I did not know what he is contending for, I would be led by his arguments to believe that he is in favor of eliminating the cup from the Lord's table entirely, but instead of that he is contending for more of them, as many as our "judgment dictates" is best for convenience and order," and most peoples' "judgment dictates" that the individual cup is best for "convenience

and order" so we know pretty well what the result of such teaching will be.

But why is the word "cup" so prominent in the N. T. where the communion is mentioned? In Luke 7, 33 Jesus says: "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil." Why did he not use the word "cup" here? In John 2:3: "And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine." In the 9th verse, "When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine," And again in the 10th verse "And saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now." Why was not the word cup used in some of these passages? Even Paul could say wine instead of cup. "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth." Why did he not say, "drink the cup?" In 1 Tim. 3:8. "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine." But why did he not say, Not given to many cups? So we see that both Jesus and Paul could say wine when the container was of no importance, and that is just what Jesus would have said when he instituted the communion if it had not been that the cup containing the fruit of the vine, taken and blessed, and from which he commanded all the disciples present to drink, was, as he says, "The new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. 22:14). —N. E. Kellems.

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

Proposition: "The Scriptures teach that man is wholly mortal."

Albert S. Hodges, affirms;

Jas. D. Phillips, denies.

Second Affirmative

Why waste a lot of space telling what "wholly" and "mortal" means? This proposition is so simple that no elaborate definition is needed. Adam died, therefore, Adam was mortal. Had he obeyed God and partook of the Tree of Life he would have become immortal—the same body in each case. It was the same body of Jesus that hung on the cross that Thomas examined to find the nail prints in His hands. Brother Phillips says: "Man was not subject to death when he came from the plastic hands of God." Brother Phillips is lined up squarely with the serpent who said, "Ye shall NOT surely die." God said, "Ye shall not eat of the forbidden fruit lest ye die." Adam ate and died, therefore, he was mortal. Had he refrained from coming into contact with the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, he would have continued to live and become immortal. Bro. Phillips says, "It takes more than a body to constitute

man." Let us hear what God says: "And the Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of Life and man (ie, this lifeless body) became a living soul."

He was MAN before the breath of Life entered his nostrils, just as an engine is a complete engine when it is turned over to the fireman for the first time. Adam was inanimate or lifeless and when the breath of Life from God entered his nostrils he came to life.

Why man lives can no more be explained than how grass grows. The sun shines on the earth and plants grow but no man can tell how. The Spirit of God gives life to mortal man, but it is no part of the man. It is man's only in the sense of a loan. "Govern your bodies," says the Lord, "And I will furnish the motive power." The Spirit of God that quickens our mortal bodies is no part of us. It is separate and distinct from man and goes and comes at the command of God—Eze. 36: 27; 37:9-14.

Brother Phillips confuses the two subjects. The Spirit of God and the breath of life operate in man, for the purpose of developing in man—mortal man—a holy and clean body of flesh, fit for association with God in His eternal Kingdom. Brother Phillips is right; the spirit has never been dead, but we are not discussing that. Mortal man is our subject.

"Kill the soul." Man can kill the body, i. e., mutilate or abuse it until the breath of life departs, but God holds the right to restore life and man cannot touch or destroy this future life. This inherent immortality had its origin in the Garden of Eden when the serpent said, "Ye shall not surely die," and has been a popular doctrine among the heathen ever since.

Modern theology has it that man sheds his mortal body and slips off into a spiritual world and returns later and reinhabits a body. The truth of the matter is God supplies the spirit to animate our bodies and train them to be obedient. If we succeed, then our mortal bodies put on immortality and are just as real and tangible as we are now.

Immortal bodies eat and drink as shown by many examples.—Gen. 18:8; 19:3. Jesus ate after His resurrection.—Luke 24: 43, and promised to eat with His disciples in the Kingdom.—Mark 14:25. The River of Life teems with fish.—Ezekiel 47:9, and fisherman stand on its banks.—Verse 10. The only difference in mortal and immortal bodies is that mortal bodies are subject to death and decay, while immortal ones are perfect and imperishable. They both eat and drink.

The body apart from the breath is dead. Just stop breathing for a few minutes and we die. We can cause the breath to leave the body by abuse, but its return is another problem, and is only possible by Divine edict.—Ezekiel 37:9-10.

ALBERT S. HODGES.

Orlando, Florida.

Second Negative

We do not "waste a lot of space" in complying with the Rules of Debate by defining the terms of

a proposition, my brother. You failed to comply with these rules here, so I had to do it for you. And I here repeat, for the sake of clearness, that "wholly" means "totally;" and "mortal" means "subject to death." Man's body is mortal; his spirit is not mortal: his body dies; his spirit does not die (Matt. 10:28). Hence, his spirit is not mortal, or subject to death. Now, meet this if you can.

"Adam died, therefore . . . mortal." Yes, Adam's body died, therefore, his body was mortal. But his spirit did not die, therefore, his spirit is not mortal. "And the dust returneth to the earth as it was and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it."—Ecc. 12:7. "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."—Acts 7:59. "And the rich man died and was buried and in Hades he lifted up his eyes being in torment."—Luke 16:22,23. All these Scriptures show that the spirit of man does not die, therefore, the spirit of man is not mortal.

Yes, "Phillips says, 'It takes more than a body to constitute man.'" And the Scriptures bear him out in this. "And may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire." 1 Thess. 5:23. "My spirit was grieved in the midst of my body."—Dan. 7:15. Note: "My spirit" and "my body." It takes both to constitute man. "The spirit of man which is in him."—1 Cor. 2:11. "The spirit of man" is part of "man." And since "the body" can be "killed" (Matt. 10:28), and the "soul" cannot be "killed" (Ibid.), we know that the body is mortal, but the spirit is not mortal. "Your mortal bodies"—"your mortal flesh."—Rom. 6:12; 8:11. Where is it said that the spirit is mortal, or subject to death? Nowhere! "I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain . . . and they cried with a loud voice.—Rev. 6:9-11. "And I saw the souls of them that had been slain . . . and they lived."—Rev. 20:4, 5. "A body hast thou prepared me."—Heb. 10:5. Here it is shown that the "me" existed before the "body."

We are not discussing what "God holds the right to do," brother: we are discussing the proposition, "Man is wholly mortal." And since you are affirming this, it is up to you to prove it. And you have not done it.

But you admit that I am right, for you say: "Bro. Phillips is right; the spirit has never been dead." Now, if you believe the spirit is any part of man (as Dan. 7:15; 1 Thess. 5:23; 1 Cor. 2:11; Matt. 10:28 show), how can you affirm any longer that "man is wholly mortal"? We agree that the body is mortal; and we agree that the spirit is not mortal, as you say, "the spirit has never been dead;" so where is there any disagreement?

There is no disagreement between us unless you are going to take the position that the spirit is no part of man, which you cannot do, unless you are going to deny the Bible—it plainly shows that the spirit is a part of man, as I have shown. So please tell us in your next article whether you think the spirit is any part of man. And if you say that it is not, how are you going to get around the Scriptures I have used to show that it is? If you believe the spirit is a part of man, just say so and stop the discussion of this proposi-

tion. You have already admitted that the spirit is not mortal, or subject to death; for you say, "Bro. Phillips is right; the spirit has never been dead."

The spirit is not just the breath. See here: "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."—Job 32:8. "My spirit was grieved."—Dan. 7:15. "What man knoweth the things of man save the spirit of man which is in him?"—1 Cor. 2:11. The breath cannot be "grieved." And the breath is not conscious. So the spirit is more than the breath. It is a part of man (1 Thess. 5:23), and it does not die (Matt. 10:28). Hence, man is not wholly mortal, and the brother has produced no Scripture that shows that he is.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

BRO. ALLEN'S MUDSLINGING

Literature is learning. There is the same authority to write as there is to speak orally. The apostles both wrote and spoke orally, used the pen as well as the tongue. The Bible itself is Literature. Those who oppose written comments stultify themselves by giving oral ones; and it may be that sometimes the reason a brother opposes the written ones, is, he wants to monopolize the time and try the patience of the brethren and sisters who are compelled to listen to his oral ones. The anti-Sunday-school denomination that is being built up in our midst is based on a morbid and unbalanced condition of mind. Those who are building it up, so far as I know, are good men personally, but are men whose morbidness has got their minds in a narrow groove that is a species of insanity. Such men are incapable of balanced reasoning and do things that are infantile and childish.

—Jas. A. Allen in Gospel Advocate, 2-21-'29.

Remarks

Brother Allen is by far the ablest writer among our Sunday School digressive brethren, and always writes in a kind, Christian spirit when he is exposing sectarianism, or is writing the truth. And what he says is usually true. But what he says in the above article is mostly false. And it shows a spirit of malice and hatred for his brethren, whom he admits to be "good men personally."

When he intimates that there are brethren who "oppose written comments" in teaching the truth, he makes an intimation that he knows to be absolutely false. No one opposes written comments in teaching the truth if it is used in the right way. But, because Bro. Allen cannot find the Scripture to justify him and others in publishing uninspired text books for the brethren to use, the use of which makes Christians "think of men above that which is written." (1 Cor. 4:6), and because he is being pressed on every side to defend his practice, which he will not dare to do because he knows he can not defend it by the word of God, he falsifies by intimating that there are some among us who "oppose written comments."

"The anti-Sunday-School denomination that is being built up in our midst." There is no such de-

nomination being built up in our midst, my brother. And you know it, too. If we are an "anti-Sunday-school denomination" because we oppose your human institution which you are forcing into the churches to the division of the body of Christ, then Paul, Peter, John and all the early disciples belonged to an "anti-Sunday-school denomination," for they had no Sunday-school and you know it, brother.

After falsely accusing us of "building up an anti-Sunday-school denomination among us," Editor Allen says the work "is based on a morbid and unbalanced condition of mind." And he speaks of our "insanity." Such a manifestation of the spirit of the Devil in the editor is enough to turn every true disciple from the gospel perverter, called "Gospel Advocate."

The Gospel Advocate is constantly after the digressive brethren, who are more manly than are the pussy-footers who write for the Advocate, because they will not defend the use of instrumental music in the worship, in debate with them. Yet, if the truth was known, Allen's mudslinging is but an effort to cover up his lack of Scriptural authority for his man-made Sunday School institution.

The fact is, the Gospel Advocate has been repeatedly challenged for 15 years to put forth a man to debate this question with one we are willing to put forth, the debate to be published in the Advocate and a medium furnished by us. And they would not, and they would not, and **THEY WOULD NOT**. And Allen knows it, and Smith knows it, and Srygly knows it, and the whole editorial staff of the Gospel Advocate know it. And they have been too cowardly to even try to defend their practice, and the more mudslinging they do, the more evident their defeat.

I am persuaded that the leaders among these brethren have already sold out to Satan. This is evident from the above clipping from the pen of Bro. Allen. But I believe the "rank and file" of the brethren among them are honest and would quit the Sunday School if they should see both sides of the question in a discussion published in the Advocate. But such a discussion would be a death blow to the digressive work done by the Advocate. And Allen knows it, and Srygly knows it, and Smith knows it. So debate there is none.

When Editor Allen made his wicked pass at us, saying we have "a morbid condition of mind," and that we are "insane," he made "lies his refuge" (Isa. 28:15). They "have made a covenant with death, and with hell they are at agreement" (Isa. 28:15). So we need not expect anything but mudslinging from them.

If we are so "incapable of balanced reasoning," as Editor Allen says, why does he not discuss this issue with us, so his readers can see that we are a bunch of crazy fellows who need to be in the insane asylum, and put an end to our progress among them? Yes, why? Is it because he knows it would do the Sunday School cause no good? I think so. If the editor wants to discuss this question with a man we select, the discussion to be published in The Truth and in the Gospel Advo-

cate, the way is now open. So come on, brother; either lead or follow.

—Jas. D. Phillips,
439 N. Drury Ave.,
Kansas City, Mo.

EXAMINE YOURSELVES

Now the Spirit speaketh the expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils—1 Tim. 4:1.

With this warning before us, we can see the necessity of examining ourselves, as Paul again says, whether we are in the faith.—2 Cor. 13:5. And with reference to the Lord's supper he also said, "Let a man examine himself."—1 Cor. 11:28. He did not say let a man examine his enemy, or his friend, his neighbor, or his brother. Mind you it is yourself you are to examine. And if we would put in as much time in examining ourselves as we do others, the cause of Christ would suffer less and more people would be saved. King Ahab lost his life by going to seducing spirits.—1 Kg. 22. He forsook God and God's way and walked in his own ways. He had his own prophets and he loved them and their ways. They told him things that pleased him. He hated Micaiah, God's true prophet because he told him the truth; and he commanded him to be imprisoned and be there fed with bread and water of affliction.

So also some today love their own prophets, who say smooth things that please them. And if a true man to God's word comes into our midst, and preaches, his preaching must "carry a rider" that robs it of all value to us or we are ready to condemn it, and send him ways on a starvation diet, not even bread sometimes. And he and his family suffer.

Brethren, let us examine ourselves lest we be condemned.

David's anger was greatly kindled against a man, but for lack of self-examination, it turned out to be himself that he condemned, when Nathan said, "Thou art the man."—2 Kg. 12:5-7. A little self-examination would have saved him this humiliation and sin.

Two men went to pray; one thanked God that he was not as other men, and he recounted the faults of others to the Lord; the other centered his criticism on himself and humbly confessed himself a sinner before God, but the Lord tells us that he was justified by God's mercy rather than the other. Lk. 18:10-12.

When we decide God accepts "Me and my wife, my son, John and his wife—us four and no more," it may be that a little self-examination will show that we are not in it at all with the Lord.

Dear brethren, if we will heed Paul's admonition, and turn our eyes upon self rigidly until we are brought to repentance if we do not measure up to God's standard, there will be less malice, envy, and hatred, and more love, mercy, kindness, and humility among us. Then God will be pleased and humanity will be blessed by our lives.—Brotherly, H. R. Stringer.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MAY 1, 1929

No. 9

PURE LANGUAGE RESTORED

By Jas. D. Phillips

THE TRUTH

In our effort to complete the restoration of Primitive Christianity, the work so nobly and successfully begun by the Campbells and others of a century ago, we must not overlook the fact that our language is becoming very corrupt, and needs to be improved. Bro. Alexander Campbell, the main leader in the movement to restore the ancient order of things in religion, said, in 1851:

"As the Lord promised by Zephaniah (3:10), that in order to union amongst his people, he would give them "a pure language, that they might all call upon the name of the Lord to serve Him with one consent," so every effort at evangelical reformation must, to heal divisions and to prevent debate among Christians—aim at a "pure language," the language of Canaan, and avoid that of Ashdod,—calling Bible things by Bible words."—Campbell on Baptism, page 20.

Concerning the language of Ashdod, which types the corrupt language of the Catholic and Protestant and Digressive Christian churches, I quote the following from "Pioneer Sermons and Addresses," published by F. L. Rowe:

"The corrupt language of Ashdod has fearfully invaded the pulpit and the press of the living world. It is well illustrated by Nehemiah, chapter 12, in his history of the Jewish captivity. One passage will suffice: 'In those days also, I saw Jews who had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab. And their children spoke half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jewish language; but, according to the language of each people.' 'And,' says Nehemiah the reformer, 'I contended with them and reviled them.'

"Babylon the Great is the anti-type of old Babylon. And most Protestants that have come out of her still speak, and preach, and teach in a mixed and confused dialect.

"No one of Elder Campbell's contemporaries known to me more earnestly contended and labored than he for "a pure speech," a Scriptural dialect, or the calling of Bible themes by Bible names. "The restoration of a pure speech" was with him a cardinal theme, and a petition in many a prayer."

Bro. Campbell said, in explaining what he meant by a "restoration of a pure speech:"

"—instead of the modern ecclesiastic and sectarian terminology, or technical style, we adopt BIBLE NAMES FOR BIBLE THINGS. For example: Instead of 'sacraments,' we prefer ordinances; for 'the Eucharist,' the Lord's Supper; for 'covenant of works,' the law; for 'covenant of grace,' the gospel; for 'Testament,' Institution or

(Continued on page 5)

"I have evaded a discussion of the 'cup' question for four long years, although I have been pressed often to debate it through the papers, especially since 'the Truth (?)' has been founded."—J. N. Cowan.

Note: We are glad to have you tell the truth about this matter. This is what we have been setting forth in "The Truth" since it was founded, but you have been crying "misrepresentation" all the time, as our readers know.

And why do not you or Johnson meet Sanders in the Way if it is an open forum? He tells us that he is ready to meet you. Then why not have the discussion? Is it because you are "running" from him, too? It seems so, or the padlock is on the Way when it comes to the S. S. question, too.—Ed.

"Bro. Duckworth, you know that I have written you several times, begging you for the opportunity to discuss the question through the Way with any man you might select. So why do you continue to make out like you cannot get any one to enter said discussion?"—Ira L. Sanders to R. F. D., 2-16-'29.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

"Upon this rock I will build my church."—Matt. 16:18. Who is this rock? Answer: Christ is the rock.—1 Cor. 10:4. He is the chief corner stone.—Acts 11:12. He is the foundation.—1 Cor. 3:11. He is the door.—Jno. 10:1-9. He is the good shepherd.—Jno. 10:11-16. Head, Eph. 1:22; 5:23. High priest, Heb. 2:17; 4:14; 7:26; King of kings and Lord of lords, Rev. 19:16; all in all, Col. 3:11. He was mighty in battle, Psalm 24, but he did not use carnal weapons. He fought the devil with "It is written," Matt. 4.

Christ did not build churches to suit the people. He built only one, and he built it to suit himself. He did not build his church on Peter, but on the confession that Peter made, namely, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Matt. 16:16. Who revealed it to Peter? God did. v. 17. Did the gates of hell prevail against Christ building his church? No. The devil thought he had Christ safe in death, Heb. 2:14, but Christ burst the bonds of death, and came forth from the tomb, and built his church in spite of the devil. Did the gates of hell prevail against the church? Yes, Rev. 13:7-15; Dan. 7:21-25; 2. Thes. 2:3-12; 1 Tim. 4:1-3.

Catholics claim that Christ built his church on Peter and that the Pope gets his keys from Peter. If that be true, the Catholics are left out, for Peter was the apostle to the Jews, and as they

are not Jews they are left out and Peter had no keys for the Pope. Besides if Christ built his church on Peter, we would have to be added to Peter; but Luke says they were added to the Lord.—Acts 5:14; 11:24. Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles—Gal. 2:7-9. And he did not get his keys from Peter, but from Christ.—Acts 9:15, 16; 22:21; Gal. 1:1-19.

Let us notice Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 1:12, 13. Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of Paul? No. Then we can't be Paulites. Was Peter crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of Peter? No. Then you can't be Peterites. Now was John the baptist crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of John the baptist? No. Then you can't be baptists. Was Campbell crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of Campbell? No. Then you can't be Campbellites. Was the Pope crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of the Pope? No. Then you can't be Catholics. And so with all others but Christ. Was Christ crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of Christ? Yes, yes, and you can be Christians, Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet. 4:16; Acts 4:12. Now do all in the name of Christ, Col. 3:17. Appollos knew only the baptism of John, Acts 18:25. Aquila and Priscilla expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly. Paul found about twelve who had been baptized "unto John's baptism," Acts 19:1-7. Paul had them baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, *ibid*.

Did Peter have all power in heaven and on earth? No; but Christ had, Matt. 28:18. Christ has the keys now, Rev. 1:18; 3:7. Christ did open the book and loose the seven seals, Rev. 5:5, which Peter could not do; neither could the Pope, Rev. 5:3. I believe the beast and the Pope of Rev. 13:1, 2, are the same person. And if that is true, the beast, or Pope, gets his keys or power from the dragon or devil, Rev. 13:2. And we dare not worship the beast, Rev. 14:9-11; 15:2. Christ has a people in Babylon; but he tells them to come out, Rev. 18:4. "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up," and the tares will be gathered first and bound in bundles to be burned, Matt. 13:30-42-50. But he will gather his wheat into his barn, Matt. 13:30. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father," Matt. 13:43; 25:34; Lk. 21:31; 2 Pet. 1:11.—Brotherly, A. J. Thompson, Sabinal, Texas.

CANNOT SEE

"I cannot see how it would be any better to adopt the use of one cup to the exclusion of the right to use more than one, than it would be to adopt the use of more than at all times. And more than that, it is hard to tell which course would offend the greater number; and I am not sure as to which of these weak ones may be the weaker. We have come to the place where it is impossible to adopt either course to the exclusion of the other without offending many. Suppose Paul had found some on each side of the meat

question that were so bitter as to condemn everybody that disagreed with them. What then would he have done? But you may say that the weak one was tempted to worship idols, while there was no temptation to the one who favored eating; so that it would be necessary to respect the conscience of the one that might be tempted to worship the idol. Now that is the main place where your meat question fails to apply in this issue: there are no idols connected with the cup question, so that even if Paul might have been sure just what course to take, there is no reason to think that he would take either side of this issue. In fact I am satisfied that he would have nothing to do with the issue except to condemn the contentious ones."—Jno. R. Freeman.

Remarks

Let us see about this. This "meat" issue is found in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, and after commenting on it in his Commentary, Lard says, "That is, if your brother is grieved by your eating certain food, you no longer walk according to love. The conclusion is inevitable. You must refrain from eating, at least when your brother can be cognizant of the act." He then makes this application, saying, "A church, suppose, is composed of a hundred members, and I am among them. Ninety-nine of these members decide to put an organ into our house of worship. The use of an organ grieves my conscience, and is offensive to my feelings. Do the ninety-nine walk according to love when they put the organ in?"

But Brother Freeman, Digressive like, would tell Bro. Lard, "There are no idols connected with the organ question" and "that is the main place where your meat question fails to apply in this issue." So in comes the organ—and the CUPS. And where one gets in the other gets in. It has been evident for some time that the Cups brethren were turning Digressive. But we did not expect them to brand themselves so soon.

The Digressive could worship with the organ or without it, but he would not give it up and worship without it in order to worship with his brother who could not conscientiously worship with it, and thus maintain the unity of the church, indeed he would not. Likewise the Sunday School brother could worship with the S. S. or without it, but he would not give it up and worship without it in order to maintain the unity of the church by remaining with the brother who could not conscientiously worship with it—indeed he would not. And the CUPS brother says he can worship with the CUPS or with the cup, but he will not give up the Cups and worship without them in order to worship with his brother who can not conscientiously worship with them in order to maintain the unity of the church—indeed he will not. And so we find all digression alike. The same spirit, the spirit of lawlessness, animates it all. And open division follows, and the Digressive wags on and on, drifting, drifting.

We have the very best of evidence both from Paul's law of love as set forth in the meat question and from his teaching on the Lord's supper, that he would have taken the side of the one cup

in this issue, for not only does the law of love demand that he take the side using one cup, but also that which he received from the Lord, as is evident from his setting it forth by saying "cup" and not CUPS. And we maintain and are ready to affirm—that a church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the Communion. And we are ready to meet any man that will add s to "cup" and affirm it with us. Cowan has refused to do this, and where is the man that will do it? He is yet to be found. Dare the President of Littlefield College do it? No: he has been tried. He has advocated the use of CUPS and that publicity, but he knows he, like the editor of the Apostolic Way, can not defend by the Bible "more than one." A crooked set—as crooked as any organ advocate or Sunday School digressive.—Ed.

"AWAKE THOU THAT SLEEPEST"

Paul says, "Awake thou that sleepest;" "Be not slothful in business, but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord;" "Redeeming the time for the days are evil," etc.

If there ever was a time when most of the "loyal" brethren were sound asleep it is now. They are doing comparatively nothing toward sending the gospel to the misinformed; while the Sunday School brethren are watching every opportunity to preach to all they can reach. And they are circulating lots of literature setting forth their views. This proves the truthfulness of the Scripture: "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light."

We, as "loyal" brethren ought to be up and doing. We should make the church of God shine forth in the light of "a city set on a hill." We are said by Peter to "shine as lights in the world." And Christ says we do not "light a candle and put it under a bushel."

There are several hundred congregations in the United States that have not bowed the knee to Baal. But there are very few preachers left since The Apostolic Way has been "smothering the truth" on the cup question. Most of the preachers have gone off with them and are doing all in their power to destroy the peace of God's people by advocating the cups privately among the cups people and leaving them to do the rest. There are many one-cup congregations that are still using these digressives for their meetings—just as many of the loyal churches used instrumental music advocates and were thus led into digression in the days of Benjamin Franklin; and just as many churches that opposed the Sunday School used Sunday School preachers until we became hopelessly divided. And if the sound churches don't quit using the cups digressives, they will soon force another division upon us.

There are but few preachers left among us who have not gone off with either the Sunday School faction or the cups faction. What few there are left to tell the "old, old story" in its primitive purity and simplicity are hampered in their work

by a lack of a proper support. Some of them have been driven from the field in order to support their families. It seems that a great many of the brethren don't care whether a preacher and his family are in comfortable circumstances—just so they can use him for their meeting.

By all means, brethren—you who have done but little toward the support of the gospel—get busy! Get the church where you worship to where it wants to do something. Support a preacher in as many mission meetings as you can. When you see a worthy brother wearing out his life preaching on a scanty support, send him a contribution occasionally. We can build up congregations all over the United States if we only will. But we must work all together to do it. Don't let your money cry out against you in the great "Day of all days"—the Day of Judgment. There is coming an awful terrible judgment and then shall we be called before the Judge of all Earth to give an account. Many brethren will have to answer for not supporting the gospel preachers. Will you be among them?

CHURCHES, GET BUSY! PREACHERS, GET BUSY! Let the faithful preachers—there are only a few left—get in the harness and work. And by all means, let the faithful churches get behind them and support them while they are there! And let all pray that the work may prosper.

—Jas. D. Phillips,
8127 Walnut Drive,
Los Angeles, Calif.

P. S.—While you are supporting the sound preachers, don't forget Bro. Harper and "The Truth"—the only loyal paper published.—J. D. P.

TRULY, "IT WAS"

"It was to stem this tide of innovations that the Apostolic Way was started and not simply to antagonize one phase of it—the Sunday school—as some have vainly supposed, though that was the first point of attack because it was the most outstanding feature of numerous departures from New Testament doctrine and practice. Other derelictions are coming in for exposure and brethren who are zealous for Bible order in all things are exhorted to give it the wide circulation it deserves as the one publication that stands, flatfooted, for a "thus saith the Lord" in all things."—Apostolic Way, April 15, 1929, G. A.

Remarks

Truly, it was started (in 1913), under the ownership of Rice, Harper, and Trott "to stem this tide of innovations," and not just "simply to antagonize one phase of it—the Sunday school—as some have vainly supposed." It took a bold and decided stand against the use of CUPS in the communion, from the very first, as the writings of Harper and Trott therein, as editors, and owners (after the decease of Rice) plainly show, and "flatfooted, for a 'thus saith the Lord' in all things." Indeed, it did; but now "How is the mighty fallen." Which side of "the cup question" that came up twenty years ago among the church-

(Continued on page 6)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00



LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

THE CHILD AND THE MAN

After quoting I Cor. 13:11 and Heb. 5:12-14, Brother A. M. Morris, editor of Peoples Bible Advocate, the motto of which is "If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God," makes these remarks, namely, "These scriptures set forth facts of human nature. A child can not think or understand as a man. And a strong man should not think and understand as children. 'In malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men.' In public schools there are many grades. This is recognizing the principles set forth above—that children must begin with primary teaching and be graded as to years and ability. It seems strange that some disciples of Christ would have children, youths and seniors all in a group in studying the Bible. They denounce classifying into separate groups in order to teach them the lessons which they are capable of understanding

"It is ridiculous to assume that what edifies grownups likewise edifies children. This would reverse Paul's teaching and compel him to say, 'When I was a child, I spoke as a man, I understood as a man, I thought as a man.' Or 'when I was a man, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, and I thought as a child; I had not put away childish things.' If this were true, the babes could digest meat, and the strong men could digest milk only. The apostle is clearly opposed to grouping children and men because of their disparity of age and ability to understand, hence all who oppose classes for study, which respects the talents and abilities of the groups, are diametrically opposed to the apostle."—Dec. 15, 1928.

Remarks

Just a turn of the wrist. How easy it was for Brother Morris to refute the brethren who oppose the classes, and that too with the Bible. Why is it that the class advocates have so long overlooked these scriptures which, to let Brother Morris say it, so effectively put the opposers of the "class system" to rout? And if they can now prevail upon this worthy brother to give them a boost on the "woman teacher question," and the Sunday School literature the battle will be over in a jiffy, and those who oppose the Sunday School will be effectively vanished. Viv la Morris. Bring out the crown.

Indeed, this would be laughable were it not so serious. It makes one thing of the ostrich, which hides by putting just its head in the sand, while

its long legs and bulky body stick out in full view.

Can it be possible that Bro. Morris has finally unearthed the Scripture where the Holy Spirit has authorized the organization of the church into classes? Does he say it is not the church? Perhaps so, since he does not baptize children of such tender age as are those taken into the classes. Then what is it? The family? Paul gives directions as to the bringing up of children in the family, and surely the brother will not tell us the thing (and it is a thing, but he may be ashamed to name it) he here contemplates teaching in classes, is the family. What is it? A "Young People's Meeting?" a "Christian Endeavor?" a "Sunday School"? What is it brother, in plain English?

We notice that the brother did not go to the Bible to get a concrete example of its working, but to the "public school." Why is this? Is it possible that inspired men at no time and place carried out the directions so plainly revealed, to have the brother tell it, in regard to organizing classes with "children" here and "youths" there, with "strong men" yonder in the same room with a teacher over each class, as is done where they have not yet constructed "classrooms to prevent confusion"? Is it? Did inspired men slip a cog here, and leave it for some uninspired man to "interpret" the Bible and show us the authority for classes, so plainly revealed? Wonderful.

Is it not possible that the brother, rather, has slipped and fell here by reasoning from analogy, as many a poor fellow has, and run into humanism? The baby sprinkler is not worse tangled in his foolish heart.

Does the brother mean to tell us that when he "teaches" (Mt. 23:19, 20) the "world" and "feeds the church of the Lord," standing before an audience of "children" and "youths" and "strong men," his practice is "diametrically opposed to the apostle?" If not, why not, as he presses Paul's analogy? Yes, why? And how long would he hold his position as a teacher in the "public school" were he to put several classed in the same room with a teacher hearing each class at the same time, as is done with this class teaching where they have not yet introduced the "classrooms"? You do not need to go any farther to find that which is "ridiculous" and opposed to divine revelation, for "God is not the author of confusion."

We would invite the Advocate to divide space with us in a discussion of "the class question," but it would be useless. They dare not do it, and yet they will put in the classes, causing alienation, hatred, malice, and divisions. They are in the same fix that the music brethren found themselves. If the Bible authorizes it, no church can be apostolic without it; and if the Bible does not authorize it, they are guilty of speaking where the Bible is silent, and causing division.—Ed.

LIKE BEGETS LIKE

Never has there been a better display of this than in the recent action of the publisher of the Apostolic Way in turning down our notice of "The Truth" sent to that paper. When the Firm Foundation persisted in keeping down any notice of the

existence of the Apostolic Way, as the Apostolic Way now has "The Truth," an ad was sent to the F. F., which they ignored. And the brethren were kept in the dark as to what was going on. And now the same policy has been invoked by the publisher of the Apostolic Way, which has become as cowardly and as much afraid for its readers to see the truth as the F. F. has been. Seeing that the A. W. had persistently ignored the existence of "The Truth," I sent its publisher the following notice, offering to pay for its insertion if necessary:

"I wish to call the attention of the A. W. readers to "The Truth," a paper published in the interest of a complete restoration of Primitive Christianity. It contends for 'the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.' It opposes all innovations now disturbing the peace of God's people—such as the pastor, the cups, the Sunday School, the Young People's Meetings, etc. It is an 8-page semi-monthly. The subscription price is \$1.00 the year. H. C. Harper is publisher. Bro. Harper is a former editor of the A. W. Many of the old writers for the Way now write for the Truth. Address: "The Truth," Sneads, Fla.—Jas. D. Phillips."

And I now say of the A. W. as it was then said of the F. F.; They are afraid some might learn about "The Truth" and its address, and they are going to stand guard over the minds of their readers, not going to allow them to read "The Truth", no sir-ree, not R. F. Duckworth. Now watch for their alibi. They will print it if they have the courage; otherwise they may say nothing. If Brother Showalter—just substitute Brother Duckworth here now, thinks he is going to keep the truth away from his readers, he is mistaken. Some may be Pope ridden, but not all, we are sure. Of all cowards, it seems to me the religious coward is the most despicable. And I repeat the words from the same issue of that once-fearless paper, words now applicable only to the stand taken by "The Truth"—"namely, "The truth has nothing to lose in the long run from an investigation, fair or unfair. We believe we have the truth; hence we court investigation. G. H. P. Showalter (R. F. D. now included) does not court investigation, therefore, he does not believe he has the truth." Turn on the light, brethren; let cowards quake; truth has nothing to fear. "Truth shines brighter be collision."—Jas. D. Phillips.

PURE LANGUAGE RESTORED

(Continued from page 1)

Covenant; for 'Trinity,' Godhead; for 'the first, second and third person,' the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; for 'Eternal Son,' the Son of God; for 'original sin,' the fall or the offence; for 'Christian Sabbath,' Lord's day or First day; for effectual calling, calling or obedience; for 'merits of Christ,' righteousness or sacrifice of Christ; for general atonement, ransom for all; for 'free grace,' grace; for 'free will,' will, &C. &C."—Campbell on Baptism, page 20.

To this I will add, that instead of saying, "Get religion," we should say, "obey the gospel; for

"join the church," added to the church! "under the blood," purchased by the blood of Christ; for "our church," the church of God or of Christ.

There are some things practiced among us, which are not 'Bible things' and hence, they cannot be called by "Bible names." For example: "Sunday School" or "Bible School" or "Bible Study" or "Bible Classes." There is one institution that is called by all these names. It is a separate organization from the church, and hence can't be called the church. "The Pastor" is a name for an unscriptural preacher. Elders (not preachers) were called pastors in the days of the Apostles, hence no preacher was called "the pastor" in Apostolic times. "The (Preacher) Pastor" is not a "Bible thing," hence cannot be called by a "Bible name." "The cup" used on the Lord's table is called "a cup," "the cup," etc. "Cups" is not a "Bible thing," hence cannot be called by a "Bible name." All these things are as foreign to the "pure language" of the Bible as whales are to Arizona desert. What are we going to do with them? They are not "Bible things" and hence cannot be called by "Bible names." By all means, give them up! Do away with these things and instead of saying, "Sunday School," say church; for "cups," the cup. Put the "Pastor" in the evangelistic field, where he belongs; and cease calling him 'the Pastor,' but call him an evangelist.

Again, Bro. Campbell says: "The confusion of religious speech now existing is analogous to the confusion of speech at Babel, and the confounding or mixing the pure language of Canaan with the language of Ashdod during the captivity; our creeds, sermons, and scholastic terms, mingled with some Scriptural terms, terminating in an almost general ignorance of the sacred writings, is illustrative of the analogy between us and the captive Jews while in Babylon."

Let us come out of this confusion, and give up the corrupt language of Babylon and Ashdod and return to the pure language of Canaan. Paul says, "Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine." And he also says, "Use pure speech which cannot be condemned." It is high time that all who "love Zion and seek the peace and happiness of Jerusalem" were doing this.

"Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city; for henceforth there shall no more come unto thee the uncircumcised and the unclean. Shake thyself from the dust, O Jerusalem; arise, loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion."—Isa. 52:1. "Up, and be doing, and the Lord will be with us." Come out of Babylon, my people," saith the Lord.

UNITY

Moses E. Lard, who was one of the outstanding preachers and writers noted for their advocacy of the "Plea to restore the Apostolic church," has this to say in his Commentary on Romand, p. 224, namely, "That is, if your brother is grieved by your eating certain food, you no longer walk according to love if you persist in eating it. But

you are bound to walk according to love. The conclusion is inevitable. You must refrain from eating, at least when your brother can be cognizant of the act. If he is not able to keep from feeling hurt when you eat, you must, then in deference to his feelings, refrain."

He then makes application of this plainly stated law of love as given in the Holy Oracles as follows: "A church, suppose, is composed of a hundred members, and I am among them. Ninety-nine of these members decide to put an organ into our house of worship. Such use of an organ grieves my conscience, and is offensive to my feelings. Do the ninety-nine walk according to love when they put the organ in?" No, a thousand times no.

McGarvey tells us some will say, "We want it and we are going to have it." Yes, and they did have it and destroyed that unity for which the Savior prayed.

And now the Firm Foundation, the Christian Leader, the Gospel Advocate, and others are upholding those who say of the "class system," which is being brought in as the organ, "We want it and we are going to have it," and they over-ride the law of love, as did the organ advocates, and the unity that Jesus prayed for and Paul advocated, has been broken, and the world goes unsaved. How sad.

And this is not all, for we now have those who say of the CUPS, which are giving offense, "We want them and we are going to have them." And shall we see the unity destroyed again? Why will brethren thus trample under foot the law of love given by the Holy Spirit? Why will they thus spurn the Savior's prayer? That a church can use one cup and "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent," is not questioned. But that it can use cups and thus speak and be thus silent, is disputed by some of the best and most talented men in the brotherhood. Now what are we going to do about it? Remember the judgment will require of us a reckoning of how we answer this all-important question. And now may God help us to so answer it that we shall not be condemned for the course we take. Campbell has pointed out, as I have shown in these columns, that one cup was used in each congregation one hundred years ago. And the Anti-Nicene history shows that one cup was used in each congregation before the deflection into Catholicism. And may God help those churches that have transgressed to repent before the Lord removes their candlestick out of its place. Yours for peace and harmony on the will of God, —Jas. D. Phillips.

TRULY, "IT WAS"

(Continued from page 3)

es of Christ to pervert them, does it now stand on? It has studiously evaded a stand against the Cups, has actually closed its doors in the face of its owners and editors under its present high-brow management, and has tried its level best to play neutral if not shut-mouth altogether. This fact is patent to any casual observer. It has played the role of "the Pastor"—anything to please the people and rake in the money. And on this

line it has been a grand success, but for taking "a stand against all innovations," it has been a "flat-footed" failure.

True, the Doctor, since he has ceased to be connected with the paper either as editor or owner, has said time and again that he is ready to meet Cowan "at any time" in a written discussion in the paper on "the cup question," and as has been shown time and again, he "personally" preferred to have the Clark-Harper discussion to appear in the paper, and was glad that it was to come off, while the publisher stood "flatfooted" against it, and did not run it in the paper until he saw that brethren were determined to have it and were raising money to put it out without running it in the paper. But the Doctor still persists in misrepresenting the matter by saying that Duckworth agrees with him, while I have shown time and again that they do not agree in this matter. For example, one of the Doctor's most recent expressions is this: "Brother Duckworth contends for one cup as strenuously as I and in that item, neither of us agrees with or endorses Bros. Clark or Cowan, but considering how faithfully they have both contended against other innovations, we hope they may both yet be converted from the error of their way and I am sure the scriptures teach that every means to accomplish that should be used before withdrawal."

We have given the expression thus full to prevent any charge of "garbling," as has been made before, and we will give more if the Doctor calls for it.

The Doctor seems here to be far more lenient than Cowan now does, for if I get him correctly in his recent utterances he asserts very emphatically that those who contend for one cup are heretics and should be withdrawn from after the first and the second admonition, while Duckworth takes a still different position from that of the Doctor or Cowan, namely, "They are not questions for tests of fellowship as I see it." He says, "Well, as to a discussion of the 'cup' question, the 'wine' question, the 'tobacco' question, and other ideas that brethren get up by drawing extravagantly upon their imaginations on the one side or the other. I feel that is all right for them to talk about them and reason about them, they should not divide over them. They are not questions for tests of fellowship as I see it. I consider that one cup could meet the demands, but I wouldn't refuse to fellowship a brother believed the fermented only, or the unfermented only could be used, and the tobacco question, I think that it is better for men that they do not use it, unless it be of special benefit to them, but I do not feel that I have a right to decide whether it does, or does not benefit them. They might use it in moderation as they use other things, but when one uses it to a point that they, themselves, know is injurious to them, surely they should be strongly exhorted to give it up."

Does the Doctor contend for the "cup" no more "strenuously" than Duckworth does? The truth is, that many have lost confidence in Duckworth as a Bible man and the Doctor is trying to patch

up the matter in a way to satisfy them, but it can not be done. The Apostolic Way does not take a stand for one cup as it did before its present publisher put his "policy" in vogue and made it a compromise journal, which it now is—anything for the money, just as "the Pastor" works. And the brethren are blindly following on. And Dr. Trott is not only being made a decoy to lure them on, but he is basely making himself such in the face of the most incontrovertible evidence, that he does not agree with the Way on this question. And since the Way ignores a discussion of this cup question with Trott or the writer, and Cowan will not discuss it in "The Truth," which is open to him, he is safe in the arms of—back out, as cowardly as religious cowards can be.

WHAT ABOUT BOBBED HAIR?

I have been asked to write an article for "The Truth" dealing with the "bobbed hair" question. As I had rather quote older and abler writers than to give my own writings to the brotherhood, I give here a clipping from the pen of Bro. John T. Hinds, which appeared in the Firm Foundation about the time the "bobbed hair" evil was taken up by Christians. But before giving Bro. Hinds' article, let me say that the practice of bobbing the hair first started in the houses of illfame—the most indecent places on earth—and was borrowed from them by the "society" ladies in the cities, and was finally borrowed from them by Christian women. To say the least of it, it is from the world and Christians are not to be "conformed to the world" (Rom. 12:1,2). As Bro. Joseph Miller truly says:

"God's children are commanded to 'love not the world, neither the things that are in the world' (1 Jno. 2:15; Jas. 4:4). To follow Christ we must not fashion ourselves according to this world' (Rom. 12:2), but we are commanded to 'keep ourselves unspotted from the world.' (Jas. 1:27)." Consider this carefully; then read the following article by Bro. Hinds:

A brother in Texas asks the following questions:

1. "Is the general tenor of the teaching of the Scriptures for or against the present fashion of women bobbing their hair?"

2. "Or do the Scriptures encourage Christian women to wear long or short hair?"

First of all, I wish to say that regardless of what the Scriptures may say on this or other matters most people will follow the fashion. It is unfortunately true that most people will do what is popular whether right or wrong. Like King Saul who lost his kingdom because of his disobedience we "fear the voice of the people."

There are two ways to arrive at conclusions. One is the direct statements of the Bible. The other is the "general tenor of the teaching of the Scriptures." Some things should not be done because a violation of direct Scriptural statements. Other things should not be done because of the tendency, influence, possible or probable results that may follow. A good Christian will never fail

to consider influence and results. In 1 Cor. 11:14, 15 the contrast between "long" hair for women and "short" hair for men is so clearly presented that it cannot be ignored safely. Of course, the question of "long" and "short" may be a relative matter, as no particular length is specified. It may be possible that those who bob the hair may leave enough to keep up the distinction between long for women and short for men; that is, may be with hair just bobbed the distinction between men and women may be kept sufficiently clear to avoid sin. But, it must be confessed that with this step there is grave danger of destroying this distinction by further shortening the hair. When the fashion first started I said I was afraid of it even if it were permissible. I feared that it would develop the habit of women and girls cutting it like men. This fear has already been justified. Many women cut it like men on the back of the head, and some about the same all over. This is undoubtedly a violation of Paul's teaching as well as disgusting to a large part of the male sex.

I still fear that this habit will grow until women in general will cease to have any respect for Paul's teaching. It is my judgment that all Christian women who have had their hair bobbed better let it grow again, and those who have not had the hair bobbed better refuse to do it. I expect some of them will call me a crank for such advice and will continue to bob their hair. But I shall take some satisfaction in the thought that I may be right in spite of such opinions. At any rate I know that my advice is safe and can lead to no bad results.

JOHN T. HINDS.

I consider the advice of Bro. Hinds as sane, sound, and Scriptural. But as he has truly said, "Regardless of what the Scriptures may say on this or other matters, most people will follow the fashion." This is regrettable. The very fact that Christians are commanded to "shun the very appearance of evil" is enough to condemn the practice of bobbed hair among them. It has the "appearance of evil," therefore, it should be "shunned" by Christians.

Many of our bobbed-haired sisters are very loud in quoting "Let your women keep silence in the churches" and "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection," when talking to sisters who teach in the church; but while they are willing to quote this, they should be willing, also, to quote what the same Apostle says on the "hair bobbing" question. And the sisters who favor women teaching in the church and oppose bobbed hair among Christians should seriously consider 1 Cor. 14:34, 35. It is very inconsistent to favor the one and oppose the other.

There are some preachers among us who condemn bobbed hair and advocate the practice of women teaching in the church. Thus they teach 1 Cor. 11:14, 15; but ignore 1 Cor. 14:34, 35. On the other hand, there are preachers among us, who tell sister that Paul said for them to "keep silence in the churches" (1 Cor. 14:34, 35); but insist that it is all right for them to bob their hair. Thus they teach 1 Cor. 14:34, 35; but ignore 1

Cor. 11:14, 15. So they are very inconsistent.

Regardless of what preachers and others may say of women teachers in the churches and bobbed hair, it is enough for any God-fearing woman to know that God says, "as in all churches of the saints, let your women keep silence in the churches;" and "If a woman have long hair, it is a glory unto her: for her hair is given for a covering." Girls, mothers, you will want a bright home in heaven some time. Why not please God and get it—a mansion?

—Jas. D. Phillips.

THE CONTRIBUTION

In Bro. Jones' reply to me, he said the scriptures I used did not say they put the contribution on the table. If they did not put the money on the table, why did not he tell us where they did put it? Where was the money put before it was placed in the hands of Barnabas and Saul? He went to Heb. 8:5, where Moses was commanded to make all things according to the pattern. Yes, they had the tabernacle in the wilderness. Does Bro. Jones think the church started there? Some sectarians say the church was started in the wilderness; some say it was started in the time of Abraham, some say it was started in Eden, and some say in the time of John the baptist, while others claim during the personal ministry of Christ as the time for it. But we know that the church Christ built, was not until they were baptized in the Holy Spirit at Jerusalem after Christ ascended to the Father.

Bro. Jones cites us to 2 Kings 12:9, where, under the old covenant, the priest took a chest and bored a hole in it, and in 2 Chron. 24:8-13 we find they put the money into the chest day by day. What does Bro. Jones mean by citing this? Are we under the old covenant? He seems to be as badly confused as sectarians in trying to locate the church of Christ. He says why put the money on the table and cause confusion like a mourners' bench. The trouble with him is that he does not seem to know the difference between a mourners' bench and the table of the Lord. Jesus said, as my Father hath appointed unto me: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.—Lk. 22:29,30. The Lord put the table in his kingdom. So it is far from a mourner's bench when we gather around it to worship God. But Bro. Jones, like sectarians, makes fun of it. Is it right to lay your money on the table? Say yes or no now. We are under the new covenant, Heb. 8:6, where the Lord's table is, 1 Cor. 10:16-22. So putting money in the hole made in a chest is gone, together with the covenant that passed away, Heb. 8:13.

In Matt. 21:12 and Mk. 11:15 we find money on the table. Mark 11:16 he would not suffer any vessel carried through the temple. Where is the Lord's table? In the kingdom. Who gave the orders to lay by? Paul, 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. And he said ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils. 1 Cor. 10:21. We eat at the Lord's table, drink at the Lord's table, and we can lay by our contribution at the Lord's table, for whether therefore ye eat or drink or whatsoever

ye do, do all to the glory of God.—1 Cor. 10:31. And we lay by to the glory of God. We meet to worship to the glory of God. We are in the kingdom, the table is in the kingdom, we are around the table in singing, praying, reading, exhorting, teaching, eating, drinking, and we lay by our collection on the Lord's table, all to the glory of God. And the money is taken and used to the glory of God. And there is no confusion in a worship like that. Any thing is confusion in the worship of God that is not by his appointment, whether mourners' bench, passing the hat, cups, or any thing else. To do as God directs in the worship, is to do things decently and in order. 1 Cor. 14:40.

—Chas. F. Reese.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

By Benj. Franklin

"The Church of Christ was not made for the preachers, but the preachers of Christ were made for the world and the church. The church of Christ does not belong to the preachers of Christ,—it is not their property, but they belong to the church, are its property. The church is not the servant of the preachers, but preachers of Christ are servants of the churches. The Church of Christ is not called and sent by preachers, but preachers are called and sent by the church. Preachers in the kingdom of Christ are no more dignitaries, kings, and priests, than any other members. They are the Lord's instruments, put forth the church to do his work, and mighty instruments, too, while the Lord is with them, but the poorest, most useless and miserable creatures on this earth when forsaken of God. Or, in other words, when they are doing the Lord's work, with an eye single to His glory, there are no such instruments for good among men; but when they become selfish, engage simply in their own work, or that which they can turn to their own personal aggrandizement, their usefulness ceases, and they are dead weights upon the cause. Our Lord's own life is the model of all perfection in human character, both public and private. No community need look for any permanent good from any preacher who does not imitate the character of his Lord and Master. He may be much of a gentleman, very fine, pleasant and interesting to worldly-minded persons, and not do anything or say anything that would remind anyone of the Savior of the world. But to come under the name of a preacher of Christ, a disciple of Christ, and not be like him, not make men think of him, love him, and desire to come to him, is a deception upon the church and the world."—Choice Selections.

PROTRACTED MEETING

The brethren of the church of Christ at Loco., Okla., have secured the services of James D. Phillips, of Kansas City, Mo., to hold their meeting this year, beginning the 1st day of August, 1929, at the community Tabernacle in Loco.

Bro. Phillips is a young man of only 25 years of age, but he is an able gospel preacher. He is one of the most loyal preachers we have, and we hope other churches near here will use him while he is in Oklahoma.—M. Sellers.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MAY 15, 1929

No. 10

MOORE AGAINST MARTIN

In the Christian Leader of Sept. 25, 1928, a sister asks this question: "Was I Cor. 14: 34, 35 given only to the prophets' wives, or does it apply to all Christian women today?"

Brother T. Q. Martin, scholarly editor of the Leader, replied: "I see nothing in the text or context that would limit the application of the language to the wives of the prophets. The expression, 'As in all the churches of the saints' and 'as also saith the law, would forbid such limitation.'"

Now, listen to Bro. Ira C. Moore, senior editor of the Leader. He says:

"Turn to 1 Cor. 14:34. This epistle was written about the year 58 or 59. The possession of a spiritual gift would carry with it the right to use that gift. The Spirit would not work against himself by forbidding the exercise of one of his gifts. This forces the conclusion that gifts were not bestowed upon the women and that this lack of spiritual gifts was what made it 'shameful for a woman to speak in the church,' and 'permitted them not to speak.'—Leader, June 24, 1924.

Now, we have Moore—an editor of the Leader—against Martin—another editor of the Leader. So we have the editorial staff of the Leader divided against itself.

Who is right, Moore or Martin? Did either of these brethren give any evidence that he was right? I am glad to say that Brother Martin did. Re-read what he has to say. He gave Paul's reason why the language should be applied to Christian women today. Did Bro. Moore give any evidence? No, he gave his own assertion.

I used both these quotations against Bro. Moore in our debate at Charleston. He failed to meet Bro. Martin's argument. I said, "Bro. Martin is going to hold Bro. Moore a meeting. I hope he converts Bro. Moore." Brother Moore said, "Just wait and see if I don't convert Bro. Martin." So we are "waiting". But I hope Bro. Martin does the converting if any is done, and brings Moore to the truth.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

VIGILANT

"Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."

Now if we fail to obey this command to be vigilant or watchful, we will surely be devoured by Satan. The devil is the one we must watch. If we were out in some forest where there were lions, we would be sure to look in all directions and in every dark corner before we would go in-

to it, because we know the lion is tricky, and seeks to devour. But we fail to watch Satan as we would a lion. Let us notice how the devil works so that we may be able to watch him. In the 13th Chap. of Matt. the devil took the word away from the heart of some, while in some others he choked out the word with cares of this world and deceitfulness of riches and the lusts for other things. And we want to know what the lusts of the flesh are. These lusts are many, but I call attention to a very common one that some people are letting deceive them. It is the habit of using tobacco, which contains a narcotic poison and they get "tobacco heart," "tobacco throat," "tobacco stomach," tobacco nerves," and many other troubles result from its use. Paul speaks of "many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition."—1 Tim. 6:9.

A lust causes us to use tobacco, and it is a very fascinating lust. Yes, and expensive lust. "Holy both in body and in spirit," says Paul. I Tim. 7:34. "Glorify God therefore in our body." I Cor. 6:20. How can you do this and gratify such a lust? I do not think you can, and Satan may be hiding here to devour you. Watch, brother? And if Paul would reject even meat, which is a food, rather than to cause another to use it and sin, how much more would he lay aside tobacco that might lead another to use it as a lust of the flesh, even if it is not so used by you.

And there is a lust that causes some to wear immodest clothing and expose their nakedness with little if any shame and cause others to do wrong. Think how Satan lurking around trying to devour such, and oh, if they could only see him as a hungry, roaring lion ready to devour them. And there is the lust that draws you to the obscene show and other worldliness, lusts that will drown your soul. Oh, be careful. "Prove all things," yes, prove them, says Paul. I Thes. 5:21. Yes, watch, watch, watch, for that old lion may be lurking around. Look around that tobacco leaf, curled so nicely; look behind that screen, so dainty and dazzling. Make sure Satan is not there. And look in God's mirror, his word, for the adorning that is pleasing to God. 1 Pet. 3.

Satan worked through Peter to tempt Christ. Matt. 16:22, 23. Christ said to Peter, "get thee behind me, Satan." Now if Satan tempted Christ through Peter an apostle, is he not likely to tempt us through men who are what we term good? Paul says, "Satan is transformed into an angel of light." Again: "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." Now if the devil comes to us in some man and teaches things not in the word of God, and we fear to resist him because some one may say we are fussing or that it causes some

disturbance in the church, can you not see that the devil is thus hiding behind some man to shield his works to sow false teaching? And through just such cowardice is Satan devouring many churches. Let us watch in all, yes, ALL, directions, and when we see the lion, go after him without fear or favor, not hiding behind anything but "the shield of faith" while we use "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." And let us watch all, both friend and foe.—Albert Bledsoe, Littlefield, Texas.

NOT BIBLE QUESTIONS

During my recent meeting at Montebello, Calif., some of the brethren at the digressive, organ, society, festival "Church of Christ," became deeply interested and expressed a desire to have their divisive and questionable practices tested by the Word of God and assured us that their preacher would debate with us. Their preacher's name is Edward Charles.

I sent the following to him:

Propositions for Debate

The use of mechanical (instrumental) music in Christian worship is authorized by the New Testament.

The use of the Sunday School organization in teaching the Scriptures is authorized by the New Testament.

The use of the missionary society in preaching the Gospel is authorized by the New Testament.

The use of cups in the communion is authorized by the New Testament.

The practice of receiving people from sectarian churches without baptizing them "unto the remission of sins" is authorized by the New Testament.

I will deny any or all of these propositions. And if asked to do so, I will affirm everything that I teach and practice, religiously, to be authorized by the New Testament.

Bro. Charles turned all these propositions down, not because they did not state the issues between us, but "because," said he, "they are not Bible questions." And there you are—away from the Bible, but in Babylon.

Now, some one please take the news to Lappin of the Christian Standard, Moore of the Christian Leader, to Allen of the Gospel Advocate, to Sommer of the Apostolic Review, and to Duckworth of the Apostolic Way—tell Lappin his instrumental music in Christian worship is "not a Bible question;" tell Moore that his Sunday School is "not a Bible question;" tell Allen that his "individual communion (?) cups" practice is "not a Bible question;" tell Sommer that his sect-baptism is "not a Bible question;" tell Duckworth that his "two or more cups" is "not a Bible question."

And tell all these men that Thomas Campbell said:

"Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church, or be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament."

Ask Lappin if his instrumental music is "as old as the New Testament?" Ask Moore if his Sunday School is "as old as the New Testament?" Ask Allen if his "individual communion (?) cups" are "as old as the New Testament?" Ask Sommer if his practice of receiving sectarians into our fellowship is "as old as the New Testament?" Ask Duckworth if his "two or more cups" in the congregations are "as old as the New Testament?"

Now tell these men that Creacy (one of their own number) said, "To make a law where God has made none is as sinful as it is to transgress one God has made." Ask them who made the instrumental music law? The Sunday School law? The "individual cups" law? The sect baptism law? And the "Two or more" cups law?

And tell them that, to be like the primitive Christians, we must continue "steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching" (Acts. 2:42). And tell them that, if we are ever saved, we must keep in mind the fact that "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God."—2 Jno. 9, R. V. And tell them that Paul said for us to "learn not to go beyond the things that are written."—1 Cor. 4:6.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

THE NEW BIRTH, NO. II.

(Jno. 3:5)

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." To be "born again," as cited in John 3:3 is explained in John 3:5, and means that a man must be "born of water and of the Spirit." It is apparent that the "kingdom" indicated in John 3:5 is the eternal realm of God's kingdom (see John 3:13), which clearly teaches that no man can go to heaven from whence Jesus came unless he be "born of water and of the Spirit." The margin in John 3:3 reads "from above," and to be born from above means to be "born of water and of the Spirit," John 3:5.

The baptism of John was "from above," Mark 11:30, and this forever clinches the fact that John 3:5 is water baptism by the Holy Spirit, and exactly compares with 1 Cor. 12:13, namely, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." A man is born from above of water and the Spirit just as the baptism of John was from Heaven, or from above. The baptism of John was designed by the God above, and the water of the Jordan and of the whole earth are "from above." Heb. 6:1; Isa. 55:10, 11. The entire system of redemption was spoken "from Heaven." Heb. 12:25-29. And so Christian baptism is "from above," and to be born of water and of the Spirit is "from above."

In John 3:3 the term "again" is styled "anew," and so to be born again, or born from above, or born anew means to be "born of water and of the Spirit." The term "Holy Spirit" is always used in the Bible in the masculine gender, and no birth of it is cited in the Bible except in conjunction with the water, as we say that Washington was born of English parents. And where the phrase "born of God" is cited in the King James trans-

lation, it is styled "begotten" in the Revised version.

The phrase "born of the Spirit" (John 3:6) in the K. G. version is styled "begotten of the Spirit" in Anderson's translation and others. It is the Holy Spirit of which we are born of water in baptism, and it is the Holy Spirit of which and by which one is begotten and quickened in the waters of baptism. Hence the declaration of Jesus "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

(To be concluded)

—G. A. Crutchfield, Ala. City, Ala.

SHOULD CHRISTIANS MARRY UNBELIEVERS?

"The Christians (those who lived in Apostolic times) inter-married with one another, and not with the world. They were expelled for marrying any other person than a Christian. Whosoever violates this law of primitive Christianity will be sure to suffer the penalty, whether he is expelled or not." Thus writes Bro. Jacob Creath, in the *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. No. 10, 1843.

Bro. Creath was among the pioneers who plead for "a restoration of primitive Christianity, in name, in doctrine, and in spirit," by believing and doing "everything which the Scriptures enjoin" and rejecting "everything which they do not sanction," as Moses E. Laird said. And he was interested in learning and doing the will of God (Matt. 7:21) in all things, and not in trying to please men.

What does the will of God say about Christians marrying unbelievers? "To the law and to the testimony." What does "the law" of the Spirit say about it? Here it is:

"Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers; for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity?"—2 Cor. 6:14. But there are some who are ready to say: "Yes, but that didn't have reference to marriage." How do you know it didn't? Marriage is a yoking together, is it not? It is. And when a Christian marries an unbeliever, he is "unequally yoked with an unbeliever." And he sins by thus violating the law of God.

"She is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord." 1 Cor. 7:39. It is true that this was spoken of widows, and hence some brethren think it applies to the widows only. But remember that "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10:34), and hence He would not bind the widows to marry "only in the Lord" and allow the virgins to marry an unbeliever—to do so would make Him a "respecter of persons."

Many examples could be given from the Old Testament that show that God permitted Israel to marry one another, and that He did not permit them to marry Gentiles or heathens. And since "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our admonition," we know that we Christians are not permitted, under the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2), to marry unbelievers (2 Cor. 6:14; 1 Cor. 7:39). Young Christians, unmarried, yes, old Christians,

unmarried, you cannot afford to disobey God in this. Just think what heaven means to you with its eternal joys.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

THE DEPARTED

A letter from the Ottumwa, Iowa, tells of the death of our esteemed brother, A. C. Abraham, of that place. I have not learned the exact date of his death. I was in Bro. Abraham's home many times during the four months I was in Ottumwa, and learned to love him for his godly conduct and disposition. I don't think he missed a service of the church while I was there. And he didn't quit attending until he was sent to the Hospital for treatment, from which place he never returned. I am sure that Bro. Abraham was prepared to die, and that, when his spirit departed, the Lord led him safely "through the valley of the shadow of death" and that he "feared no evil" (Psa. 23). The Ottumwa church has lost one of its best members. And Sister Abraham needs our prayers during these sad hours of bereavement. But let her ever remember the great text of Revelation, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." (Rev. 14:13). Let us all live so that we may meet God in peace.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

REPORT

Since coming to California, I have held two meetings—one at Los Angeles and one at Montebello, where the Cowan-Fuqua debate was held a few years ago. The Los Angeles meeting lasted two weeks and closed without any additions. The Montebello meeting lasted a month and one day and resulted seventeen baptisms. Two of the number baptized were from the Methodists, two from the Christian church, and one from a branch of the Seventh-day Adventist church.

I go to El Centro next Lord's day. And the fifth Lord's day evening in March, I will begin a mission meeting in the Chamber of Commerce building, at Date and Manchester streets, Los Angeles. This meeting will last at least two weeks. When it is over, I shall, the Lord willing, hold a tent mission meeting in East Montebello. Then to Long Beach. The churches at Long Beach, and at 138 So. Fourth Street, Montebello, and at 3535 Siskiyou street, Los Angeles, are supporting this work. They are to be commended for their zeal in sending the gospel to the misinformed. Let other congregations follow their example and see what you can do.

I shall hold a meeting for the So. 7th Street church, Fowler, Colo., beginning the last Lord's day in May. I begin at Healdton, Okla., the first of July; at Sentinel, Okla., July 15th; at Loco, Okla., Aug. 1st; at Elmore City, Okla., Aug. 15th. I hope the brethren will have everything ready for these meetings when the time comes.

—Jas. D. Phillips,

8127 Walnut Drive,
Los Angeles, Calif.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00



LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

AN EXPLANATION

Many brethren in W. Va. and other Eastern States where we have been making a plea for a restoration of the ancient order of things in religion seem to have a misconception of what we teach relative to the Sunday School, or class system of teaching.

Some think we oppose division of assemblies into classes to teach them, and at the same time favor "one class," as they call it, in which the men, women, children, and all, read a verse about and ask and answer questions. Some churches who oppose dividing the church into classes think the "one class," just described, is the divine plan. I hope the following will be clear and satisfactory on this matter. I have dealt with this somewhat in detail so as to be understood by those who do not understand the issue:

We oppose organizing the Church into classes, thus making a separate institution from the church. I know the Sunday School digressives, such as Janney, Moore, et al, claim they have no separate organization. But to organize a thing means, according to Webster, to arrange it in parts for systematic work. When Moore, Janney, et al, form their classes, with a certain teacher over each class, a certain time and place to meet, etc., they have organized the church into classes. This they can not escape. It is not a method of teaching that we oppose, but A SEPARATE ORGANIZATION, organized to do a part of the work God said for the church, as a church—not a Sunday School—to do. See Eph. 3:10; 21; Matt. 28:19,20.

God said for the teachers to "prophesy one by one that all may learn" (1 Cor. 14:31) and we insist that this command be obeyed. Moore claims this is not binding on the church today. But God says it is. See 1 Cor. 1:1-3; 14:23, 36, 37, 40 Paul says, "Yea, let God be true but every man a liar" (Rom. 3:4), hence I take God's word as true and Moore's word as not true. "Prophesy (teach) one by one"—one at a time—excludes five or six teaching at a time, whether they try to detour around the Lord by organizing the church into classes or not.

Paul said for the women to keep silence in the church—they are not even permitted to ask a question in the assembly. 1 Cor. 14:35. And this is what Paul meant when he said, "Let the woman learn in silence." 1 Tim. 2:11. Hence, we insist

that they "learn in silence" and not disobey God by asking and answering questions. We are often asked, "Would you oppose one class with a man teacher?" To this we answer: Yes, if the women violate 1 Cor. 14:35 by asking and answering questions. It is scriptural for the men to either ask or answer questions in the assembly.

We can not detour around the Lord, and thus "put one over him," by organizing the church into classes. I made Moore admit that, according to his contention, it was all right for the women to wait on the Lord's table, and teach "when the whole church comes together into one place." 1 Cor. 14:23. So "an extra Sunday meeting either before or after the regular worship period," in which class divisions are made does not help Moore any now.

I notice that some congregations in W. Va. still read a verse about and ask and answer questions, allowing the sisters to take part with them in this teaching service, yet they oppose class divisions. But I hope that they will study the Scriptures and thus learn "the way of the Lord more perfectly," as Apollos did, and quit this near-digressive practice.

—Jas. D. Phillips,
439 N. Drury Avenue,
Kansas City, Mo.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

"Without exception, those who oppose discussion are the ones who are conscious of the fact that it is ruinous to their cause to present the other side."—Editor James A. Allen, Gospel Advocate, April 18, 1929.

And that is why the Gospel Advocate has persistently refused, for the past fifteen years, to debate the Sunday School question with us. They "are conscious of the fact that it is ruinous to their cause to present the other side," you see. So debate there is none.

"Any paper that is used to merely spread one-sided propaganda in favor of things that will not bear investigation should be ashamed to exist."—Editor Allen, Ibid.

Hence the Gospel Advocate "ought to be ashamed to exist," for it "is used to spread one-sided propaganda in favor of" the Sunday School—a thing "that will not bear investigation," its own advocates being the judges. If they think it will "bear investigation," let them come out like men and defend it. "The Truth" is open to them at any time they will open the Advocate to us. What do you say, Editor Allen?

"Anybody that does not believe in debate ought not to present his side of it."—Editor Allen, Ibid.

Hence Editor Allen "ought not to present his side of" the Sunday School, for it is evident that he "does not believe in debating" it. If he "believes in debating" this question, let him come on now and debate it and quit ignoring our challenges. Will he do it? We soon shall see.

"In the first place, denominations, and denominational machinery are unknown to the Bible."—Editor Allen, *Ibid*.

And in the second "place," the Sunday School, with its classes, women teachers, "International Sunday School Literature," etc., is "unknown to the Bible." And the Editor knows it, too. If the Editor thinks these are known to the Bible, we know he would step up and debate them with us.

"There is none of what the world calls 'organization' in the Bible."—Editor Allen, *Ibid*.

And since the Sunday School is one among the many things "the world calls 'organization,'" we know it is not "in the Bible." And Editor Allen knows it, too. If not, he would be eager to defend it with us.

"The apostles and early Christians were the greatest Missionary people the world has ever known, yet they had no 'organization' of any kind."—Editor Allen, *Ibid*.

Hence they had no Sunday School, for there can be no Sunday School in the absence of an "organization"—it is an "organization" within itself, and Allen dare not try to defend it with the Bible to measure it. —Jas. D. Phillips.

FROM ZION TO BABYLON

We regret to see many churches now going into Babylon by way of the Sunday School and the "pastor" system.

Editor Allen in the *Gospel Advocate* of June 10, 1926, says:

There is the same Scriptural authority for a preacher to preach every Lord's day for a church that there is for him to preach one Lord's day a month for four churches . . . We deeply regret that there is a rapidly growing disposition among a few of our preachers to develop into "pastors" and to inculcate the "pastor" system. It must be squashed, or there is an end to our growth and usefulness.

Remarks

The *Gospel Advocate* has been the chief offender among the "anti-organ churches" in the part in "inculcating" the "pastor" system among the "loyal churches," but Editor Allen is now crying "put on the brakes," and stop the "movement." It makes one think of the efforts of the *Christian Standard* to check the advance of the "societies" after being the chief offender in starting them among the churches, when a few years ago it began its cry, "Back to the Bible." Why did it ever leave the Bible, and why did the *Advocate* let the "pastor" system grow up right under its nose? It is the same old story of "locking the barn after the horse is stolen."

In proof of Editor Allen's statement that the preachers are now introducing the "pastor" system, I here submit a case or two. And while he says "a few" are doing this, I can find them for him by the dozens. In fact it is well to note that these churches that are "sponsoring" the "pastor" movement are Sunday School churches "sponsor-

ed" by the *Gospel Advocate*. And it is the Sunday School that paves the way for the "pastor," just as it was with the churches that went off with the organ. They put in the Sunday School, then they needed the "pastor", then they managed the "pastor" to put in the organ. And what will Allen say when the organ comes? If he will not "knock under," he will be brushed aside to make room for leaders that will put in the instrument.

CHURCH OF CHRIST CENTRAL

363 N. W. Fourth Street

REV. G. MITCHELL PULLIAS, PASTOR

Bible School at 9:45 A. M.

Communion at 11:00 A. M.

Preaching at 11:15 A. M. Subject: "The Grace of God."

Evening: "A Change of Heart."

Prayer meeting at 7:45 Wednesday.

BOWLING GREEN

N. W. Fifty-third Street and Seventh Court

REV. W. C. TODD, PASTOR

Bible School at 9:45 A. M.

Communion at 11:00 A. M.

Preaching at 11:15 A. M. and 7:45 P. M.

Prayer meeting at 7:45 P. M. Thursday.

These announcements are quoted verbatim from the *Miami, Florida, Herald*, Saturday, June 12, 1926.

If the "pastor system" has not been "inculcated" into these two so-called churches of Christ, it has never been "inculcated" anywhere. The "Rev. (?) Pullias and the "Rev" (?) Todd are both "pastors" in the very strictest sense of the word. I think that Editor Allen should advise these two "Rev." (?) gentlemen to resign their respective "pastorates" for he correctly says, "It (meaning the "pastor system") must be quashed, or there is an end to our growth and usefulness."

We might mention another thing that these two "Rev." (?) "pastors" are doing. In their "Prayer meeting," announced above, they single out the women, asking questions for them to answer, thus causing them to openly and publicly disobey 1 Cor. 14: 1 Tim. 2:11, 12. And it is just such ungodly practice as this that leads to such abominations as the following describes. I saw the picture of this "flapper Pastor" in the *Ottuma (Iowa) Daily Courier* last spring, and know the following from the *Gospel Advocate* to be correct in every detail:

"Miss Pattye Horn, nineteen-year-old pastor of the Christian Church at Promise City, Iowa, has bobbed hair and wears flapper galoshes, as you see. She is a Drake University (Des Moines, Iowa) Bible School student."

The *Gospel Advocate* refers its readers to 1 Cor. 14: 33-35; 1 Tim. 2:11, 12 (quoting each reference in full) to show them that Miss Horn is entirely out of her place. But what difference should that make with the *Gospel Advocate*, since they have women teaching in the assembly, and criticize us for not having them? Truly "the legs of the lame are unequal," but remember whose legs they are.

Maybe "Rev." (?) Pullias or "Rev." (?) Todd would like to debate the issue between us. If so, please sign the following:

The church of which I. (G. M. Pullias) am pastor is Scriptural in work and worship.

Aff. -----

Neg., J. Douglas Phillips.

Come on, brother; let us have a debate.

Jas. Douglas Phillips.

HERESIES

"Heresies, that which is chosen; a chosen course of thought and action; hence, one's chosen opinion, tenet; according to the context, an opinion varying from the true exposition of the Christian faith." (Thayer) Paul said, they are "works of the flesh." Peter said they are "damnable." Three prominent heresies now abide in the so-called churches of Christ:

1. Officials without divine appointment.
2. Sunday school methods for teaching.
3. Unfermented grape-juice for "the cup," the drink element of the Lord's supper.

These three, but the worst of these is grape-juice.

W. G. TUCKER.

Remarks

The above is a clipping from the Apostolic Way, of Jan. 25, 1927. Please note the following remarks:

1. If Bro. Tucker believes that "the worst of these heresies "is grape-juice," as he affirms, why does he not defend his fermented wine theory in a written debate? Yes, why? The way is now open. Let him affirm his teaching on this matter if he thinks the use of unfermented "fruit of the vine" is the worst "heresy" in the church of Christ.

2. All who have read up on fermentation know that it is a leavening process. And since Jesus instituted His supper in the "days of unleavened bread, when no leavening of any kind was allowed in their houses, He used unfermented "fruit of the vine." Matt. 26. Is Bro. Tucker ready to say Jesus is a heretic? and that He is guilty of teaching the "worst" "hersey" in the church of Christ?

3. Since the Scriptures furnish neither precept nor example for the use of fermented wine in the Lord's supper, can any man contend for its use, to the division of the church (as Bro. Tucker is doing), and not be a heretic?

4. Since Bro. Tucker endorses Thayer on the meaning of heresies, admitting that it means "a chosen course of thought and action; hence, one's chosen opinion, tenet," etc., does he not stand self-condemned when he preaches his fermented wine theory, when he knows it will cause division in the church?

5. Since Bro. Tucker does not point out the Scripture that says for us to use fermented wine-

in the Lord's supper, can he expect us to believe his theory or this to be anything but "a chosen course of thought and action," his "chosen opinion, tenet," etc., which Thayer says is heresy?

6. If Bro. Tucker can locate the Scripture requiring us to use fermented wine in the Lord's supper, let him point it out to us, and we shall cease our opposition to his teaching. Come on with your Scripture, Bro. Tucker—we are ready for it.

Jas. D. Phillips.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

"Christ gave two generic commands—to sing and to teach. (Eph. 5:19; tt. 28:19). E. C. Fuqua.

Wrong again. Christ never gave one generic command, much less two. For, as J. B. Briney says in his book *The Form of Baptism*, "All of God's commands are given in specific terms." Now see. "Replying to your inquiry, teach is specific." The Lexicographer's Easy Chair of "The Literary Digest." And again we have this: "Replying to your question 'Is teach in Matt. 28:19 a specific term?' Yes." And this is by the leading linguist of Bethany College, W. Va.—J. D. Phillips.

"FIGHT THE GOOD FIGHT OF FAITH"

"The Truth" is coming along fine and is enjoying a consistent growth.

Isn't that fine? Let all renew immediately when time is out, or give notice that you will soon do so, and not miss an issue. The enemy is being pressed as never before, and there will be important articles and notices in every issue. Another essential thing, and do not neglect it, brethren, is to send in subscriptions to the paper. Let every reader send at least one subscription a month. Let others know about the paper. Call attention to it wherever you may be. And give liberally to The Truth Fund. We have started the year fine, and let us keep ahead with the funds.

The Primitive Christian has suspended, and we shall have to work to keep "The Truth" before the people; but a "long pull, and a strong pull, and a pull all together" will do it. We propose to steer clear of all entanglements such as supporting schools, colleges, fine church houses, pastors, costly printing plants and equipment for running secular work; but press the evangelistic work, the building up of N. T. churches, strengthening the weak, and helping the needy. We expect to meet

the enemy, in the church and out of the church, at every turn, and he must surrender to the truth, fight, or run. God's word is our weapon—a powerful weapon. By "it is written" Jesus put the evil one to route; and by it we conquer. On to the front. Those who can not preach can pray and help by giving, remembering the words of Christ—"It is more blessed to give than to receive."

We feel encouraged as never before. Let truth and error grapple, and truth will win. When a paper has to be padlocked to shield the false teaching of any man "because he is on our side," it is time to set the paper aside.

Take your stand now, and don't go off gazing into the air, and then come dragging to the front after the battle is won with you? "Betsy and I killed the bear." Will you stand for "Where the Bible speaks?" — "A thus saith the Lord" for your faith and practice? If not, get ready to run—we're coming, and not maybe. If we have not a "Thus saith the Lord" without fudging, for our faith and practice, we want you to give us a trouncing with the "sword of the Spirit," and not spare us. Who is on the Lord's side?—Stand forth, every one of you. Quit you like men.—Jas. Dougias Phillips.

HOBBIES—HOBBIES

The church is being torn asunder over hobbies. The most recent hobby is the "Communion hobby." We have those who are publicly peraching that we can not commune scripturally without using the "Individual communion set." How smart (?) some men are! The "Individual communion set" was not known until a few years past. I suppose no one had ever communed only in a dangerous unscriptural way until very recent years. Of course God and the Holy Spirit knew it was dangerous to drink from one or two "cups," but said nothing about it—just let the danger run on for hundreds of years. Then when God wanted the "Individual cups" used, he had the legislative bodies to enact the law to compel us to use said cups. Thus ignoring Christ as head of His church.

Christ is God's sole—only legislator, lawmaker and law giver for the church of God.

But Paul says: "Be subject to the higher power . . . for they are ordained of God." We pay tribute, tax, to support our government—not to enact laws to control our worship—(God did that thru Christ) but to restrain the passions and acts of evil ones, and meet out proper punishment to them. Has God permitted man or any set of men to enact laws for the church of Christ, and endowed them with power to punish (a law without

a penalty is a nullity) when the church violates said law? Of course I speak of things pertaining to the worship. If so, then we serve two masters religiously instead of one.

How can our constitution grant to all, "religious liberty" and at the same time permit men to enact laws to control the religious acts of worship and make it compulsory or be punished, after church is tried before our courts? Why did not Paul submit to the powers that be while at Phillippi? The charge was "That these men teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive,, neither to observe being Romans." Paul was teaching customs ordained of God. The Roman's customs were ordained of men. Paul did not submit to the "powers that be" in things pertaining to Christ and his government, for God does not permit man to legislate for the Kingdom of Christ. God permits man to legislate in regard to earthly governments, but never for the Kingdom of Christ.

To permit man to legislate for the Kingdom of Christ is dividing the rule of the Kingdom of Christ—hence Christ is "head over all things to the church"—Eph. 1:23.

Besides, that is uniting church and state in religious matters, such teaching is Roman Catholicism, the very essence of it! As a citizen of this government I pay tax to uphold the government in controlling the evil passions of men.

As a citizen of God's government, and in worship of God, I submit to no authority except as revealed through Christ, my Captain, Priest and King. I'll never ignore Christ my leader, my Savior by permitting men to say how I am to worship the Father through him. For "no man can come unto the Father" but by Him.

Dethrone Christ as legislator and divide the rule of Christ with the "powers that be," and that too in the worship of God. I'll never do it.

Yes, some men are awful smart to the hurt of the church, its peace and harmony.

(G. G., 1925)

—J. W. DENTON.

LOGIC AND FACTS

It is a Biblical fact that one literal cup is expressed in giving the accounts of the communion, and this brings the question as to whether the use of cups is permissible, under the following rule of logic: "Expressio unis est exclusio alterius." That is, the expression of the one excludes all others. Then if facts are facts and logic is logic, there is nothing left for the cups advocates to do but to surrender, or ignore the Bible statement and logic. Let President Freeman or Editor Duckworth try his hand on this. Yes, let them boost together, and see how much they can move it. They might as well try to move the rock of Gibraltar.—Ed.

LIGHT UNDER A BUSHEL

Just received "The Truth," and your answer to Dr. Trott was to the point. I have read the whole correspondence and I know the truth of what you say. The Dr. seems to be kicking up because you published his reply to Cowan. I don't see why he should object to his reply being published. It just answers Cowan in a neat, logical way. It looks as though the Dr. wanted his light put under a bushel so no one could see it. Why are the leading brethren acting this way? I have always thought that Dr. Trott wanted both sides of every question published. And this is one time he got both sides published, so why should he be kicking. It looks funny to me and I wonder if it doesn't look funny to the brotherhood.

"With my present mind (quoting R. F. D.) I can partake of the loaf and the fruit of the vine where more than one cup is used, but I could not defend more than one."

That sure is an awful predicament to get into, and I am just wondering whether Cowan, Johnson and Clark haven't got into the same "intenable" position. It looks that way to many of us. What ails them?

And I am wondering whether Trott and Duckworth are not about to sell their birthright for a secular school, a secular paper, and a printing plant. It looks like making a decoy out of the church to get money.

—Ed Swindler.

Jas. D. Phillips, 225 E. Cleveland, Montebello, Calif., April 22:

I closed a meeting last night at Date and Manchester, Los Angeles, Calif., with one baptism and two from the Christian Church. This was a mission meeting conducted by the church meeting at 3535 Siskiyou Street, Los Angeles, and the church at 138 So. 4th Street, Montebello. These two congregations will begin another mission meeting next Lord's day evening in East Montebello. I will do the preaching. Prospects good. These congregations are to be commended for their zeal in sounding out the word. We hope others will follow their example. I will, the Lord willing, be with the brethren at Taft, Calif., the third Lord's day in May, en route to Fowler, Colo., where I will begin a meeting with the church of Christ on So. 7th Street, the last Lord's day in May. The church at Fowler uses one cup. So do all the "loyal" churches in Calif., that I know anything about.

"When the Digressives play an instrument they do not do one thing that Christ commanded, for playing is not singing."—E. C. Fuqua, in "The Stabilizer" for Nov., 1925.

And when "E. C. Fuqua, minister of Sichel Street church of Christ," organizes the church in-

to classes and appoints women teachers over part or all of these classes, he "does not do one thing that Christ commanded, for" organizing the church into classes "is not" teaching, you see. It is the Sunday School, which Ira C. Moore truly says "is an organization separate and apart from the church, that we object to—we have no objections to you or anybody else teaching the word of God at any time or place. And we don't object to the use of methods in this teaching, either—what we object to is the organization of the church into classes, or a Sunday School.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

DAY APPEARING

In Heb. 10:25 what day is it that is said to be appearing (drawing near)? Some say it is the first day of the week; some say it is the judgment day; and some say it is both days. The Bible says day, not days. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more as you see the day approaching." We meet and exhort one another in view of the Judgment Day? so it seems to me that we, the Lord's people, are to prepare thus to meet God in peace at the Judgment Day. Dear reader, there is a day coming in which all are to be judged and I fear that some will not be prepared? Will that day come to you and overtake you as a thief in the night and unprepared. May God help us all to be prepared to stand uncondemned. "Prepare to meet thy God," said the old prophet. I am watching and praying and exhorting and waiting for my change, with the full assurance from God's blessed word that "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."—Jackson Howton, Brownwood, Texas.

"Truth bows to no human shrine; she seeks neither praise nor applause; she asks only a hearing."—Sel.

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again; the eternal years of God are hers; but error wounded writhes in pain, and dies among his worshipers."—Sel.

"Yours for more debates, J. N. Cowan. But you will not debate the use of CUPS in the communion with us in "The Truth." Hence you are nothing but a pretender.

Subscribe for THE TRUTH and help us carry the good work on.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JUNE 1, 1929

No. 11

COWAN-MUSGRAVE DEBATE

Don't forget this debate to be held at Elk City, Okla., on May 27 to 30, four days. I am now at Bard, Calif., but will go home to Elk City the 15th of May, the Lord willing. I want you to come to the debate. There are two things that will cause me never to debate the cup question again: (1). If I can not prove our practice with one cup I will never debate the question again; (2). If Bro. Cowan can prove two or more containers used in observing the communion I will never debate the question again. I believe with all my soul that I can prove by the Book of God that one cup was commanded by the Son of God, accepted by the apostles, and practiced by the church. Now if you want the truth, come and hear this discussion.—Bob Musgrave.

Yes, we urge every brother who can to be there, and it is to be hoped that Cowan and Johnson will pick up courage enough to meet me there on the propositions they have signed with me.— H. C. Harper.

I AM READY

Eldorado, Okla. Feb. 16, 1929.

Mr. R. F. Duckworth, Dallas, Texas.

Dear Brother Duckworth:

I have just read Bro. Trott's article under the head of "DEBATES," with your comments. Also what you have to say in your editorials in regards to the position the A. W. occupies in opposing error and the great ability and courage possessed by its writers.

Now, Bro. Duckworth, I heartily endorse the sentiments contained in Bro. Trott's article and have long craved the opportunity of letting the readers of the Apostolic Way examine closely every argument advanced on both sides of what you call the S. S. question. And seeing that Bro. Trott says that he has challenged, begged, and pleaded for those who differ with him on this question to prove their practice in a fair written discussion, and that they have refused to do so, and seeing that you have offered to publish such discussion between Bro. Hines or Allen and Trott whether the F. F. or G. A. endorses them or not.

Now if these brethren do not see fit to enter such discussion, why not let me have this opportunity to discuss the question through the Way with any man you might select? So why do you continue to make out like you cannot get any one to enter said discussion?

Again, as you claim that no advocate of error is able to successfully cross swords with the A. W., why is it that you continue to refuse to give Bro. Harper and a number of other brethren the opportunity of crossing swords with it on the cup question? And why do not those strong and courageous writers of the A. W. meet them in oral discussion? Now it may be as Bro. Trott said: There is a reason for it as there is a reason for everything, and their reason can be read in their own utterances when they are urging the obligation that rests upon every honest man to defend the things he preaches and practices.

And may I say, as he did; Brother, if you are honest in your belief, insist on your champions defending the cup question with Bro. Harper through the A. W. Now it may be that you think Bro. Harper with his paper is contending for the truth, but if you do why did you say that no other paper was so outstanding in its opposition to error?

Now, brother, I hope you don't do this like you have done most of my others, that is, refuse to let your readers see it. So hoping to hear from you and to get the opportunity to let your readers see both sides of what you call the S. S. question, I remain, Yours for truth, Ira L. Sanders.

Dallas, Texas, Feb. 28, 1929.

Ira Lee Sanders,

Eldorado, Okla.

Dear Bro. Sanders:

Your letter before me. We have more copy marked for publication now than we can publish for some issues. However I have dictated a statement covering your proposition which will appear as soon as we have space for it. Yours in Christ, R. F. Duckworth.

Now I insist on the readers of the A. W. getting behind their "strong and courageous writers" and see whether they can be persuaded to meet me and whether the A. W. wants to debate the S. S. ques-

tion, as they call it, one half as bad as they pretend that they do. I am ready to meet any man they will put up.—Ira L. Sanders.

Remarks

Seeing that the Way has now remained mum for four months, and has thus ignored the issue it has made in its columns, we are glad to let the people know the truth of the matter.—Ed.

A CAMP MEETING

This scribe and Bro. Ira Grantham, the Lord Willing, will begin a meeting at the six-mile crossing on the North Llano River between Junction City and Roosevelt in Kimble County, Texas.

We will begin on Friday night before the first Sunday in June and run over the two next Lord's Days.

The place is on the Old Spanish Trail, a fine tourist road. There is another highway that runs north to Menard and San Angelo from there. The country around is the prettiest for camping and river and hill scenery in the state. All you that want to take an outing come and camp with us and help yourself to the meeting

Remember the place—29 miles south of Menard and 6 miles west of Junction at the junction of the Menard road and the old Spanish Trail on the banks of the beautiful Llano River.

The Word of God will be preached without any human "isms" or "schisms."

Jas. T. White,
Lometa, Tex. May 17, 1929

PROTRACTED MEETING

The Church of Christ at Healdton, Okla, have secured the service of James D. Phillips of Kansas City, Mo., to hold our meeting this year beginning the 30th day of June 1929. Bro. Phillips is a young man, but is a power in the Gospel. He is one who will contend for the Truth just as it is revealed in the Book of God, that is the only kind we want and the only kind we will have. Brethren, when you select a preacher to hold your meeting, be sure that he is sound in the Faith and Practice. The Preachers are few that are true to God. Let us keep the Faithful ones busy and support them.

On the 4th day of July we will have dinner on the ground; every body invited to come. We will have some good preachers present on that day. We will have some good singers here. If you like good preaching and singing come and be with us.

O. C. Mathews,
Healdton, Okla.

Latest—Cowan-Musgrave debate called off at moment I arrived in Elk City, May 21st. Challenging Cowan to meet me at Healdton, Okla., about July 4th.—H. C. Harper.

APPEAL FOR COUNSEL

Dear Brother, I have been considering for a long time the divided condition of the church. There must be something done. First, we can not have a united church without a united ministry. I do not believe in man-made creeds, disciplines, and rules of faith and practice; but I do believe in a strict observance of the divine creed, a complete enforcement of divine discipline and unwavering adherence to the divine rules of faith and practice. Jas. 1:25; Phil. 3:16, etc.

While other people have gone beyond scriptural authority in some things, we have failed to come to it. We have criticised conferences, etc. of others and omitted the necessary counsel which I think is the primary cause of so much division, and I am sure that counsel is the only thing that will relieve the situation; therefore I am making an appeal for such procedure. We preachers must get together in counsel, and if split we must, let us let it be on determined lines that will stop splitting the sprouts before they are large enough to make two parts.

Now, you may say oh, yes, you want to call a preachers' meeting. Yes, if you want to call it that, is what I want and what must be. Study carefully the subject, counsel, and I am sure you will agree with me and prepare yourself for such an occasion; also help promote and arrange it. Consider thoroughly the power and necessity of counsel in all things, then write me what you think about it. I shall be glad to inform you further as to the place and consider any suggestions you may offer. For scriptural preachers, churches, elders, and discipline.

April, 1929
Geo. M. McFadden,
Arkoma, Okla.

Remarks

We are always glad to work for the unity of the people of God, and if it is possible for us to attend any meeting of disciples looking to that end, it will be a great pleasure to us to attend. But like attending church, it is not generally those who need it most that attend. And the United States is a big country. Many who would like to attend such a meeting would not be able financially to do so, and hence comparatively few would get the benefit of such a meeting. We certainly would like to meet preachers, elders and other brethren, and hear them grapple in dead earnest with the

problem of unity—the “unity of the Spirit.” We confess that this theme has been one of much concern to us since entering into the profession. And since no Christian walks worthy of this profession unless he endeavors to keep this unity, the unity the Savior prayed for, it is plain to be seen that this is an important duty laid on every Christian if he wants to be saved. In fact he can not be saved unless he endeavors to keep this unity, unless one can be saved while walking unworthy of this profession.

Brother McFadden assures us that he shall make other important announcements looking to this end in a short time.—Ed.

MADE TO REJOICE

I am in receipt of a copy of your paper, “The Truth,” for which I thank you very much. I sat down and read to mother “The Truth” from beginning to end. Mother and I can both say Amen TO EVERYTHING WE FOUND ENDORSED THERE. The arguments are conclusive, and we are convinced that your excellent paper deserves to be called “THE TRUTH”.

The items you mention there on the plan of salvation have been matters of debate in my mind for some time, but that issue of your paper has settled them for mother and me.

With regard to the Communion we can say that we never have had any blessing from communing where the cups were used. There was no life, no spirit in it.

As for baptism, as you know, the common teaching on that subject is that it is “an outward sign of inward life,” but the passages you referred to on the last page of “The Truth” are just the ones that used to bother me when I tried to accept the popular and superficial teaching.

And as for the Sunday School, I have seen of late that it does more harm than good, but was of opinion until I received your paper that it was a universally accepted practice. I am with you, head, heart, and soul on the obliterating from the Christian program any doctrine or practice not authorized by the New Testament. O, how I thank God I have found out there are still some people in this world who are interested in primitive Christianity. Today has been the happiest day I have had for a long time. Now I can say good-bye to lifeless Christianity—good-bye to Ladies’ aid; good-bye to lemon aids, and ice-cream socials. Good-bye Sunday Schools and all other ecclesiastical clap-trap invented by man. I tell you my heart leaps within me for joy, as the nimble deer upon the mountains of freedom when I think of bidding farewell to these things. Yes, I am willing to take God at his word and follow it. I am willing to do all that Christ commands me with regard to everything. There are no if’s or but’s to this my declaration of willingness to obey the Lord Jesus. Words cannot possibly depict the happiness mother and I feel in discovering the Church of Christ.

—A. A. Sorenson.

Littlefield, Texas, 5-19-'29.

Dear Bro. Harper:

In Bro. L. W. Hayhurst’s talk to-night he gave “The Truth” and the editor of a “certain paper” a pretty hard lick. He said this editor came to Dallas circulating certain reports on another brother and that he (Hayhurst) tried to show this preacher editor he should go to that brother and talk with him about the matter, and that this editor got mad and said he would never have anything more to do with him (Hayhurst), and left him.

Hayhurst told me privately after meeting that you were the man, and said when he got time, he intended to show you up in “The Truth” if you would give him space. He also stated that Bro. Trott said you had never owned any interest in the Apostolic Way and that reports you had circulated were false. I mention these things to show you to what lengths they are going here, and that publicly, to injure you and the paper because you are uncovering their crookedness. Yours in hope, H. C. Welch.

Remarks

Well, let them foam, brother, for as Cicero remarks, “Those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.” So let them rave, for their end is thus made manifest to all men, and the more public the better. I have perceived, as have others, for some time that they “are in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.” But, like Judas, the web is one of their own weaving. So let them perish in their own gainsayings and iniquity. “The Truth” will be opened for this matter for Hayhurst or any other man when the Way is ready to extend the same treatment to its readers. Come on now, and let us have the facts and not the hearsay.—Editor.

THE ELDERSHIP

If the readers of “Truth” will pardon me for “butting in” on the delving for truth and nothing but the truth,” I shall take advantage of Bro. Harper’s invitation, and, beginning at the beginning, write a series of articles on the present “Errors and Innovations” of the Church of Christ.

Let it be known in the outset that I am not out for controversy, fame, nor fun; but to set before the readers of our church papers what the Holy Spirit says on these subjects to be discussed.

As the whole success of the church depends upon working of a scriptural eldership, we beg leave to show what that was, and should be now.

“AND the things thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit unto faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.” 2 Tim. 2:2.

There are a great many of our modern preachers who do not realize there is a difference between the choosing of the servants of the church,

(Continued on page 6)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00



LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

OPEN FORUM

We wish to state again what we said in our issue of April 15th, namely, "If any one wants to take Bro. Watson's article and review it for his reply, 'The Truth' is open for equal space to each. Or if any one can induce Bro. Tucker to take up in the paper the proposition he has signed with me for a written discussion, the paper is open for equal space for each."

And I will say the same thing for Cowan and Johnson on the proposition each has signed with me on the question of the use of cups. Or I will take any other man the Way will indorse if he will affirm—A church can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use cups in the communion. And I will affirm—A church can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one cup in the communion.

CLIPPINGS AND COMMENTS

M. D. Baumer

Central Church (Disciples of Christ) Spokane, Wash., worshipped the other Sunday by having a musician play the slide trombone and the musical saw. Now what do you think of that? And where on earth do you suppose they found scripture for a musical saw?

—Christian Leader.

Bro. Baumer, you should have been the last fellow on earth to criticise "Central Church" for their "musical saw." And why do you ask—"Where on earth do you suppose they found Scripture for their musical saw?" unless you intend hereafter to try to follow the Scriptures.

I am sure "Central Church" can very easily tell you that they "found Scripture for their musical saw" where you "found Scripture for" your unauthorized "Sunday School," your unauthorized "Pastor", your unauthorized "Individual Communion (?) Cups," etc. When you try to find

Scripture for any of these practices, it is just like the Irishman's flea—"When you go to ketch 'im he ain't thar."

And you brethren have so many innovations in the Sunday School churches of Christ that you are leading the Christian churches a merry chase on many of these things. So you have no right to criticise them. And they have no right to criticise you. You are as much alike as two black-eyed kittens. Two kittens fight each other, you know, though both are wrong.—J. D. P.

IS IT NOT STRANGE?

In the Leader, some time ago, Bro. I. C. Moore said: "We can learn nothing about the number of vessels to be used, or that may be used in the Communion, from the fact it is said that Jesus took the cup, and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying: "Drink ye all of it." Matt. 26:27.

I say, is it not strange that a man like Bro. M. who is a good grammarian would make such a statement? If it were a theory of man instead of a plain statement from God's word, we might bear with it, but it is a statement that is misleading and false.

Bro. M: knows as well as I do how many vessels Jesus held in his hand at the time he gave that command, for it says "Jesus took THE CUP." Now will Bro. M. tell how many "a" or "the" Means? Such subterfuge! Such pussy-footing! Such pandering to popularity!

Bro. M. says he prefers the "old way"; the "one cup." Why? Because he knows it is the Bible way. What would happen to Bro. M. or Bro. any one else, if he should come out conscientiously and tell the churches that they are "going in the way of Cain," and that they will land on the wrong side of the fence in the Judgment? Well, he would still have his editorial page, but as to preaching, he would be nil.

If what he says about "dividing" was not so absolutely ridiculous, it might be funny. "The wine has to be divided among the participants some time, by some one etc." Eighteen times has Bro. M. used divide or its derivatives in trying to impress the fact that as he thinks, Christ's blood was divided. The very fact that it was in one container shows that it was not to be divided, but that they were all to drink of it from this one container.

O, that you digressives would show some scripture from your departure from "the old way" instead of "my judgment is," "my view:" "I advise the people of West Va. confidently."—all opinion of the poorest quality. You disclaim being a digressive? Every man and woman who has left the scriptural use of the bread and cup, is a digressive in a worse degree than those who use instrumental music in the worship. They rob the most sacred institution ordained by Christ, of its sanctity and make a fashionable, sectarian feast.

When Christ was sitting at the Passover table, he took a cup and blessed it and told his disciples

to "divide it among themselves but at the Supper memorial, it was not so. I defy Bro. M. or any other brother to find one scrap of authority for this sinful modern practice.

"This cup is the New Covenant in my blood." 1 Cor. 11:25. What is? This cup. Why not these cups, or this stack of cups? How many New Covenants are there? Just as many as there are Cups.

"The life of the flesh is the blood." Lev. 17:11. "The blood is the life." Ex. 12:23. This cup then represented how many lives? The one life Jesus gave on the cross. He gave one body and one life; therefore this one life can be represented only by one cup, as one body can be represented only by one loaf.

Then if you try to represent the blood, or life of Christ, by more than one container, why not represent the BODY by individual loaves? There is no question but what it would be just as consistent. And the time will soon come and is at hand when this step into further digression will be taken. "For sanitary reasons." And the next perhaps will be, to do away with immersion for the same reason.

Now, brethren, we have discussed this question thru the papers for some time, and many articles have been returned to the writers because they penned up the advocates of these digressions, now suppose we go before the churches in open discussion. As a starter from the Leader office, I challenge Bro. Moore, or any preacher in Tennessee. Write me. Dayton, Tenn. Route 5.

E. A. Lowry.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AGAIN

Brother Johnson says, "I was pleased to note what Bro. Chas. F. Reese had to say on the music question in the Apostolic Way of Aug. 1, and especially his question, What say the Scriptures?"

Johnson said (A. W. Aug. 15) he had just attended a debate on the music question and that one disputant was wrong as to the use of it in worship, but was right as to its origin, while the other was wrong as to its origin.

I showed him what the Scriptures said about music in the old worship. So I drove him from the origin of the "music question," and he did not say a word about the origin of music. I showed him that David said he made instruments of music to praise with. 1 Chron. 23:5. Origin: earliest of its class, precise language of a writer, one who has new ideas; origin, beginning, rise, source. And David said he made them, so it was not of divine origin.

Bro. Johnson said God commanded it, and it was an "ordinance of the old law." So he left off the origin this time, and came to the punishment of God. He said God through his prophet Amos condemned not just the instruments of music, but instruments and feasting and revelry, not because of the instruments of music.

Let us see the truth of this. In Amos. 5:21 we read: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies though ye

offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings I will not accept them, neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts."

Johnson said what God condemned was not the instrumental music. But Amos says, "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viol." v. 23. What Bro. Johnson calls "music" God calls a "noise." To speak where the Bible speaks is to call it "noise," but to speak where man speaks is to call it "music." See the difference? Johnson says, "God condemned them because of the fleshly, riotous, ungodly conduct in their assemblies—because the spirit of God as spoken by the prophet was not manifest there." But the Bible says he condemned a "noise." He wants to know how I can accuse these godly men of being false. Just like I do you when you will not preach it and speak where the Bible speaks, but said when I appealed to the Arabic and Assyric that if my defense of my position is dependent upon these for support my case is hopeless. I gave him what Clark's Commentary says on 2 Chron. 29:25, namely, that no musical instruments were to be used in divine worship, and there was nothing of the kind to be in divine worship. And Johnson now gives up the origin of such music as being from God in the old testament, and goes to the new Testament to try to hide his false teaching. He says he showed by Lk. 16:16; Dan. 2:44; Heb. 1:2; Matt. 17:18; Lk. 9:33; Col. 2:14, that God had a chosen people; that he gave a law; that among these people he had prophets; and that through these prophets ordinances were added to the law, one of which was instrumental music, and that this was to last until the Son of God came. So Johnson admits God was not the originator of it and that it was an addition to his law as given. Now can't you see that they were transgressing God's law when they added instrumental music to that which God gave them, and that God condemned them for this "noise" made on instruments? And let him now tell us what will become of us if we add to the New Covenant as they added to God's law. Read Heb. 2: 1, 2. For their wickedness God said, "Thy pomp is brought down to the grave and the noise of the viols, the worm is spread under thee and the worms cover thee . . . thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the side of the pit." Isa. 14:11-15.

What went with God's people that added to his law? What will become of those now who add to the word of God? Yes, what will the ones who add instrumental music, the classes, the cups, the women as public teachers, the "Pastor," and such things have to answer for? The Holy Book says, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire . . . And whosoever was not found in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever. Rev. 20 and 21. Look out, brother, if you don't watch, you'll go with the crowd that make what God calls "noise" in his worship, not music.—Chas. F. Reese.

THE ELDERSHIP

(Continued from page 3)

and appointing, or ordaining them. They are two distinct acts which take place at different times, and may be performed by different persons.

To illustrate: God chose Joshua as a leader of the Israelites, but Moses ordained him. Num. 27: 18, 23. God selected the Levites to minister before him in the Tabernacle. But the other eleven tribes ordained them. Num. 8:10-14.

Then we come to Christ and the Apostles. He chose them one by one as he found them at their daily advocations. After they had been trained to the work, he met with them in the mountain and having ordained them, sent them out to make disciples of the Jews. John 15:16; Mark 3:13, 14.

The first and greatest (and I might say, plainest) example of the Way in which servants of the church were selected, and ordained, appointed, separated, set apart. (take your choice), is the beginning of the first congregation in Jerusalem.

Now, I do hope and pray that all the brethren will throw off prejudice and be willing to take these scriptures at just what they say.

Acts 5:2-6, is too much for me to quote here in this limited article, so we will only read what bears directly upon the subject.

Who did the choosing here? Were the Apostles not fitted by the Spirit to choose rather than the "multitudes"? Then why did they not do it? Why did they call on the "multitude of the disciples" to choose? Brethren, I insist that you answer this question? Would you do it NOW? Why then do you insist that "most of the congregations are too ignorant to choose elders and deacons, and a FEW of US WISER ONES must choose?"

Listen: "And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose, etc, etc." They who? A half dozen leaders? They who? The Pastor? I insist that you do likewise.

Whom were these seven men to serve? They became the servants of the church. Then why should the church not choose them. Brethren, there is a mighty hot place waiting for those who fail to follow God's word.

This was the choosing, and it was an example for the churches for all time. When inspired men were chosen according to the pattern, the Apostles ordained them. How? They said "We will appoint them." How did they do it? "They prayed and laid their hands on them." Well, you say that is Mormon doctrine. Is it? Where did they get it?

Now be ashamed of your teaching and come with me. Let us read and reason together.

Acts 18:1-3 next demands our attention: "And

there were at Antioch in the Church that was there, prophets and teachers, Barnabas, and Symeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen the foster brother of Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit said; Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then they had fasted and prayed, they laid their hands on them and sent them away." Who chose Barnabas and Saul? Christ, thru the Spirit. Who laid hands on them? Listen and be sure you get it. Symeon, Lucius, and Manaen. Apostles? No. Could they impart the Holy Spirit by laying on their hands. You say not. Then why did they do it? The best reason in the world: God had commanded it. And it was practiced from that on and in the same way. It was so practiced in the church thru the Reformation, and until about seventy-five years ago, when the church started down grade. Who will tell why the change was made? Who will tell why a preacher must start out from a Bible school now instead of from his home congregation? Answer quickly. The Judgment is coming, and woe unto him who has changed God's law.

Let us now look to Acts 14:23. "And when they had appointed them elders in every church, and prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed." Does this verse teach another doctrine, or does it mean the same thing as Acts 13:3? The act is the same but elders were ordained here, evangelists in Acts 13:3, and deacons in Acts 6:6

The Holy Spirit having made these scriptures so plain, Titus knew exactly what to do, and how to do it when he was left in Crete. Timothy also having been ordained at Lystra, and being with Paul while "ordaining elders in every city," was not at a loss to know how it was done.

He was, however, warned not to appoint a man as elder until he had proven himself worthy. 1 Tim. 5:21, 22; 3:10.

May God help us read His word and obey it.
E. A. Lowry.

BEYOND WHAT IS WRITTEN

Why some brethren will oppose the organ, Missionary Society, and every other innovation on the grounds that they are unscriptural, and not oppose the Sunday School is a puzzle to me.

Let us beware lest we be led by the blind and fall into the ditch with them.

The Sunday school violates at least two positive commands of the New Testament:

1. 1 Cor. 14:31, "For ye all may prophesy one by one, that all my learn, and all be comforted."
2. "Let your women keep silence in the church-

es: for it is not permitted unto them to speak . . . and if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." 1 Cor. 14:34, 35.

"Oh, yes," says one, "but Paul meant for them not to usurp authority over the man." 1 Tim. 2:11, 12, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor usurp authority . . ." Here he separates teaching and usurping authority. He did not say "teach or (which is the same) usurp authority," but teach, nor usurp authority." You see he separates the two. He forbids both.

Seeing that the Sunday school violates two positive commands of the New Testament, and has divided the church, we conclude by saying, let us be content by doing what the Lord has taught us to do and we shall surely be blessed.

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13.

—J. D. P.

JESUS IS OUR KING

"Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion."—Psa. 2:7.

Here David speaks of a king—the Ruler and Lawgiver of an absolute monarchy. And that Jesus is this King is clearly shown by the fact that Paul calls him "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords."—1 Tim. 6:15. And John describes Jesus in Rev. 19, and he says, "And he hath on his garment and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."—Rev. 19:16. "These (powers of darkness) shall war against the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for he is Lord of lords and King of kings; and they also shall overcome that are with him, called and chosen and faithful."—Rev. 17:14.

The "called and chosen and faithful" of Rev. 17:14 are the Christians who have confessed Jesus as the Messiah and surrendered themselves, heart, spirit and body, to Him. And they are said to be "a kingdom of priests" (Rev. 5:10). And it is said of them, "These are they that follow the Lamb (king) whithersoever he goeth."—Rev. 14:4.

God has placed all power and rulership in the hands of Jesus, our Lord and King.—Matt. 28:19. We are an absolute monarchy—a kingdom—and Jesus is our Ruler, our Lawgiver, and our King. It is His business to make our laws; and it is our duty, as His subjects, to obey Him in everything He commands us. He has never put up any man or set of men to enact laws for His disciples to follow. But He says, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." The "Man of Sin" and "Son of Perdition," the Pope of Rome, arrogates to himself the authority to change the divine laws of Heaven's King. And to do this, he makes himself to be "Another God on Earth," "The King of kings and Lord of lords."—2 Thess. 2; Dan. 7:25. And he has cursed the Earth for centuries with his destructive teaching. But,

thank God, there are many who do not follow him, for they know him to be an Anti-Christ.

The fact that Jesus is our King teaches us that we are limited to what He says and to that only. Doing His commandments is "the whole duty of man" and if we do them, we have assurance that we shall "have a right to the tree of life and enter in thru the gates in to the city."—Rev. 22:14. The law of limitation (2 John 9) forbids us to go beyond "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6). How, then, can any person who has been "washed in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 7) and has acknowledged Jesus as his rightful Ruler and King (Matt. 10:32), advocate the organ in the worship, the cups, the societies, the Sunday School, etc., seeing that Jesus the King has authorized none of these things? By advocating these things they bind upon us a law which our Heavenly King has not bound. And they dethrone Jesus the King and set their own ways up in opposition to the ways of their King. No wonder that God said of His ancient people, "My people are destroyed for the lack of wisdom."

Let us exalt the Messiahship and Kingship of Jesus,

Whose genial power shall overwhelm earth's iron race,

And plant once more the golden in its place."

"Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion."—Psa. 2:7.

"Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way, for his wrath will soon be kindled."—Psa. 2:12.

It is a blessed privilege to be a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ and to have such a King as Jesus.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

LUTHER-ZWINGLI DEBATE

I have before me a book, entitled "Life of Martin Luther;" and on pages 226-237, is a report of a discussion between Martin Luther, the German Reformer, and father of Lutheranism; and Ulrich Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer. The subject discussed was the Lord's Supper. It was held at Marburg, Germany, in the year 1529, four hundred years ago.

Luther maintained the old Roman Catholic position that the loaf and the cup were transmuted into the soul, body, blood, and divinity of the Lord Jesus; while Zwingli's position was "that the bread and the wine are only memorial signs of the death of Christ, and that they only signify the body and blood of Christ."

Luther based his contention on the words of the Lord at the institution of the Supper, when he said, "This is my body;" and "This is my blood." Matt. 26. After the debate was over, he wrote a book in which he affirmed, "The words, 'This is my body,' yet stand."

Zwingli contended that these words of the Master were only figurative and spoke of his victory in these words: "Before three years shall have passed, Italy, France, Spain and Germany all, will be on our side."

Zwingli was right in contending that the loaf and cup are not the literal body and blood of Christ. It can be demonstrated by actual test that they are only bread and wine—that they are not actual flesh and blood. And this fact is further shown by the fact that Paul says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we bless, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? (1 Cor. 10:16).

Robert Milligan says:

"In all our attempts to interpret the Bible it is very important to discriminate between what is literal and what is figurative. The whole doctrine of transubstantiation is based on a misconception of a single term, and that, too, one of the smallest words in our vernacular: "This is my body." The question to be determined is simply this: Does the copula express the relation of identity, or merely that of analogy between the subject and the predicate of this proposition? Is it used in a literal or a metaphorical sense? The Roman Catholic (and we may add, the Lutheran, too.—JDP) maintains the former, and hence infers that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are transmuted into the body, blood, soul, and Divinity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

As we have shown, the loaf and the cup cannot possibly be the actual body and blood of Christ. And as Bro. Milligan has shown, the copula is simply expresses the analogy between the subject and the predicate of this proposition.

But what should the loaf and the cup on the Lord's table be called? Should we say, "This loaf is an emblem of the body of Christ?" And should we say, "This cup is emblematic of the blood of Christ?" There is some contention over this matter among the churches of Christ.

In answer to this question, I think we should always, when possible, use Scriptural terms—"Bible names for Bible things," as the Campbells taught, and as we profess. Paul warned Timothy, thus: "Speak thou words which become sound doctrine." And he also told him to use "sound speech which cannot be condemned." And the Lord promised us thru Zephaniah that he would "turn to the peoples pure language, that they may all call upon the name of Jehovah, to serve him with one consent." Zeph. 3:10. Jesus calls the loaf, "my body;" and he calls the cup, "my blood." And Paul calls the loaf, "a communion of the body of Christ;" and the cup, "a communion of the blood of Christ." 1 Cor. 10:16. There can be no harm in calling them just what inspiration calls them. So let us do that, and thus avoid the language of Ashdod.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

PREACH THE WORD

Who should preach the word? Christ committed his word to men to preach, not to women: there was not a woman among the apostles of Christ. The bishops of the congregations were all men; the deacons were men, and the evangelists were men. To Timothy Paul said, "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be

able to teach others also." 2 Tim. 2:2. Timothy had been commanded to "Preach the word." He had received this word from Paul, and now Paul enjoins on Timothy the duty of preaching this word and committing it to faithful men that they may be able to pass it on to the coming generations.

So today, "faithful men" should preach the word of God without fear or favor. But I fear that many are not carrying out the instructions of Paul. Since the Sunday School and the "pastor" system have come upon us a "Sissy jazz, doodle kind of preaching," as one writer names it, has taken the place of plain, straight-forward gospel preaching, as it did with the Digressives when they left the Bible for "sanctified common sense" as their religious guide, until the papers supposed to stand for "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent," are beginning to call attention to departures from the Bible and are trying, or say they are, to get the churches to drop their worldlyism "jaz" step and get back to the Bible.

In some congregations the leaders forbid a preacher to preach on subjects that would condemn their practice, the elders in some cases having agreed that these subjects shall not be mentioned. Can a man faithfully preach the word under such conditions? No. Then what are we to do? My idea of faithfulness to God and his word forbids. Such preaching will never keep the churches to the Bible. And that church is in a deplorable condition when it comes to such a pass. And no man at all familiar with present conditions among us dare deny that they are deplorable, and are getting worse all the time. And one has said, "What has been, will be." Another says, "History will repeat itself." Yes, another Digressive movement is plainly upon us. May faithful elders and preachers get busy and save as many as we can from the foundation of sand, namely, "the commandments and doctrines of men." Matt. 7:26, 27 and Col. 2:21, 22. For these shall "perish."

These "namby-pamby, good-Lord and good-devil preachers and teachers will never restore the church to its apostolic purity and practice—never. They are a set of time-servers and money-getters, as were the false prophets among Israel. Now let us inquire, "Lord, is it I," and look well that our own skirts are "Free from the blood of all men." Hell eternal is an awful place with the devil and his angels." Matt. 25:41-46. Let every one that reads this make a heart-searching examination of himself, and let us join together in earnest and continued prayer and faithful work with whatever sacrifice it may require that we may be found faithful to the Lord, and may bring about better conditions in the church, and let us so labor until God calls us from our labors to his sweet rest. Rev. 14:15.

Your humble brother in Christ, W. T. Taylor

THE TRUTH FUND

J. D. Perkins -----\$10.00

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JUNE 15, 1929

No. 12

Portales, N. Mex., May 29, 1929

J. N. Cowan,
Shreveport, La.
Dear Brother:

In answer to yours of May 24, I wish to say that you did not answer me as to having the debate taken and published, each bearing half the expense. How about it? The brethren want this done.

I was at Elk City to meet you and Johnson on the propositions you have signed with me, and you both had notice from me that I would be there for the purpose of meeting you. If you both did not "back out," what did you do?

You wrote the following proposition in 1925, and signed it with me to debate it, and I do not see any sense in signing it again. And you admit that you have been "evading" a debate with me on it:

Proposition: "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. (See letter of Oct. 10, 1925).

I see that you want me to affirm a proposition. All right. Here it is:

The word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

H. C. Harper, affirms. _____, denies.

Return this proposition to me with your signature to it if you will debate it with me. I told you in 1925 that "I think you don't want to debate anything with me," and I yet think the same way.

And if you now want to debate on the number of cups to be used since you now say, "I am fully convinced that when a brother takes the position that Christ or Paul referred to the container when they said cup is a heretic," I will now say to you what I said in 1925, namely, "I will affirm that A church of Christ can 'speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent' and use one drinking cup in the communion service. But if you prefer to lead, just omit 'one' and add 's' to 'cup' and I will deny it." And I will now say to you, as I said to N. L. Clark, "Now either lead or follow." Dare you do it? If so, sign here with me.

Proposition: A church of Christ can "speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the communion service. Aff. H. C. Harper; Neg. _____

Proposition: A church of Christ can "speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use drinking cups in the communion service. Aff. _____; Neg. H. C. Harper.

I suggest that we have three days to each proposition, and two sessions of two hours each during each day, and that the debate begin at Healdton,

Oklahoma, or at the Community Tabernacle at Loco, near Healdton, on July 1, 1929, beginning at 10:00 o'clock A. M. and I will here say, as you have said,

"Yours for more debates,"

H. C. Harper.

Elk City, Okla., May 20, 1929.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I, H. T. Evans, have written three letters to Bro. J. N. Cowan, asking him to call off the debate at Elk City, that a part of the church here did not want him and Bro. Bob Musgrave to debate that question at Elk City; and for the sake of peace in the church. But Bro. Cowan refused to grant my request. Myself and five other brethren went to the home of Bro. Musgrave on May 20, 1929, and talked the matter over with Bro. Musgrave; asked him to call off the debate between him and Bro. Cowan for the sake of peace in the church, and he granted our request and wrote Bro. Cowan that day; called the debate off at the wishes of these six brethren. (Signed) H. T. Evans.

Elk City, Okla., May 20, 1929.

J. N. Cowan, California Creek, Texas.

Dear Brother Cowan,—I am writing you what brethren that oppose the debate request of me for the sake of the church of Christ at Elk City. There are six of the brethren at my home this evening wanting the debate called off, and I am submitting to their request, not that I have any other reason; only for their sake and what they think the results would be for the church at Elk City.—Bob Musgrave.

They are: H. T. Evans, G. H. Bowman, H. Berger, J. W. Sullins, E. A. Isom and D. A. Curtis.

COWAN'S MUDDLE

In his recent meeting here Bro. Cowan preached one afternoon on "Eating Meat." He made such a blunder that I asked him for permission to speak a few minutes after he dismissed, but he refused, saying he didn't have time, that he had promised not to keep the audience over one hour." If he does not knowingly pervert this Scripture, and is cowering to try to hide behind something, he would better study before he tries to preach on this subject again. But it was evident to at least some of us that he was trying to save his lost cause in defending the use of the cups. When I talked to him about debating, he seemed brave on everything but defending the use of the cups. Yes, he was ready to defend right here what he contends for

except on the use of the cups. He would not defend his position on that issue, nor would he get a man to do so. He offered me this:

"The Scriptures authorize the use of unfermented wine in the observance of the Lord's supper." He then wrote, "I will get a man to affirm Prop. No. 1 above."

I do not deny this, and did not ask for a debate on it.

His second proposition was: "The church of Christ at Littlefield, Texas, is Scriptural in the use of one container in the distribution of the cup of the Lord's supper."

"J. N. Cowan, Aff."

-----Neg"

This is the practice of the town church, but the College church uses CUPS.

But I do not deny this, and he knows it. Let some of the debaters who favor the cups now meet Cowan on this. Here is their chance. Where is Bro. Howard? Yes, where is the Floydada preacher that has blowed so much on the one cup brethren? Here is his chance to show his metal. Dare he do it?

Now here are the propositions I submitted to Cowan:

1. The Scriptures authorize the use of more than one cup (container) in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

Aff. -----

Neg. H. C. Welch.

He refused to sign this. But this is the practice of the College church.

2. The Scriptures authorize the use of one cup (container) in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

Aff. H. C. Welch.

Neg. -----

He refused to sign this. But it is the practice of the town church.

So he agreed to defend the church at Littlefield who use one cup in their practice as being AUTHORIZED by the Scriptures; but refused to defend the Littlefield College church who uses a plurality of cups, and yet in the face of this in answer to a question, he stated publicly that he believed the College church to be Scriptural in their use of more than one cup. But just how strong does he believe it? Not strong enough to defend it, you see.

When I challenged him for a debate on the cup, he said he didn't think that question should be debated at all. I said, Then why are you going to debate it at Elk City? He said, Just to keep them from blowing and saying I am a coward. He is certainly in a hard place; and I told him that we would likely notice his cowardice at Littlefield, and other places. But I couldn't get him interested somehow.

He doesn't think it should be debated, but if some brethren pronounce him a coward, he will do what he thinks should not be done at all—at Elk City. (No, brother, not yet; for his cups brethren have there pulled him as a brand from the burning—Ed.)

He has had so much experience in dodging to catch the S. S. debaters that he has become an expert dodger to keep out of debate himself. As Brother Harper well said in "The Truth" recently—"All digression is alike" But some refuse to see it in Cowan. Yours for an open mind.—H. C. Welch.

SCRIPTURAL FACT

I am not contending for precedent only, when I contend for one cup for each congregation in the communion, but for the "faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." Notice the accounts given in the following scriptures: "And he took a cup and gave thanks, and gave to them saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:27, 28 R. V.) "And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he break it and gave to them, and said, Take ye, this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank of it." (Mark 14:22, 23 R. V.) "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he break it and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. 11:23-26). In the above scriptures we see: (1) Jesus took bread, and blessed it; (2) breaks it and gives it to His disciples; (3) Commands them to "Take; eat;" (4) Commands them "this do in remembrance of me; (5) takes a cup containing the fruit of the vine; (6) gives thanks and gives it to them; (7) commands them all to drink of (or, out of) it; (8) they all drank of (or out of) it; (9) commands them to do this as often as they drink in memory of Him, the "it" being in italics which shows that it was not in the original manuscript from which the King James and Revised Versions were made. Here, then, we have the teaching of Christ on the communion, and John says, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God" (2 John 9 R. V.) Again he says in the 6th verse: "And this is love, that we walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, that, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it." Now what have we heard from the beginning on the cup? We have heard from the beginning that Jesus took a cup containing the fruit of the vine, and blessed and gave it to his disciples and commanded them all to drink of (Or, out of) it, and that they all drank of it, and that he commanded them, this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me; and here John says that as we heard from the beginning we are commanded to walk in it. This should be plain enough for any one to see. We have God with

us, or in other words, we walk with God, just as long as we abide in the teaching of Christ, but beyond this God is not with us, but we are tossed about on the broad sea of human speculation, and there is division and discord. James says: "But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion, and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." (James 3, 14-17) As long as we all abide in the wisdom that is from above there is peace, but the moment we turn aside after the wisdom of men there is division and discord. A command is exclusive. This all admit, very well then, when Jesus gave one cup to his disciples and said, "Drink ye all of it," that excludes the use of more than one cup for each congregation. To the question as to why the Lord did not use more than one cup, if such was allowable, one brother says: "The answer is very simple and easy: Because more was not needed on that occasion." Had he added, "to please God" his answer would be correct. Jesus says: "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me I speak these things." If every professed Christian would follow the example of the Master and speak only what the Father teaches in His word, what a change there would be; divisions and discord would cease, but the Master continues: "And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." (John 8:28, 29) So we see that when Jesus gave that one cup containing the fruit of the vine to his disciples, he did what he knew was pleasing to God, and when he commanded them all to drink of it, he spake what God had taught him to speak, for he says: "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things," and he tells us that the Father was with him because he always did those things that pleased God. Just so we may have God with us if we do always those things that please Him, and we may know what pleases him by what Jesus commands to be done. One brother is very busy fighting the S. S., he tells us, but not too busy to advocate privately the use of the "cups." I think he is advocating a worse innovation in private than he is fighting in public. He says: "I am doing some private work along this line." I can remember when I was a boy, how that just before the organ was introduced into the worship of the congregation my parents were members of, the preacher did some "private work" along that line too, and I can remember now that Peter warns us: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." (2 Pet.. 2:1,2) How careful then,

we should all be, lest we be found to be false teachers or followers of their "pernicious ways." Paul speaking of some men, says: "They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him." One brother speaks of a plate as though the N. T. mentioned a plate as being used by Christ. Jesus commanded his disciples to eat of the bread, so they eat of it in obedience to Christ's command. If the book said that Jesus took wine, and blessed it, and gave it to them, then we would use any kind of container, and as many, as we like, but it does not say that Our brother asks which piece of the bread after it is broken, is the body of Christ? Christ said, "This is my body, which is broken for you," so when we break and eat of the loaf, we eat of Christ's body which is for us. And thus all "are partakers of that one loaf." (1 Cor. 10:1) Can we not drink of the cup divided in two parts and all drink of the same cup? No. Wine is a liquid, and may be called a cup only when it is in a cup, or a bottle when it is in a bottle, and when it is in more than one cup, it becomes more than one cup, and may then be spoken of as "cups". I will illustrate it this way: You and I sit down at a table upon which two cups are placed, one of them is full, the other empty; you pick up the full one and pour half of the contents into the empty one and say to me, Which cup will you have? Then you drink your cup and I drink mine. You see it is no longer one cup but two, for when a PART OF a liquid is poured from one cup into another, it becomes the contents of the cup it is in or in other words, becomes another cup. But why such question? Jesus commanded his disciples to eat of the bread, and to all drink of the cup he gave them, and to do that as oft as they do it, in memory of Him, and we can all understand that. Why so much speculation? Why not abide in the teaching of Christ and have peace among ourselves?
—N. E. Kellems.

STRANGE ADVICE

The church at Gunter, Texas, was using cups, and a brother came in there who did not believe in the use of cups, and he and his father wanted the church to use one cup so this brother could worship with them. But John R. Freeman's mother said if they put in one cup she never would meet there again, and she said John advised her to take that stand. Now you can see how John stands on the use of one cup. His conscience will permit him to worship where they use one, but this is the way he acts towards the brethren to break up the fellowship by the use of the cups.

THE TRUTH FUND

J. A. Bond\$5.00
I. B. Kile 1.00

SUBSCRIBE FOR THE TRUTH

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00



LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

SAD SITUATION

The churches that have not yet robed themselves ready for the eternal abode with Satan and his angels need to wake up if they do not wish to be swept into the vortex of innovation that is now coming on like a great tidal wave that will try the foundation of every church.

Those that Satan can not destroy by an open fight or by secret assaults, he will likely overcome by "policy". And already the "policy" platform is getting to be as popular as a modern picture show or theatre, and preachers and churches are crowding this platform like cattle driven before a Texas blizzard.

The organ innovation began in just one church in St. Louis. How did it spread and engulf almost the whole church? The preacher who fought this innovation was debarred from the churches that used it, and dogged and derided as an old fogey. The preachers that favored this innovation were received with open arms by the churches that did not have it and also by those that had introduced it, and he was thus getting double the support of the preacher that stood for the truth. Hence this loyal preacher had to quit the field or agree not to say anything against the use of the organ if he went where it was used by the church. And many preachers, rather than quit, stifled their conscience and kept still at first and compromised the truth, but in most cases finally came out for the organ and got the support that went with it, while the brother who would not stifle his conscience and compromise the truth was driven, in most cases, from the field, and then the innovation spread like a Kansas prairie fire.

And it has been the same with the Sunday school innovation. The churches that did not have it and opposed it continued to use preachers that were in favor of it, or at least would not "fight" it, being willing to compromise the truth for the money, and the preacher that would stand for the truth was pushed back and starved out, and the Sunday school digression spread everywhere.

And again "history repeats itself" in the matter of the cups, and it is but a short step from "two or more cups" to "the individual cups." Churches that have one cup are supporting preachers that stand for the cups. These preachers are the big "guys" too with the big churches that have the "dough" and throw their support to such preachers. These preachers thus get support, while the preachers that stands against the innovation are

starved from the field. This is now the situation that confronts us, and it is indeed a sad situation. Who shall be able to stand. Look at the Littlefield church, a one cup church, and who holds the meeting? Cowan? Look at the Dallas Church, a one cup church, and who holds the meeting? Cowan? Look at the Apostolic Way, a one cup paper, (?) and who is it throwing its support to—Cowan, Johnson, Clark, Freeman, and others who indorse the cups. Is that the way to put out digression? It is just the way the organ innovation spread; it is the way the Sunday School digression spread; and what can we look for as to the cups but the same sad story repeated? But why murmur?—every man's faith must be tried. Yes, but it seems that we should learn something by the past.

Listen now, here is the "policy." The cups advocates will settle back to that insidious "sweet spirit" that will shield them from meeting the opposition, and they will play shut-mouth and preach for the one cup churches (especially those that pay well) and also for the cups churches that as a rule are of the largest and able to pay and will pay well if the preacher is a cups man. And as fast as the churches get to be any size as it was with the "Pastor" the cups will go in—they will have them or divide the church.

NOTES

Never has the church seen a stronger determination to have their way regardless of what the Bible says than now. We need the warning of the prophet Samuel repeated constantly in our ears—"To obey is better than sacrifice.

By mistake Bro. Pearson's name was omitted from his "Thoughts for wise thinkers" in our edition of April 1st. Let us have more like them.

We hope the brethren will not compel us to miss an issue for want of funds. This is the hard season to get by, and we ask the brethren to help us meet the printing bills only. We have been wrapping and mailing the papers without charging for it. And it is no small task. There has been no expense made but for the printing. And our printers, the Laycook Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn., have been doing the printing this year almost at cost of paper and labor. Don't neglect this, brethren. We are right in the midst of one of the hardest fights for the Bible way that has been waged for "The faith once for all delivered to the saints," in years.

We need more short articles on primary obedience and Christian living. Our printers are doing the best they can to make up the paper with what they are able to use. We do not propose to lessen our fight against all innovations, nor do we wish to check in any way a thorough discussion of all religious subjects, but we wish to have more articles, short written on "What must I do to be saved? and "Walk in newness of life."

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

Proposition: "The Scriptures teach that man is wholly mortal."

Albert S. Hodges, affirms;
Jas. D. Phillips, denies.

Third Affirmative

We will refresh Bro. Phillips' memory. He says I did not prove that man is mortal. Here are the texts cited in my first affirmative: 1 Tim. 6:13-16; Rom. 6:12, 2 Chron. 14:11; Job 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:53; 2 Cor. 5:4.

We are discussing MAN and NOT SPIRIT. God said in the beginning, "Let us make man in our image," Gen. 1:26, and in the next chapter says, "And (God) breathed into his (man's) nostrils the breath of Life AND MAN BECAME A LIVING SOUL." THE SPIRIT IS NO PART OF MAN. It is his only to use and when he abuses his body, God takes his spirit and breath back. Elihu understood it this way, listen! "If He (God) set His heart upon man, if he gather unto Himself HIS (GOD'S) SPIRIT, man shall turn again to dust." —Job 34:14-15. "Thou (God) hidest thy face, they (men) are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust."

We are discussing man in his original form and as he is today, and not what God hopes to make him in the future. I, like Job, hope to see God in my flesh. That is why we are so interested in cleaning up these bodies of ours and have them presentable when the Lord appears for His waiting bride. The spirit of God is man's only in the sense of a gift to enable him to think, act and choose and direct his mortal body with the hope of securing immortality for his fleshly body. See?

To illustrate: You are loaned money from the bank and it is duly placed to your credit and it is commonly referred to as your money and you pay out and the business world counts it your money, and so it is, but just as soon as you make shipwreck of your business your funds are taken away and you fail financially. Even so we use the Lord's breath and his spirit in the effort to subdue our carnal natures and make our bodies fit temples for the Holy Spirit, until this mortal shall put on immortality, and this "wholly mortal" shall become WHOLLY IMMORTAL—mortality swallowed up of life, Eternal Life.—2nd Cor. 5:4.

I am not so foolish as to contend that spirit and breath are always synonymous. Get the viewpoint that God's plan is to take mortal man and furnish him with breath of life to animate his mortal body and His word and Spirit to enlighten this living body of flesh and prepare it for association with its Creator.

Man kills this mortal body but the life of our prospective bodies is indestructible. This was vividly shown when the angel entered the fiery furnace with the Hebrew children and kept them from harm.

God dwells in devouring fire, Ex. 19:18. His angels have the same power to resist fire, and His people who are obedient have the same protection promised them, viz: "When thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned."—Isaiah 43:2.

This explains Math. 10:28: "Fear not man who can kill the body, but has no power to kill the (future) soul (or body). When God has demonstrated that man in the flesh, mortal man, could be kept from harm, (Daniel 3:25), how much more are those mortals who put on immortality exempt from death at the hands of those who would kill them.

We are living in "The Time of the End," when knowledge is increasing—Divine knowledge to those who apply themselves and rightly apply Revelation. "The wise shall understand."—Dan. 12:10.

Come on, Brother Phillips, let us learn the way of the Lord more perfectly.

Orlando, Florida.

Albert S. Hodges.

Third Negative

In my last I said, "We are agreed that the body is mortal; and we are agreed that the spirit is not mortal," and I said, "There is no disagreement between us unless he is going to take the position that the spirit is no part of man."

He now says, "The spirit is no part of man." He might as well say the body is no part of man. We read, "be holy both in body and in spirit." 1 Cor. 7:34. Again, "glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." 1b. 6:20. He says the spirit is God's—so is the body. And we must keep both for God, for Paul says again, "let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." 2 Cor. 7:1. And he prays for the the Thessalonians that "your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thes. 5:23.

And I want to say again that the man who denies that man has a spirit that is "your spirit" as well as a body that is "your body" simply denies the Bible, and this is just what constituted the Sadducees materialists, denying the resurrection. Acts 23:8; Matt. 22:23-32. And such men as deny that man has a spirit to live on after the body goes down into dust are illogical in claiming a resurrection while denying that man has no spirit to survive his body. For under such condition there can be no resurrection and the Sadducees were logical enough to see it, and hence denied the spirit and also angels. God might create another man, but there could be no resurrection of the dead. The body is mortal, as I have shown, and dies; but the spirit does not die, as he has admitted. But he quotes passages showing that man dies. Yes, but listen. Jesus says, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Jno. 12:24. But you know and I know that the little germ does not die, if there is to be another grain, or body. God might create another grain, but none would come from the one sown. The Lord says the "grain" dies, and the Bible says "man" dies, but that is not to say that the "grain" is wholly mortal, nor is it to say that "man" is wholly mortal. But it is the way the Bible speaks of each. Hence when Paul shows the resurrection, he speaks the same way, in 1 Cor. 15:35, 36.

And Bro. Hodges is bound to deny the resurrection if he denies that "man" has a spirit to survive the body at death. But I have abundantly shown from the Bible that man has a spirit as well as a body, and that this spirit does not die.

Man's body is "wholly mortal," and man's body will be "wholly immortal" in the resurrection. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption . . . it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." 1 Cor. 15:42. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." v. 26. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" vs. 54, 55.

Then so long as one mortal body remains, death is not conquered; but death will be conquered; therefore every corruptible body will put on incorruption.

Yes, "the end" is nearer to-day than it was yesterday. And if some of these "wise" ones know when the end will be, let them tell us. Miller missed it, and so has every other man that has set a date. Yes, brother, now instruct us, and let us learn the way of the Lord—not man's way—more perfectly.—Jas. D. Phillips.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

By E. A. Lowry

Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh." Gen. 2:24. Matt. 19:5. And Jesus also adds in Matt. 19:6, "Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh. What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

What man, what court has any right to sever this God-made union?

There evidently is no tie that should be stronger, or oath more binding, except one (that is to Christ), than that which binds husband and wife.

"They two shall be one flesh. "Think of it. My wife's bones and flesh are the same as mine. This is God's decree under the Old Testament, confirmed and reenacted in the New by the author thereof, even Christ.

Do men and women ever stop to contemplate this great crime against God's laws, and the severing of their own bodies when they are heedlessly rushing on to divorce?

Why this great modern evil, one of the greatest the devil has introduced? It has been brought about by hasty, sinful, loveless marriages. Men and women, boys and girls, marry for money, marry for society, marry for ambition, marry for lust, and sensual gratification, and hence when these false allurements turn to bitter disappointment, the heart palls at the future prospect, and the only escape is found in the divorce court.

It seems to me that the preachers, parents, and guardians of the young are almost entirely to blame for this state of affairs. The young are not taught, because the parents and preachers are afraid to come out boldly and emphasize the law

as Jesus did in Luke 16:18, That "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marryeth another committeth adultery." And whosoever marryeth her that is put away committeth adultery. Again, Mark 10:11, 12 is so plain that a fool may understand: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if a woman shall put away her husband and marry another, she committeth adultery."

Seeing these plain teachings why will some preachers writhe and squirm, twist and turn, ignore these plain scriptures of which there can be no doubt and turn to Matt. 19:9 for license to marry a couple, or even take a divorce for a wife? The point stressed here by the Savior is the grounds for divorce. There is only one excuse for divorce.

I was absolutely astounded at Bro. Elam's teaching, a few years ago in the Sunday School literature, that the one could marry again without sin, if the other had been guilty of adultery. If Christ taught any such thing in Matt. 19:9, he crossed himself in Mark 10:11, 12, and Luke 16:18.

But let us hear Jesus further: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so." For twenty-five hundred years God did not allow it, and it was only thru their meanness that it was allowed, and it brought its punishment as other sins.

1 Cor. 7:10, 11: "But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband), and the husband leave not his wife." Therefore the preacher who assists in this sinful practice is a party to the crime.

When men and women throw down and trample under foot this God given institution, and make it subservient to their lusts and worldly desires, they have committed one of the most heinous crimes, the devil has in his catalogue. "A marriage for convenience!" "Simply want position!" "Love not expected!" "Companionate marriage!" Like the beasts of the field, we will "run together" awhile, then jump into another pasture. Yes, and the brute is an honor to you.

But my dear brethren and sisters, these things should never be with us. We must be a law abiding people; a holy people; a people of good works; a people of light, and of noble example. No man should be able to say of us: "Christian has divorced his wife and married another."

The world is not subject unto the law of Christ, but to the laws of man. These worldly laws allow one to get a divorce for any cause, and marry again, but in Christ it is not so.

A Christian should marry a Christian, and not an unbeliever. The cause of so much trouble in the church is careless marriages; Godless marriages; apeing the world; not realizing that we should be a "peculiar people" in this as in every thing else.

In conclusion, we will submit a few questions for you to ponder, and answer if you want to, because answer you must, here or hereafter.

1. What is scriptural marriage?
2. Who authorized it?
3. Can any power repeal, or change a law except the power that made it?
4. How can this union be dissolved? 1 Cor. 7: 39
5. Cannot man dissolve it? Matt. 19:6.
6. Can one who has married a divorcee be saved? Lev. 20:10; 1 Cor. 6:9; Heb. 13:4.

"If ye love me ye will keep my commandments." "Why call ye me Lord, and do not what I say?" "Not every one that sayeth unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven."

Brethren, this divorce evil is in the church. Will you help to teach members their duty along this line. You are the "Watchmen on the walls." Cry aloud, and spare not. "Reprove, rebuke, with all longsuffering and doctrine."

Dayton, Tenn., R. F D. 5

BINDING OF SATAN

Much speculation has been made on Rev. and assertion without proof is not worth any thing. "Bound," does it mean fast and can't move? No. The word "bound" in this Ch. means can't deceive no longer. First I want to notice the 9 ch. The word "bottomless pit" is used here for the first time in the Bible. The "bottomless pit" was locked. "I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit," and he opened the pit. "Star" is used for man. In my next article I will prove it. Heaven means the church. What came out of the pit, is what—to be "bound" and put back in it. Smoke came out of the pit. What came out of the smoke? "locusts" (men). Was there any thing besides locusts came out of the pit? Yes, A beast. Proof: Rev. 11:7. The beast that ascended out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them and over come them, and kill them. What is beast? Daniel 7:17 tells what. Beast is King or kingdom. What beast came out of the pit? The one that made war with the two witnesses and overcome them. What beast or kingdom overcome the two witnesses? The Roman beast, or kingdom. It is the one that deceived every nation on earth; it is the one to be "bound" and put into the "bottomless pit" so it can't deceive the nations any more for a thousand years. Is the "1000 years" literal figurative? Does it stand for a definite, or indefinite time? Definite. I will prove it is definite time. Star fell from heaven. Which heaven? Paul said third heaven. This star fell from the church, which is called heaven; that's why the church was driven into the wilderness for 1260 years. This heaven is in this world, but not of it; that's why this star fell unto the earth. The highest place one can occupy is in the church. To fall from the church to the world, is to do worldly things instead of spiritual things. (To be continued)

W. H. Purlee, Pekin, Ind.

HERE AND THERE

"They say the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians is to be followed on Sunday morning and at all other times . . . These same people also call the Sunday-morning meetings the 'worship'. I asked them for the chapter and verse, but they could not find it. They insist that the members must all be given a chance to talk every Sunday morning, in order that the church may be edified. A very laudable ambition, but they are not accomplishing it. Only three or four take part, and the same ones over again every Sunday. 'Edify' means 'to build up.' They are not building up the church in any sense. They are not turning out preachers that will make a sacrifice for the cause of Christ, nor are they building up in numbers. Every church I know of which is practicing that system is getting smaller all the time, except, perhaps, one where members move in."

G. A., Apr. 10, 1924.

We are glad to see the brother calling for "chapter and verse." This has the old, familiar ring, and we expect to demand the same thing of the Gospel Advocate. The brother here acknowledges that it is right to demand "chapter and verse," now let the Gospel Advocate meet this demand. No fudging now: just "come up to the rack—fodder or no fodder." This is where we stand, and if the Gospel Advocate will stand there too, there will be no division.

Now after the brother had visited one of the churches that is "practicing that system," he wrote, saying, "They have no Lord's day Bible study (Sunday School), and the children there come up to the standard, or average, in intelligence and Bible knowledge, and they are at peace among themselves, and as for me I care not to disturb them."

Is the brother such a "peace" lover that he will let a church go on to destruction, rather than correct it or attempt to do so when he has the opportunity. If the "system" he advocates has "chapter and verse" for its foundation, being founded in the wisdom of God, and not of man, should he not, like Paul, "have declared the whole counsel of God" to that church, and thus made himself "pure from the blood of all?" If his "system" is of God, it was his duty to see that that church followed it, if it was in his power to do so. But the very fact that he did not, as he here admits, make any such attempt, is an open confession that he is self-condemned. As it now stands: either his "system" he now pushes so rampantly through the Gospel Advocate, is of man, or he is guilty of the blood of his fellowman. There is no escape.

If he condoned a "system" that has not the stamp of "chapter and verse," a system that does not "build up the church in any sense," a system that is "not turning out preachers that will make a sacrifice for the cause of Christ,"—he himself is not worthy the name "preacher." "Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching," is the apostolic requirement. And whenever a preacher fails to do this for any cause—even "peace" or policy—he has the blood of men upon his garments.

But "These same people also call the Sunday-morning meetings the 'worship,' says the brother. Of course they do: have you never read Acts 20:7, together with 1 Cor. chapter eleven and chapter fourteen? A "preacher" should be able to find this for a brother that lacks New Testament knowledge. Even the editors of the Gospel Advocate know this much. Listen: "Worship, to be acceptable, must be ordained of God and must be from the heart. The worship of God prescribed in the New Testament is very simple. It consists in reading the scriptures, teaching, breaking bread, the contribution, prayers, and singing. Hence a church of Christ should assemble on the Lord's day and engage by divine authority in these things. This is the worship which God has ordained."—G. A., Nov. 17, 1910. Again: "When a church undertakes to worship God as directed in the New Testament, it must follow the direction as therein given, and it cannot do this with women 'answering and discussing questions,' and we, therefore, answer our brother's question with an emphatic no, 'the New Testament' does not 'direct women to ask, answer, or discuss questions' when the church is engaged in the worship of God."—G. A., Sept. 29, 1910. Again: "When the church meets for worship and for their own edification, then whatever teaching is done should be such as will edify all the members; and in that case the whole church should be taught together, and the teaching should be of a character that all the members can understand."—G. A., July 8, 1909. And again: "God has appointed but one regular, necessary meeting on Lord's day, where certain worship is to be performed. The Bible makes only one meeting on Lord's day a necessary meeting." G. A., Jan. 19, 1911.

Now let us uphold the "system" for which we can furnish "chapter and verse." We will meet you on this ground.

WHERE WILL HE ANCHOR NEXT?

Brother Moore denies that he has been "inconsistent" in his teaching on the cup question. I wrote brother Moore Oct. 10, 1928 and called his attention to two issues of the Leader; one in which he had "advised" the churches in West Virginia that they could "adopt" the "individual cups" with out violating New Testament teaching; and in the other (of later date) he denied that he had ever "advised or advocated" the communion set. Here is what he said: "If you will hunt up what I have written and will quote it to me I'll cheerfully acknowledge my inconsistency. I still 'deny that I have ever "advocated or advised" the individual cups, except to comply with the law of the land.'"

To the above I replied: "No State has the 'power' to enact and enforce a law respecting an establishment of religion. You certainly knew this before, why then did you say in your article (see issue of Leader Jan. 6, 1925,—Also the Truth, Mar. 15, 1929, that "it is plain that the law requires churches to use the individual cups, one for each participant at the Lord's Supper. Bro.

Moore replied as follows: "This is another insidious misrepresentation. Had you read what I wrote on the subject, with unbiased mind and with a desire to ascertain the Truth, instead of with a view and determination to find something with which to find fault, you would not have accused me of granting to any State the right to "enact and enforce a law respecting an establishment of religion."

In his "article" on the "cups" (see publications referred to above) he says: "If the law of West Virginia requires the individual cups (and it does unequivocally) then one of three things follows: (1) Each congregation must adopt the individual cups; or, (2) Cease to have the Lord's Supper; or, (3) Be violaters of the law and possibly be apprehended and imprisoned." Moore knew when he wrote the above that such a law was unconstitutional, but instead of advising the churches that their "religious practices" were protected by the "Constitution," he actually "advised" "each" congregation to adopt the "individual cups". Then about eight months later some one wrote to him and told him that "he seemed to be pretty stout on the communion set." and Moore said: "I deny that I have ever advised or advocated the communion set." (See issue of Leader, Sept. 29, 1925). If it requires thirty-five years of preaching for a man to become "settled religiously," (established in the faith) "What will the harvest be?"

"If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established—Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper." (Isa. 7:9,—2 Chron. 20:20). "Be not carried about (unstabalized) with divers and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace" (Heb. 13:9). How carried away? Let Rowe and Klingman answer—"From one opinion to another; (like Bro. Moore for instance) or, according to another reading, carried away, namely, from the right path. Adhere steadfastly to your steadfast Savior, and the truth concerning him as ye have received it." For he that wavereth (unsteady; vacillating), is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed.

Rowe and Klingman says, that one who doubts is like the surge of the sea because, "he is not fixed or settled in purposes, plans or efforts." Poor Bro. Moore, he thought he was safely "anchored" in 1927. (See Leader, Mar. 29, 1927). But his debate with Bro. Phillips was too much for him; he let go his "anchor" and took another "advanced position" and now he is drifting, drifting, and no safe harbor in sight. Oh! when will our wandering Bro. come home? Truly does James affirm: "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways" —I. B. K.

Church Printing—The Laycook Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn., make a specialty of church printing, such as tracts, church papers, etc., as well as a general line of commercial work. They will be glad to give estimates on any kind of Printing. Regardless of where you are your business will receive prompt attention.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JULY 1, 1929

No. 13

"BACK TO JERUSALEM"

"Oh that my people had harkened unto me, and Israel had walked in my ways! I should soon subdued their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries. The haters of the Lord should have submitted themselves unto him."—Psa. 81:13-15.

This shows that while Israel walked in the way of the Lord, they always prospered; and it also shows that they failed and their enemies triumphed over them when they walked in their own ways. And since "These things were our examples, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted," we know that we would have long since triumphed over our foes, had we only walked in God's ways.

But how can we ever triumph over our foes with our humanisms,—the organ, the Sunday School, the pastor, the missionary society, the cups, etc.? Can we have these things and walk in the Lord's way? No; for they are no part of his way. And hence those who practice them are saying, "We will not walk therein."—Jer. 6:16.

The seven last plagues are soon to be poured out on all the enemies of the church. Rev. 16th chapter. And when the fifth angel shall pour out the bitter contents of his vial, the prophecy shall be fulfilled: "And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat (throne) of the Beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they naved their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pain and their sores, and repented not of their deeds."—Rev. 16:10, 11. All this is to be done unto them because they do not walk in the way of Jehovah. Thus their punishment shall be great.

Let us, then, see that we walk in God's way so that we shall prosper in the work of the Lord. We will never prosper if we do not "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth."

"Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots," is soon to "sink with violence to rise no more."—Rev. 17th and 18th chapters. Are you in her? You are if you practice anything—which originated in "Mystery: Babylon." And if you are in Babylon, will you please heed the call which is now going forth in our own land,—"Come out of Babylon, my people, that you have no fellowship with her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues" (Rev. 18:4)?

Let us get busy, and "come out of Babylon" and return to Jerusalem.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

AGREEMENT

Roswell, New Mexico, June 14, 1929

It is hereby agreed by and between J. N. Cowan and H. C. Harper—

1. That they shall discuss the following propositions at Healdton, Oklahoma, beginning July 27, 1929; namely,

I. "The cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine are one and the same.

J. N. Cowan, affirmative.

(Signed) H. C. Harper, negative.

II. The word "cup" as used in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

(Signed) H. C. Harper, affirmative.

J. N. Cowan, negative.

2. There shall be two days given to each proposition, and there shall be two sessions each day of two hours each, beginning at 10 A. M. and 2 P. M. And there shall be four 30-minute at each session, the first speech to begin at 10 A. M., Tuesday, July 2, 1929.

3. No new argument shall be introduced in the final speech on a proposition.

4. Each speaker shall choose a moderator, and these two shall choose a Chairman moderator.

5. Each shall have the privilege of having the debate taken and published without the consent of the other.

Any regulation of this agreement may be changed or modified by the consent of the disputants.

* * * *

COWAN-HARPER DEBATE

Roswell, New Mexico, June 14, 1929.

J. N. Cowan,
Shreveport, La.

Dear Brother Cowan:—I have your letter of June 3rd, relative to the debate to be held by us at Healdton, Okla. You are not willing to have the debate taken and published and each of us bear half of the expense. You are willing, however, for me to have this done, and I shall endeavor to do this.

Yes, you submitted a proposition for me to affirm, but I preferred to write my own proposition. And I have taken a proposition which is the opposite from yours, and if you are willing to affirm the one you wrote for yourself to affirm, you can not in reason object to denying the one I wrote to affirm.

In regard to your failure to meet me at Elk City last May on the proposition you have written with your own hand, you say, "If the church at Elk City would not allow Musgrave to meet me there, do you think they would allow you to meet

me?" In this you insinuate an untruth, for five or six of the brethren who favor the use of cups in the church at Elk City do not, by any rule of language, constitute "the church at Elk City,"—not by a long way, brother.

You say, "Were they calling Musgrave down in order to put you up?" No; Musgrave was on the ground and ready to meet you on the date set, May 27th, and I was there "to meet Johnson and I," as I told you both through the paper and by letter, either before or after the debate with Musgrave, and on a proposition wholly different from the propositions you had with Musgrave. But you now say, "Why do you ask, 'Have you backed out?'" And you have not told me why you did not appear. I asked you this because I wanted to know. But you say of it, "You must be hard up for something to say." Yes, it may be cramping you, for you evidently did "back out." At least you did not come. And I can say the same thing of Brother Alva Johnson. However, he is here in Roswell holding a meeting for the church at 5th street, who use the "individual cups." But told me in the presence of one of their Elders that he would not defend their practice. If he had said that he would, I expected to call on him to meet you on the proposition you signed while you were here, if I have been correctly informed, namely, "Resolved, That the individual cups are deceptive and divisive." However, I have him on his own proposition he signed with me, and we are both here now and the debate has been announced.

You ask of the Elk City church, "Do you think they would allow you to meet me?" They would not only "allow" it, Brother Cowan, but they were anxiously awaiting it, while your six cups brethren were frantically working to stop it. Like the Sunday School advocated, they were willing to have it where there were no accommodations and where people would not attend it. They tried to drag it out to the country, ten or more miles from Elk City, but failed, the brethren there telling them that Elk City was the place for it. And you wrote me that you proposed to go to Elk City if you found that these brethren were on our side of the question. Musgrave has written you that they were and that they shouldered all responsibility in calling off the debate, every one saying he would not endorse you. And he has told you that his side were willing and anxious for the debate. But you have not gone to Elk City, bless your soul, no.

You say, "I agreed to meet you there if they were afraid Musgrave could not do the work. Or to meet you after I met Musgrave, if they thought Musgrave failed." Yes, you put up a subterfuge to keep from meeting me, and every man who knows straight up, knows it too. And you know it, my brother.

Find propositions and agreement signed and enclosed. I notice that you refuse to deny that the use of one cup, a drinking vessel, is scriptural,

and also refuse to affirm that the use of "two or more" is scriptural. Why?

"Yours for more debates,"

H. C. Harper.

— ONLY THE PRESCRIBED ACTS,—YES SIR

"There can be found no Scripture, no consistency, no reason, for this straddle of the fence position as to the revealed will of God on any act of worship. It is true that "God is a Spirit and he seeketh such to worship him as worship him in spirit and in truth." (John 4:23-24). If we do worship, we must perform some act or acts. If the Lord has prescribed the acts of worship to be performed, then we must perform only the prescribed acts." — T. S. Hutson, C. L. March, 30, 1926.

Comment

Correct, brother; "we must perform only the prescribed acts." Those who perform only the prescribed acts, are the only ones who truly "worship him in spirit and in truth." They do not cause any schism in the "body of Christ," because they practice only what is "revealed in the will of God."

Since you have admitted that "the Lord has prescribed the acts of worship to be performed,"—why, yes, why! do you almost have a "conviction fit" everytime someone asks you to furnish a clear New Testament statement for the "class system," and "individual cups,"—neither of which the Lord "prescribed"? Those who do only what the Lord requires never cause any "schism" in the church. Where is the Scripture to be found that requires a congregation to "adopt" the class system, or individual cups, either? You say, "we have the revealed will of God on the acts of worship to be performed," and that "we must perform only the prescribed acts." See? or are you blind? You must be blind, or you could see that,—"there is no Scripture, no consistency, no reason, for this straddle-of-the-fence position as to the revealed will of God on any act of worship."

Does a congregation in order to be right with God, have to adopt the class system? You have said, "The individual cups were adopted almost unanimously and we are using them now in harmony with the law of God and the State." "Almost unanimously," eh? But not quite. There were some good brethren opposed to their adoption; and you have the "brass" to come out in print with the statement,—"we are using them now in harmony with the law of God." Impossible! An "act" that forces good brethren to sin against their own conscience or "get out," may be in harmony with his majesty, the devil; but it is not now, never was, and never will be, in harmony with the law of God, as long as God is God; and Hutson knows it. And where, yes, where! does he get authority to legislate a law restricting a congregation to the use of individual cups? He gets it from the same source that Diotrephes got

his authority to "cast some out of the church." Those who will not "knock under" to the "we," sin against their own conscience in using the little "toy cups" are virtually "kicked out" too. "When ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak conscience ye sin against Christ."

Now since the New Testament does not restrict a congregation to the use of individual cups; it follows, that those who make the law that all who worship with a given congregation, must use them or "get out,"—are making a law where God made none. Moreover, they are guilty of making a law that abrogates the law that God did make to cover such things. (see Rom. 14:—)

It is presumptuous for any uninspired man, one who has not been admitted into the counsels of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, to add to the laws of the King and try to bring His subjects under the added law; but to annul any law of our King by the addition of a human law is blasphemy and treason.

—Ira B. Kile, Sistersville, W. Va.

WASTE, WASTE, WASTE

Hundreds of cigaret butts were collected to determine what length is usually discarded unused. It was found that the average smoker throws his cigar or cigaret away with an inch and a quarter unused. And tests indicated that from fifty to ninety per cent of these stubs cause fires. Smokers are responsible for a property loss near \$90,000,000 per year by fire to say nothing of the loss in material resources thrown away in the stubs.—Literary Digest.

Some brethren seem to want to defend the tobacco habit. I have opposed all such habits for the last fourteen years, and I now stand ready to deny the following proposition, namely,—

It is within the bounds of Christian liberty to form such habits as the Tobacco Habit. Aff.-----; Neg. D. J. Whitten.

Now let the brother who has indorsement from his brethren sign the above proposition, and we will let the brotherhood see both sides of this question. If the papers will not publish the discussion, I will agree to pay half the expense of having it published in pamphlet form to send forth among the brethren for them to read and make a calm decision on the matter.—D. J. Whitten, Deming, N. M.

(We believe Brother Whitten is right in opposing this habit, not only from the point of health-detracting and waste, but from the angle of un-Christian conduct; and we shall gladly furnish this paper as a medium for the investigation.

CHAS. F. REESE'S PAMPHLET

Brother Reese has out a pamphlet, neat and valuable, dealing with the use of the cups and the Sunday School, which he is offering at 10 cents a single copy or \$1.00 a dozen. Get these and read them. Yes, scatter them in your meetings. Address Chas. F. Reese, Yuma, Arizona. The postage will be prepaid.

IT IS THERE

"It seems to me that in training young people, brethren should guard against training up a generation of women for public speechmaking in the church. My book still reads, "As in all the churches of the saints let the women keep silent in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law." And it still reads the same way after all efforts to explain it away. Let the men be the public proclaimers of the word. In view of Paul's saying no right-thinking woman ought to address the public assembly of the church."

—Cled E. Wallace, F. F., May 7, 1929.

We are glad to see Brother Wallace reminding his fellow digressives of the Firm Foundation that 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, is still in the Bible "after all efforts to explain it away." This ought to make Editor Showalter and his readers "sit up and think."

Brother Wallace would be worth more to the brotherhood if he would teach this way all the time. It is a well-known fact that Brother Wallace is a Sunday School man, and that he publicly advocates women teachers in the church, after it has been organized into classes,—a practice which he admits that his Bible condemns, for he says, "My book still reads, 'As in all churches of the saints, let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection as also saith the law.'" And he says, "It still reads that way after all efforts to explain it away."

Yes, "it still reads that way." And it will never read any other way, for "Heaven and Earth shall pass away," says Jesus, "but my word shall not pass away." And it will still read that way when we meet it at the Judgment,—when all women who have violated it and all preachers who have encouraged its violation shall be cast into Hell "where there shall be weeping and nashing of teeth."

"Let the men be the public proclaimers of the word," says Brother Wallace. Yes, by all means, let the men do it. And this will eliminate women teachers in the church, and thus restore peace on this question. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" —Psa. 133:1.

"In view of Paul's saying, no right-thinking woman ought to address the public assembly of the saints." No: "for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." And there is no "assembly" of any kind that is not a "public assembly," and hence "no right thinking woman ought to address" any "assembly of the church," you see.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

THE TRUTH FUND

A sister ----- \$1.50

Note: We need funds immediately, brethren, otherwise we shall have to miss some issues after this. Send to the office, Sneads, Florida.—Editor.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00



LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

HE NEEDS CONVERSION

Of all the dispicable things connected with the church of Christ the sissy, weak-kneed, time-serving, salary-hunting "Pastor" is the worst. These spineless creatures will lead the churches on and on into digression, but they will not defend their innovations. Just read the following from one of them:

"Pray for us that we may possess the courage, faith and wisdom to do our part acceptably to the Lord. If the law is enforced in West Virginia, we will have to do one of three things. (1) Cease communion; (2) go to jail; (3) adopt the individual cups. May we all be reasonable and law-abiding.—Thaddeus S. Hutson, in the Christian Leader, 1925.

Such a person needs conversion. Is this the kind of stuff the Christian martyrs were made of under Pagan Rome? Is this the spirit of the martyrs under Papal Rome? In whose law did these martyrs abide—that of Pagan Rome? or was it in the Law of the Lord Jesus Christ? Evidently in the law of Christ, the Law of faith. And may we, too, all be reasonable and thus be law-abiding citizens of the kingdom of heaven.

"Cease communing." These "hiredlings" may do so to keep out of "jail," but not Christians. "The hiring fleeth because he is a hireling." He needs conversion to be of any service to the flock.

"Go to jail." Yes, and the Christians, not hiredlings or time-servers, went to jail. The record shows this. But you do not find these faithless "hiredlings" and time-servers ready to go to jail. That would not be popular.

"Adopt the individual cups." Who says so? The State of West Virginia, and the "weak-kneed" Hutson chimes in, "May we all be reasonable and law-abiding." Do you get it—and adopt the individual cups at the behest of the state of West Virginia? And you can see that the man who will stand with God—"obey God rather than man" (Acts 5:29; 4:19)—is "unreasonable" in the eyes of this sissy "Pastor" of the Pargersburg church of Christ. But I think that Christ, our master, would call such a "salaried Pastor" a "fool," as he did the time-server of Luke 12:16-21.

And I am sure that the state of West Virginia would not be "law-abiding" in passing and attempting to enforce such a law in a commonwealth whose "supreme law of the land"—as law

that the state of West Virginia is bound to respect—says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Why did Congress make an exception in the 18th amendment? Dare the state of West Virginia set aside this exception? Let her try it. Dare she enforce her "individual-cups" law upon the church of Christ? Let her try it.

If the state of West Virginia should prescribe the use of "water" for the "fruit of the vine," would this sissy "Pastor" use it on the communion table? Why not? He should be "reasonable and law-abiding." He certainly needs prayers. And there are others—Ira C. Moore among them, enemies of the church of Christ, who have stepped behind the screen of this God-dishonoring law to bring in an innovation they dare not defend in open discussion. "Cowards" does not express it.

We are willing to suffer death for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, but we shall wait until this country turns into a Pagan Rome or the Roman Catholic church again holds sway over the souls of men.—Ed.

THE NEW BIRTH

No. 3.

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3:5.

That part of this text indicating a birth of water can mean no more than to come out of the water. But as respects the work of the Spirit as a factor in the new birth, it evidently is the agent, cause, source, and author of our birth of water. The in "the new birth" is the factoring medium of our birth of "water and of the Spirit," while the Holy Spirit is the director and the agent by whom the blessings incident to "the new birth" are bestowed. Hence we are born of water as the means or medium and of the Holy Spirit as the author. And the new birth is incident to life or else one would most decidedly be born dead.

Now we are baptized (buried) into the death of Jesus. Rom. 6:3. And this baptism into "his death" is a burial by baptism into our own death to sin. Rom. 6:4. And thus "We are united with him in the likeness of his death." Rom. 6:5.

Surely a birth of water by being raised from the water of baptism is not the likeness of his death in which we are united with Christ. The resurrection of Jesus was an event of life and not an event of death; and as we are united with him in the likeness of his death, it is clear that our union with Christ begins by our burial with him in baptism. Jesus died that he might live again, and that we by becoming dead with him by a burial by baptism into his death might live with him. Rom. 6:8. Hence spiritual life is realized by being buried by baptism into the death of Jesus and spiritual life is exercised and enjoyed by being "born of water and of the Spirit."—G. A. Crutchfield, Alabama City, Ala.

REPORT

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., June 7, 1929.—I was with the faithful brethren at Elk City, Okla., over the fourth Lord's day in May, having gone there to attend the Cowan-Musgrave debate, but the debate was called off; however, I had a nice visit with the brethren there, and had the pleasure of visiting with Bro. Harper, which was a great treat to me, as I had not seen him for several years.

Perhaps, the readers of THE TRUTH have begun to wonder what has become of me, as my name has not appeared in its columns for several issues. It is not because I have lost interest in its advancement or the cause it espouses, but sundry duties have just pressed upon me until I have been unable to devote any time to writing. I hope to be able to write more now.

The brethren here at home have had the misfortune of having their meeting house destroyed by fire recently. There was no insurance, hence the loss was a total and severe one. There is nothing for us to do but to build, and while this will mean that we will have to make a sacrifice, we are not discouraged and have never entertained the idea of giving up. We expect to begin the building in the very near future. Donations would be appreciated, to be sure, but we do not contemplate making extended appeals for help.

CRACK SHOTS

"Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God to draw nigh, for to hear is better than to give the sacrifice of fools."—Ecc. 5:1. The sacrifice of fools, you see. Now why would it not be such a sacrifice for a man to sacrifice his milch cows to support a school (not the church of God, mind you) and sap the life out of the church, as one has said he would do to keep Littlefield College from dying. If they wish to do some real service for the people, why don't these rich people who have so much for a secular institution skin a little deeper and help some poor gospel preacher that is being knocked out of work because he preached as "it is written"? Yes, why? Verily these rich men have their reward. Why uphold a school to turn out a swarm of "Pastors" to "Take charge" and destroy the work these poor sacrificing preachers are doing? We have seen the outcome of just such College work among us, and we shall soon see the "job hunters" coming forth, the product of a College, if it does not die. May God help us to learn something by what we have suffered from just such a source. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

* * *

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons." Have not the organ folks, the S. S. folks, the cups folks, in these things been heeding

doctrines not given by our heavenly Father? I think so, for I do not find these doctrines in God's holy word. Who can find them there? Give us "chapter and verse, now."

* * *

Those who pervert the Gospel of the Son of God, do not make Christians. "The seed in the Word of God." The farmer knows that no seed, no crop of cotton. And the devil knows that no Word of God, no child of God. Luke 8:5.

Mormons and other sectarians do not sow the word of God, for they preach to sinners a perverted Gospel. Just read Gal. 1:1-10 and see where Paul places such as pervert the Gospel. And Peter said the time would come when they would do it. 2 Pet. 2:1, 2. Watch, yes, watch, brethren.—J. M. Tuttle, Cleveland, Okla.

REPORT

Since last report, I have held a meeting in East Montebello Gardens, Montebello, Calif., which resulted in two baptisms, one of whom had been a Primitive Baptist and one a Methodist.

I was with the church at Taft, Calif., over the third Lord's day in May. We had a good congregation there until Daniel Sommer went there a few years ago and divided them, as he does all other churches that won't "knock-under" to him; but his faction soon broke down and they are recovering from the effects of it.

From Taft, I went to Bakersfield and visited a day with Brother Q. O. Cargile. There is no congregation in Bakersfield, except the Sunday school folks, and they are divided. I shall, the Lord willing, hold a meeting in Sept. or Oct., hoping to establish the cause there.

From Bakersfield, I came to Fowler, Colo., where I am in a two weeks meeting. The attendance and attention are fine. Hope to do good. I was here four years ago and find the interest much better now than it was then.

From here I go home in Kansas City; and from there to Indiana for a few days. I will visit Harrodsburg and Brazil while in the state. I shall meet tried and true Christian friends at each place.

From there I shall go to Healdton, Okla., for a meeting embracing the first two weeks of July. Healdton is a good place.

From Healdton, I go to Sentinel, Okla., for a meeting to be held during the last two weeks of July. I have never been there. Hope to find a good church and have a good meeting.

From Sentinel, I go to Loco, Okla., where Bro. M. Sellers lives, for a meeting to be conducted the first two weeks in August.

From Loco I go to Elmore City, where Geo. J. Johnson lives, and where "Fighting Bob" Musgrave has preached so much. I will be there the last two weeks in August.

From Loco, I go back to Montebello, Calif., where I will make my headquarters and will do mission work in the state during the latter part of this year and all of 1930. Isolated brethren in Calif., should write me and arrange for a meeting.

I am now ready to book meetings for the year 1931.

—Jas. D. Phillips,
439 N. Drury Avenue,
Kansas City, Mo.

THE DIVINE LIMIT

In the New Testament Scriptures there are things commanded, things forbidden, and things neither commanded nor forbidden. If we do things commanded, we are the better; if we do the things forbidden we are the worse. If we do the things neither commanded nor forbidden, we are none the better; neither if we do them not, are we the worse.

To the things of this third class Paul refers when he says, "All things are lawful for me." These lawful, or allowable things which make up this class are things in which Christians have liberty—liberty to do, not being forbidden; liberty to leave undone, not being commanded. This class is made up of two sets of things—things expedient and things not expedient. Paul says: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient—only some expedient and some inexpedient—two sets or classes.

Which are expedient? Which inexpedient? Let him who can, scripturally and satisfactorily classify these. I will myself offer a few suggestions only:

1. Things necessary and profitable belong to the class of expedients.

2. Things that give "no offense, neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God," belong to this class also.

The class of inexpedients is made up:

1. Things which, when done, offend brethren.

2. Things which, when done, will lead others to do the same and sin in so doing.

3. A thing becomes a sinful expedient when it is brought in and treated as if it were an enactment of the Lord, brethren letting it have the mastery over them so that they can not, and will not, let it go even if they see that many are offended and that the church will rent asunder.

4. A thing though neither commanded nor forbidden, or in any way interferes with it, becomes and is an inexpedient.

Finally, this subject never has, as I think been as fully and thoroughly discussed through the papers as it should be. If it had been, we would understand it, and all be of one mind and of one judgment as the Lord wills we should be. J. R. Jones.

We are safe to follow the divine examples. Why should we not offer burnt offerings or dance at church? Simply because they are not commanded. One who claims to do all that is not forbidden sets God's laws at defiance. Whatsoever God com-

mands us that we may do; whatsoever is not commanded is prohibited. Whoever adds to the commands of God sins as much as one who takes from them. Whosoever shall add to or take from the Book shall have added to or taken from him the promises of the Book. Whatsoever is commanded is sealed with the blood; whatsoever is not commanded has no blood upon it. If we do what is not commanded, we go away from the blood; if we do what is commanded, we seek the blood. What is commanded is given by the Spirit. To do this is to follow the Spirit. To turn from what is commanded is to turn from the guidance of the Spirit. Obedience and disobedience to God are found in doing what God commands and rejecting what is not commanded. David Lipscomb, in Gospel Advocate, Dec. 16th, 1909.

Christians should keep their eyes open, look into the Word of God, and see whether the thing proposed is found there. If not on record, it is empty, fruitless, and void of effect for any good to the children of God—M. C. Kurfees, in G. A.

"If all should eliminate from their work and worship, those things they cannot prove are well-pleasing unto God, then the prayer Christ taught his disciples to pray would be answered, viz. 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' . . . One way is the broad, liberal-minded way; the other the narrow way,—just as narrow and just as broad as the testimony goes."—S. H. Hall in his tract, Prove All Things, one of the best tracts written.

Now, we respectfully propound to the brethren the question propounded to the Christian Standard by the Gospel Advocate seven years ago, namely: "What shall be done when part of the brethren at a given place put into the worship some practice—for instance, the use of instrumental music (Yes, brethren or anything else upon which the Bible is silent.)—where the rest of the brethren must either withdraw from such worship or do what they believe to be wrong? Would the Christian Standard advise such brethren to join in such worship or withdraw from it? If the former, please explain on what biblical principle you give such advice. If the latter, please explain how division in such case can be avoided." Let each answer in view of the judgment. Ponder well! "Hast thou faith, have it to thyself before God" (Rom. 14:24). Does this mean anything to you? If so, what? Read the whole chapter. —Ed.

SCRIPTURAL LESSON ON DIVISION

"Mark them which cause division and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them."

The above scripture with many other are often used by satan to suppress the truth presented by humble followers of Christ. Many a minister of satan lifts up unholy hands in pretentious horror at the very mention of division, but he who has sat at the feet of Jesus and the apostles and has been taught by them knows that "It must needs be that offenses come, but woe unto that man by

whom the offense cometh" (Matt. 18:7). "There must be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" (1 Cor. 11:19).

How could Paul have known that those brethren at Corinth needed the grand lesson he gave them concerning the communion if they had not had the courage of their convictions and boldly took their stand against each other, some taking their stand for Paul, some for Apollos, some for Cephas and others for Christ? (1 Cor. 1:12).

How could any one have told a few hours before they divided and took their several positions but what that was a 'loyal' congregation? Yet at heart, and in God's sight, they were as much divided as they were after they had taken their respective positions. Some people seem to think that God does not consider a congregation divided until a physical separation takes place, but the apostle John gives us to understand that as soon as one part of a congregation ceases to "walk in the light," that fellowship between that part and the part that still walks in the light ceases (1 Jno. 1:7), and Paul says, "Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord" (2 Cor. 6:17). A physical separation should take place or the whole lump will become "leavened" (1 Cor. 5:6). Now it seems to me that if Paul had been in sympathy with the popular idea of today concerning division that here at Corinth would have been a good place to have shown it. Why didn't he say to those who were "for Christ" that if they continued to exalt Christ above Paul and Apollos and Cephas they would cause division? However, what he did say shows that he was not in sympathy with the "peace at any cost," movement, but, to the contrary, instructs them as follows: "For there must also be heresies (sects among you (why?)) that they which are approved may be made manifest" (1 Cor. 11:19). Undoubtedly, the ones who were for Christ were the ones who were right; but who could have known that had they not made a physical separation?

Had they not made a physical separation, then those who were "for Christ" would have been looked upon as being "partakers of other men's sins" (1 Tim. 5:22); their influence for good would have been destroyed.

But at this point I recall a conversation I heard between a preacher and a sister, (she being one of those back-bone-less creatures who are always looking for "concord between Christ and belial") on certain points of difference between members of the church, she said: "I don't believe in those hair-splitting differences," whereupon the preacher replied: "I verily believe that if one side of the hair is wrong and the other right, that it should be split."

Division is right for those who are right but, of course, wrong for those who are wrong, therefore the apostle said, "Mark them which cause division and offense contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them."

Those who are contrary to the doctrine are the ones responsible for the division and not the ones

who are in favor of it.

Who were responsible for the division mentioned in 1 Cor. 1:12? Surely not those who were for Christ? There are thousands of brethren who throw up their hands in holy (?) horror at the divisions, and in such cases I am reminded of a congregation mentioned in Genesis 11:1,8.—This congregation was all of one speech, and one in their work, were all working together to get to heaven—working together in unity (verse 4), but they had introduced an innovation, and there was only one individual opposed to it, God himself. "And the Lord said: Behold the people is one, and they have all one language." "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of the earth" (verse 8); and I am persuaded that if certain brethren had been there that the pitiful wail that so often floats upon the religious breeze would have gone up: "He is a church divider," "hobbyist," "specialist." "He ignores the authority of our elders," etc.

But again, I look at Exodus 32:26, 28 and hear Moses say: "Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me." But if some of those brethren who are seeking a "happy medium" between truth and error had been there they would have said, "Hold on there, Brother Moses, if you propose such a thing as that you will be sure to cause division and now, Brother Moses, let us follow after the things which make for peace, so we will come half way and you come the other half and we can occupy neutral ground and thus avoid division." Finally, I hear Matthew saying: "And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats, and he shall set the sheep on his right hand but the goats on the left" (Matt. 25:32, 33). And I am wondering if those "peace-loving brethren will say, "Wait a minute Jesus, if you keep on like that you are going to cause division in the congregation." Dear reader, let us turn to Luke 12:51 and we will hear Jesus say: Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you Nay; but rather division. How did Christ cause division? By teaching the truth (Jno. 7:38, 43).

He taught only the words of his father, yet he said he came to give division, and if it was right for Jesus to come into a sinful world and cause division, by telling them God's word, would it not be right for us to go into a sinful congregation and tell them the same word, even if it does cause division? We are not told to "mark them which cause division" in harmony with the doctrine of Christ, but that which is contrary to it.

Let us teach the truth at all times, and leave results with God. —Sel.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE

I can't persuade myself to be with you and Dr. Trott on the one cup, knowing that there were over a thousand cups used last Lord's day. Now if you say one cup for each church then you must find the Scripture that says one cup for each church, which you nor I can find; and if I should say two or more cups I nor you can't find the

Scripture for the use of two or more. So then we find there were hundreds of cups used last Lord's day and the Lord never blessed a single one of them; but he did bless the contents.

Now the Lord prepared his table with food and drink that can't be divided. If you have just one small piece of unleavened bread, you have got bread. If you had all of the unleavened bread, you would just have bread. Just so with the fruit of the vine. If you have only one cup of wine, you have wine, and if you have a thousand cups of wine, you would have only wine as long as it was the fruit of the vine. To have wines you would have to have two kinds of wine. I would like to know how a man would go about dividing the wine. My dear brother, I have to think that you in Florida and I in Indiana both eat of that one bread and both drink of that one wine; but not out of the same cup. So we see that it was the wine that he gave thanks for and not the cup. We do not know what became of that cup, but we do know that we still have wine. And we do know that the Lord's blessing still is with his table as long as we keep his commandments.

Now, do not misjudge me. I do not believe in the "individual cups" as they were brought into the church for style; but mostly, too, because some thought themselves too good to drink out of the cup with common people.

I preached at Unionville, Ind., the first Lord's day this month, May 5th, and they have about 150 members. They use two cups. Are you going to condemn them simply because they use two cups in such a large membership? This is one among the best and most loyal churches in this state. Now while they used two cups, they only had one wine and one bread. And now, my dear brother, we must remember that there were only twelve men to drink of that one cup which the Lord blessed. And you nor I can't tell how many cups he would have used if there were 150 instead of twelve to partake. So then it was the contents and not the cup that the Lord blessed, and I am glad to know that you and I both eat the same bread and drink the same fruit of the vine, and that we could do so out of two different cups.

O brother, don't you see that the wine and not the cup that was the Lord's shed blood. If I am wrong, show me. I know nothing only what I have learned. So hoping you will read and answer this in the same spirit in which I have written, I wait for your reply. —W. M. Pickler.

Reply

Yes, if you should use cups, no one could find your practice in the Bible. The Lord prepared his table with "the loaf" and "the cup," and that is one loaf and one cup for each church as Paul set it forth for the Church at Corinth. And there were thousands of loaves as well as thousands of cups since there were soon thousands of congregations. But this is not to argue that there were thousands of cups, or even two, in one church any more than there were thousands of loaves, or even two, in one church. And the Lord did not bless a single loaf nor did he bless a single cup. The Lord gave thanks for the loaf at his table and he

gave thanks for the cup—yes, "cup," brother. And Paul received it from the Lord. He says, "The cup of blessing which we bless." And you can not dispense with the cup or substitute a bottle or pitcher and do this.

"Wines" means different kinds of wine, just as fishes means kinds of fish. If you have wine in two cups, it is wine provided there is not one kind of wine in each cup, otherwise you have wines.

"Container and contained." By the figure metonymy we can present the contents of a cup to the mind by naming the cup. "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that easily suggests it." This makes it possible to present the wine in a cup to the mind by naming the vessel (cup in this case) that contains it. Cup is not the name of the liquid in it, it is the name of the vessel that holds the liquid. Both contents and container are involved.

"Divide," or "share" as more translators have it, involves no absurdity. Jesus took a cup, and the context shows that it had wine in it. He said, "Drink ye all out of it," Matt. 26:27; and "They all drank out of it," Mk. 14:23. "Implying," as Waymouth in Modern Speech Tr. says, "that all drank from the same cup, as is done at civic banquets." And I may add as Masons do in their Lodge. But the church—well, they do any old way and then try to find some excuse for it. But since the Lord's blessing is with his table only when we do his commandments, there can be no blessing from the Lord.

We do not have the cup that Christ used. True; neither do we have the wine that he used. And neither do I in Florida eat the same bread nor drink the same fruit of the vine that you do in Indiana. I challenge you to a demonstration.

"They have one wine." What of it? The Son of God said, "This cup (yes, CUP) is the New Testament in my blood" and Paul says, "The cup of blessing which we bless." So if it is just "wine" they lack that much; and if it is CUPS it is adding that much. And I am not going to "lie against the truth" to mislead any church. I love them too much.

"Individual cups"—ah, me; you do not like them. Listen; you can not put out the fiddle and keep the organ unless you do it by creed or Pope. Neither can you put out the individual cups and keep two cups without a creed or a pope. Who is pope in the church of Christ to tell me that a church may have two cups and may not have individual cups? Yes, who?—Ed.

"When You Need
PRINTING
 You Need Us"
 Phone 917
LAYCOOK PRINTING Co.
 Church & College Jackson, Tenn.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, AUGUST 1, 1929

No. 15

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

No other institution among men is so harmonious in its workings as is the church established by Christ through his apostles. Remember, though, it is the church as constituted by Christ that works in its mission without friction. But when tampered with by man, it is the most discordant institution in the world. As constituted by Christ, every member in the organism acts in implicit obedience to the Head, Christ, and there is no schism (division) in the body. The Head governs all things. "The church is subject unto Christ." (Eph. 5:24) And as every Christian is a member of the church, all his work will be determined by that relationship. He will work in the world without being of the world. (John 17:14).

There is no warrant in the divinely inspired writings for saying that a Christian should join the church. It would be no more absurd to say that the head of the body should join the body, or that the feet should "join" the head. According to God's word, it takes the head, Christ, and every member to constitute the body. (I Cor. 12:12-28) We are baptized into one body" (I Cor. 12:13) and this body is "the church" (Col. 1:24.) Hence we honor Christ, the Head, when we work in the body, his church. Hence wherever the faithful Christian goes the church is worthily represented and exalted among men, a light, indeed, that may be seen of men. One's membership in this body, according to the gospel teaching, is not a matter to be determined by himself; it is not a matter of human taste and convenience. "God set the members, each one of them in the body" (I Cor. 12) and wherever that member is, he will devote himself to the Master's cause, "always abounding in the work of the Lord." (I Cor. 15:58).

NOTICE

At the Louisville and Nashville station in New Orleans as I was coming through on my way home my typewriter, together with the copy of the paper for July 15, and all my latest letters were stolen. I got the typewriter to prepare copy for the paper while out evangelizing, and had used it but a little more than three months.—Ed.

RIGHTEOUS CAUSE

4923 Phillips St., Dallas Texas,
June 28, 1929.

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Fla.

Dear Brother Harper:—I am inclosing check for \$3.00. Please enter my subscription to "The Truth," beginning June 1st if you have copy of that date, and send samples of July 1st. I have allowed my subscription to expire purposely both to "The Truth" and to "The Way," for there has been so much contention in the brotherhood that it seemed to support a paper was to support that contention, or rather the cause of the contention; but recent developments have caused me to conclude that yours is a more righteous cause. Therefore for a time I will study and await further developments, for I would like very much to support a paper that I felt at liberty to appear in its columns. I have talked with Bro. Tidwell and we are of the same judgment in the matter.

Bro. Tidwell says that "The Truth" is creating quite an interest in the East and is growing in favor because of the straight-forwardness of your contention for principles of truth without exalting yourself or magnifying your sacrifices overmuch. If this policy continues, we feel that we can be supporters of the paper and glad to express ourselves through its columns. Yours in the vineyard, C. A. Stark.

Remarks

We are glad to have your support, Brother Stark, and we want you to write and give our readers some of those good lessons you are giving to the church in Dallas. Help us to awaken the brethren everywhere to righteousness. We need your help, brother, and that of Brother Tidwell, as well. We do not intend to magnify any man. We desire to magnify the Lord and his church.

FACULTY OF LITTLEFIELD COLLEGE

Due to the fact that the board passed a resolution to the effect that the school is not opposed to intercollegiate athletics in moderation and that such would be introduced as soon as material could be prepared, and due to the additional fact that the teachers because of their admiration of the principles of the college during its history of twenty-six years and their aversion to the evils which they thought would necessarily follow, the entire faculty has resigned. My duties in the school will end as soon as the terms of the accepted resignation are complied with. Brother

R. F. Duckworth has been selected as my successor. It is my wish that he may do better with the institution than I can really hope. Although I do not wish any evil to the school, yet I shall not in any way be responsible for its successes or failures.

—Jno. R. Freeman, Pres.

* * *

I do not think anyone felt more keenly the situation than did I. My conception of the board's action or decision was a change of policy, and not one of principle. The welfare of the school seemed to demand this change. I argued to the very last that if possible some way be found for meeting the needs and complying with the conditions which involved the finances of the institution and the making of such concessions as would keep Brother Freeman, Brother Conner, in their respective relations to the school without jeopardizing the school's financial success.

I earnestly and honestly insisted from the very first that I did not desire any connection with the school officially, simply wanted to be one of its well-wishers. I felt that Brother Freeman and others could without sacrificing principle, continue their relation with the school even after the board's action, but they thought otherwise. I do not condemn them for their decision, but earnestly wish they had not decided as they did. I felt the teachers could have said, "We believe the board is wrong but since it is the responsible head of this institution, we will consent to continue with the school for at least two years, and if their plan works, we will be delighted; otherwise, we cannot continue with the school longer." It was the conviction of the board that the plan would work, and I concur in their decision and confidently hope that during the next two years we will be able to demonstrate that the board's plan has added to the effectiveness and efficiency of the school without in any way interfering with the Christian influences and high standards thrown about the children. Then, I would be glad if members of the old faculty would make application for positions as teachers in the school, there is no personal feeling with me against them.

Usually a man would feel some degree at least of elation at having been elected to such a post, but my feeling is the very opposite. No, I have no doubts as to my ability to fill the position, call it egotism if you will, but with me, it is a matter of confidence in my ability to measure up to the needs and demands of the position, but I had no desire for it. Again, I say, I preferred to be just a well-wisher, working in the ranks, and only accepted the position because the circumstances seemed to so place duty's call. I shall, with brotherly consideration and sound business judgment endeavor to eliminate all differences, in an endeavor to secure for the school, its patrons, and well-wishers, the very best possible service and efficiency.

The great purpose, as I see it, is to give our children a secular education that will broaden their minds, develop their characters, fit them for

the duties, responsibilities, opportunities and conflicts of life without planting into their minds certain principles, ideas and courses of reasoning which within themselves cloud their minds and dim their ability to see, to understand and accept the teachings of the Word of God. The school is in no sense a religious institution, but a secular institution; one in which a man may work, teach and run a farm, a store, or direct any other business. A preacher may teach in this school without making the school a religious institution, and without allowing the school to dominate, control, or improperly influence his religious activity.

I feel that I could run The Apostolic Way and a farm without making the farm a religious farm or institution. I could run a store without making the store a religious store or institution. I felt; still feel, that as publisher of The Apostolic Way I could be the executive head of a printing plant established for general printing or secular work without making the printing plant a religious institution, and I accept the position as the president of the Littlefield College with these convictions well developed in my mind. The fact that I am the publisher of The Apostolic Way does not necessitate my making the college a religious institution. The paper is a religious periodical; the school is a secular institution. I shall not allow the one to dominate the other, nor will I knowingly allow either to interfere with my duty and responsibility to the other. I shall, however, turn over the details of the work of The Apostolic Way into the hands of others who will have the general management and direction of the work; while I act as advisor and counsellor to those responsible for continuing the publication of the paper.

R. F. DUCKWORTH.

CAMP MEETING CLOSED

Bros. J. Ira Grantham of Kempner, Texas and Jas. T. White, Lomet, Tex., closed a camp meeting at Six-mile Crossing west of Junction, Tex., June 16th after running through three Sundays. Much good was done in the name of our Lord and I can truthfully say that these two Brothers preached the word as it is written.

It is wonderful to sit and listen to a preacher that will preach just that which he can read. We are looking forward to another camp meeting at this place in 1930 beginning the last Lord's Day in June and going over two Lord's Days in July.

Everybody is invited, especially ministers of the Gospel. Plan your vacation for that time and come and camp with us. The six-mile crossing is a fine place to camp, good fishing water and plenty of shade. Do not forget the date and come.—Herman M. Stewart, Menard, Texas.

TRUTH FUND

Elder C. A. Stark	-----	\$2.00
J. Y. Morgan	-----	2.00
R. H. Peel	-----	2.00

APPEAL FOR COUNSEL

The readers of "The Truth" have had time to thoroughly consider my article in the June the first issue. Some have written me and I am sure others intended to but have neglected it and may be have forgotten it by this time.

I am anxious to hear from preachers and elders. Look up your paper and read the article again and write me. You will note that I am not calling for a legislative council; but for preachers, and others as well, to get together and reason together with the only purpose in view to learn the truth or to get an understanding of the scriptural teaching on things wherein there is trouble and division. I am glad to know there are a goodly number of preachers that are willing to submit to the Lord's plan of reasoning and unity.

There are many things I would like to say; but I want all to think for themselves and express their sentiments. We cannot expect the first meeting to be largely attended for many reasons or rather excuses, in most cases: but we do expect those attending to get an understanding of a few things and weld together the broken links of real friendship, love, confidence and Christian fellowship. Which we hope will cause more and stronger efforts for peace and unity. We are together just as far as we are agreed and we are agreed just as far as we understand unless we be deceivers. More later.

—Geo. M. McFadden,
Arkoma, Okla.

NEW MEXICO NOTES

I want to say to the readers of our solid little paper, "The Truth," that I attended every minute of debate at Roswell, conducted by our Editor and Bro. Alva Johnson, of Turkey, Texas, on the cups question. Bro. Johnson is rather noisy and a little sarcastic and fussy at times. Bro. Harper certainly conducted himself in a truly Christian manner, with an earnestness that made manifest to all that he was searching for the truth and that he wanted to please God in everything. The debate certainly did us much good for the Bible way, to speak where the Bible speaks.

Bro. Johnson talked constantly about the question being a silly and an untaught one. But it is a Bible question, for the Bible speaks on it, and it cannot be silly to study what we should do to please God. The CUPS in this institution as Johnson admitted were from man, and he placed the option of their use with the Elders or the leaders of the congregation, and this led him to

admit the use of Individual Cups, which have already divided two churches in the Pacos valley, on the same ground that they use "two or more," namely, the say-so of the Elders. Brethren of the church of Christ, where are we drifting? Surely away from the Bible, a "Thus saith the Lord" for what we do. Just like the organ and the S. S. advocates, Johnson wanted to press this cups innovation to the division of the church of God, but he wanted those who stand for the Bible way to "keep silent" and let digression have full sway, just as the organ and S. S. advocates have told us, trying to make it appear that those who stand for a "Thus saith the Lord" are the disturbers of Zion. May God wake us up, brethren, to give no quarter while we fight this hydra of Satan that is seeking to destroy the people of God. Awake, awake! We would as well go to the organ, the Sunday School, or any other digressive set to worship as to go with those that pervert this institution, and better too, for this enters into the very life of the church—there is no N. T. worship if we fail in this. I would much rather attempt to worship God with the organ or the Sunday School digressives. You can plainly see now that they intend to press this innovation upon the churches through the Elders or leaders. There is no Bible for it, and if it goes in, it must be through man; but when it does "all shall perish with the using." Col. 2:21, 22.—Turn on the light. T. F. Thomasson, Artesia, N. M.

PLEASE READ THIS

By Jas. D. Phillips

Brethren, "THE TRUTH" has never been supported by the brotherhood as it should be. It is the only publication that stands up for the "Bible way" on every teaching and practice of the church. If it should die the church would soon be led completely into digression, and we would have to meet and answer for it in the day of judgment. The Sunday School and cups brethren are doing all in their power to get their teachings before the people. And this proves the truthfulness of the Scripture—"The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." Let us get busy and support "THE TRUTH." Send Brother Harper a check today—and don't neglect it.

MEETINGS

I am now located at Stockdale, Texas, my old home, and I hope to build up the cause of the Lord here as God gives me strength and ability. My meeting at Alma is to begin the 6th of July. I have time for a meeting the last two weeks in July and for one the last half of September. Please write me at Stockdale, Texas.—Brotherly, D. J. Whitten.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

The editor is now in a good meeting at Elk City, Okla., where the Cowan-Musgrave debate failed on account of the objections to it which were filed by the Cups brethren. And at the last moment Cowan refused to meet me in Ringling, near Healdton, Oklahoma, where I had secured the large community Tabernacle for the debate, unless the Cups brethren there would consent. And Geo. W. Phillips, with Fish and Stewart who were leaders there, and some from a distance got busy, and let us know that they were opposed to the debate. On the word of a brother, we then announced it for Wilson, near Ringling, but the next morning the brother phoned that he could not get a place. So I went home, having nothing more to do. If Cowan wanted to debate with me, he had the chance. This he turned down. You may call it back out, slip out, or what you please. I want the truth, and if Cowan or any other man has it on this issue, and I have it not, he is my best friend if he meets me and whips me to a frazzle. Why not? This getting behind the church and debating if they support you to the tune of \$100, \$150, or \$200, may suit the time-server. Few such would turn down a whipping for that sum. And they would debate as long as "the church would put them up." Even Tucker said he would engage Harper again for \$100.00. Some people may want the truth, but if they do, they have a poor way of letting it be known.

There was no issue of the paper for July 15. By the time funds were in, it was too late to get copy to the printer.

A few have put in complaints about not getting their paper. The mailing is double checked at the office, and if you do not get your paper, do not fail to give us notice. We will then notify the P. O. Dept.

We left home last March, going through Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and over into Oklahoma. The churches in the East are struggling over the Individual Cups, the Christian Leader, which at first fought them, now taking the lead in introducing them to the division

of the church. Some churches are still using "two or more cups," and struggling to keep out the Individual Cups. All admit that a church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and use one drinking cup in the Communion service. But all are not striving for unity any more, but each for his own way. Why not be satisfied with a practice that enables us to maintain our cherished motto, a motto that made sectarianism tremble, that made Catholicism wilt, and that made infidelity hunt its dark corner again,—and enables us to "keep the unity of the Spirit? Yes, dear brethren, why not? This question will be settled in the judgment. Why not get on the right side of it now?

I love thy church, O God, her walls before thee stand,

Dear as the apple of thine eye, and graven on thy hand.

For her my tears shall fall, for her my prayers ascend;

To her my cares and toils be giv'n till toils and cares shall end.

Beyond my highest joy I prize her heav'nly ways
Her sweet communion, solemn vows, her hymns
of love and praise.

EDITORIAL

"An Heretic"

"I am fully convinced that when a brother takes the position that Christ or Paul referred to the container when they said cup, is a heretic, because he does not believe the definition given by them of the word cup. 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood.' (Paul) 'For this (cup) is my blood of the New Testament.' (Christ) I believe these definitions. The man who adds the container to these definitions, or makes the container a part of the cup, does violence to the word of God, adds more than the Devil added in the Garden, is an heretic, and after the first and second admonition should be rejected."—J. N. Cowan.

Remarks

Any man who has sense enough to write on this subject for the consideration of brethren, should have sense enough to know that neither Paul nor Christ has given the definition of the word cup. If Brother Cowan can give us the essentials of a definition of a word, he can refute his own nonsense here. Thayer, the Standard lexicographer for New Testament Greek, defines the word here translated cup. The Greek word is POTERION, and Thayer defines it "a cup, a drinking vessel." And the man who tries to add

anything else to this definition is an ignoramus, to ignorant to merit the attention of those who want the truth. We have no objection to the supplying of the word "cup" after "this" in the language of Christ. If this is done, it is evident that "cup" is used by metonymy, which includes "Container and the thing contained." — Comp., and Rhetoric by Williams, p. 220. That is, the "container," ("cup" in this case) is named to suggest to the mind the "contents" of the cup. What is a metonymy? "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else ("cup" in this case—H. C. H.) that readily suggests it."—Ibid. So Paul and Christ not only referred to the "container" if you supply "cup," but they named it, saying "cup."

Again: "Musgrave, Harper or whoever debates this question with me, must give me their definition of 'the cup' so that I can write it on the black board with their name signed to it. Then all I will have to do is to read the words of Christ and apply their definition. Five or ten minutes would be enough time for me to reply to their thirty minutes speech."—J. N. Cowan.

All Musgrave, or Harper, or "whoever debates this question" with you if they can catch you, will need to do, is to give the definition and sign the name of J. H. Thayer to it, and you are done for. Two or three minutes will do for this, and you will never recover from it unless J. N. Cowan is bigger than J. H. Thayer. Now try it. We have told you all along that this paper is open for the discussion, but you play the smart one by keeping your safe distance. If you can do so much, why not close in. We are ready to assist to "help me fight it out." Call on some one that is really able to help you in the fight, and not a tyro on whom you try to saddle your nonsense. We will give you word for word, column for column in "the fight." Now come out into the open and get into "the fight" like a man.

Again: "If the Bible said one container, as it does one body, one faith, immersion, etc., I would not say more."—J. N. Cowan.

All right. Now come to the open, and let us examine what the Bible does say. We'll meet you in a "Fair field and no favors," and nothing but cowardice can keep a champion fighter from such a field. We are ready. The Bible says BAPTIZO, and Thayer says this means, yes, MEANS, "immerse." The Bible says POTERION, and Thayer says this means, yes, MEANS, "a cup, a drinking vessel." So it is useless for you to "say more."

Again: "I will not ask for the chapter and

verse for one cup only, but for one container only. See?"

Yes, we see. And we will ask where POTE-RION, the word translated "cup," means anything but "a cup, a drinking vessel." And will you furnish the chapter and verse and a standard authority for your definition? See?

You admit that—A church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and use one drinking cup in the Communion service. And you have not dared thus far to insert "cups" instead of "cup" in this proposition and affirm it with us. We know that one cup was used, and that "a cup, a drinking vessel," too; and it is up to you to find the passage where more than one was used. Here the onus is yours, not ours. And you cannot do it to save your life.

Again: "Brother, the time is ripe to discuss this question; there is no evading it longer, because the one container contenders are forcing their position on the churches everywhere they can, and sowing seeds of discord, and their mouths must be stopped." —J. N. Cowan.

Then get in and stop their mouths, but do it with the word of truth, and not by refusing them a chance to defend what they teach, as the organ and the S. S. cowards have done, and as has been done by the cups advocates in places I can name. And this is the policy you now advocate if we get the meaning of your "an heretic," and "first and second admonition."

"Seeds of discord." Thou art the man. What more can a church of Christ have and please God than to "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent?" This is the thing we plead for in the "unity of the Spirit." Are churches that use "Individual Cups," in this practice such as "Speak where the Bible speaks and silent where the Bible is silent"? It cannot be if "The Individual Cups are deceptive and divisive," as you have signed to affirm. I say we hold the only ground of unity on the Bible. Have you something better to offer us? If so, what is it?

ANNOUNCEMENT

I am now preaching in West Virginia and shall busy all the time if the Lord gives me strength. I shall be glad to arrange meetings for 1930 if brethren will write me at my home address.—W. H. Purlee, Pekin, Ind.

P. S. I have worked with Bro. Harper in Indiana, and churches can ask him as to my stand. I want to read my faith and practice in the Bible. Purlee.

DISCUSSION AT ROSWELL, N. M.

Johnson affirmed for three sessions that "It is Scriptural to divide the cup into as many containers as are needed to wait on the audience." And I affirmed for three sessions that "The Scriptures teach that it takes both the cup and the contents of the cup to constitute "the cup of the Lord," I Cor. 10:21; 11:27."

Brother Trott says he is ready to join the Sunday School ranks when it is proved that the cup can be divided into cups and still be the cup, and I am ready to join the ranks of the organ advocates if Johnson is right, for all the Scripture that he produced was what they have for the organ—liberty, expediency, and "God shall supply all your needs," together with "Let all things be done decently and in order," and "set in order the things that are wanting."

And his "therefore" for the use of cups was: we want them; we need them for sanitary use. Yes, "two or more" and "the Individual Cups if we need them."

He held the meeting, beginning June 10, for the 5th Street church that had put in the Individual Cups and driven out those who would not "knock under to the Elders" and partake with them, and the debate began on the 17. When Cowan was in Roswell, he stood out against the Individual Cups, and offered to affirm this: Resolved, That the Individual Cups are deceptive and divisive. But 5th Street would not put up a man.

I put this question to Johnson: "Will you deny the proposition That the individual cups are deceptive and divisive?" He wrote: "Couldn't say. It might be true of places and untrue of others." (I then suggested that Johnson meet Cowan at 5th Street church on the proposition.)

Again I put this to J.: "Do you oppose the use of the Individual Cups?" He wrote: "Not if needed." And of course he had Scripture for them, for his "God shall supply all your needs," Phil. 4:19, would cover all the Elders say is needed, but why leave out the S. S. and the organ? and J. could not tell us.

At the conclusion of the debate the Elder of the 5th Street church, who had moderated for Johnson, arose and said that they fully indorsed Johnson's defense, and that they had employed him for another meeting next year, and the Hagerman church that had shortly before put in the Individual Cups and divided the church, invited Johnson to come and preach for them.

J. began by putting on the board—Things Commanded—Things Neither Commanded Nor Forbidden—Things Forbidden, and then put his cups under the second. I asked him: "Did the apostles divide the cup into containers to wait on the audience when Jesus commanded, "Take this and divide it among yourselves?" He wrote: "No audience there, only the apostles. Bible don't say how they divided it." Reply was—Then you have no Bible proof that they divided it into containers, and your proposition rests wholly on presumption. The Bible shows there was an audience, and it shows there was one cup. "He took a cup."

I asked: "In a church where some want one cup, and some want two, and some want individual cups, what should be done? He wrote: Let the Elders or leaders decide it.

I asked: "If the Elders have authority to say how many cups shall be used, can they not put in individual cups?" He wrote: "If you mean Lord's cup, no. If you mean containers to pass it, yes."

I asked: "If a brother is condemned if he partakes in violation of his conscience and is condemned if he does not eat the Lord's supper, how can he do his duty and be saved?" He wrote: "Educate his conscience. "Reply: Paul and J. differ, Rom. 14:23. J. is wrong.

I asked: "Is it a sin to divide a church over a thing that can be laid aside without violating the Scriptures" He wrote: "It is a sin to divide a church over a thing neither commanded nor forbidden." Reply; Then since the use of containers is neither commanded nor forbidden, as he says they are, it is a sin to divide a church over them. And those who will not lay them aside for unity, will be condemned.

Johnson insisted that I affirm something, and he stated two or three negative propositions for me to affirm. I said I will affirm: That a church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and use one drinking cup in the communion service. He said, "I do not deny your practice, but you teach that the cup is the container." I said I will affirm that—The Scriptures teach that it takes both the cup and the contents of the cup to constitute "the cup of the Lord," I Cor. 10:21; 11:27. He denied this.

I laid down this syllogism:

1. The Scriptures teach that "the cup of the Lord," I Cor. 10:21; 11:27, is a metonymy.
2. It takes both the cup and the contents of the cup to constitute a metonymy.
3. Therefore The Scriptures teach that it takes both the cup and the contents of the cup to constitute "the cup of the Lord."

In proof of the major (1) premise, I showed that the Scriptures say "drink the cup of the Lord," and they thus teach that the use of "cup" here is a metonymy, for "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220. Hence, "cup," the container, is here named to suggest to the mind the contents to be drunk. And if the contents are named, no metonymy exists.

In proof of the minor premise (2), I gave the same author, who says in treating this kind of metonymy (There are ten chief kinds that he treats) under 3, "Container and the thing contained." Here "and" connects co-ordinate elements, and no metonymy can exist without both "Container and the thing contained." No man can use a liquid apart from a "container" by metonymy; and no man can use a container, a cup, for example apart from "contents" by metonymy. And the conclusion cannot be refuted.

Johnson made a splurge or two at the minor premise, but fell flat.

We had a stenographer employed to take the debate, but on account of sickness was not able to attend but first three sessions. If the brethren will send in funds to get this, we shall be glad to run it in the paper so all can read it. What do you say, brethren? Let us know, please. —Ed.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

By E. A. Lowry

I have written on this subject time and again, and preached it from the stand, but there are those who will not take it as it reads though common sense, logic and all the host of heaven combine to teach them the truth.

Men are prone to seek the broad road as the sparks fly upward. Will Bro. Harper be so kind as to let me write this one more article on this most important and sacred subject?

Other papers have grown weary, their editors cross, the publishers tired of bringing this important subject to the front, because we are so earnestly trying to get them back from the paths of sin to the highway of holiness.

Four very important witnesses have testified as to the way Jesus proceeded when he gave this memorial, and they have all agreed in every particular, yet such giant minds as Hutson, Moore, Allen, and a host of others either can't comprehend this unity, or are determined to establish a 20th century plan of their own, and bind it upon the church for future practice.

It is through "The Truth" that I appeal especially to all such to call a halt, look behind them and see how far they are from God. It looks to me as though these people could read what Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul say on this subject, compare it with their practice, and see they are not following the teaching. If they can't they will like Sam Jones' man in the Judgment, they will be "let in at the side door."

Now please brethren, let us enter into the discussion of this subject in the love of God's promises, and the fear of His wrath.

It is called the Lord's Supper, first because the Lord established it; Matt. 26:20-26. Second, because Paul guided by the Holy Spirit, called it the Lord's Supper. 1 Cor. 11:20.

When eaten? On the eve of Christ's betrayal. Matt. 26:20; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:23.

What was the substance of it? Unleavened bread taken from the Passover table; Unfermented grape juice taken from the same source. Bre-

thren commit a great sin trying to make fermented wine represent the pure, fresh shed blood of our dear redeemer on the cross. God have mercy on them, for they know not what an insult they offer Him.

Was Christ's body broken? Ex. 12:46, Num. 9:12, "Not a bone of it shall be broken." "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his bones, . For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken." John 19:33, 36. "They looked on him whom they had pierced "Zech. 12:10. "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them shall be broken." Ps. 34:20. You cannot break a person's body without breaking his bones. So brethren please quit using those ignorant expressions simply because our daddies did, especially if they are untrue and sinful.

Preparation: This especially to the sisters, for the bread is generally prepared by them. Be sure to prepare it so that attention will not be called to the making when it is being used. It should not be tough, nor too brittle. Here is an excellent recipe: Use sweet, rich cream; or not having that, use fresh butter, water and flour, with a little salt. And remember, it is not bread until baked. No dried dough please.

The Inspired Four say that Jesus "Took bread, and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave to them saying, take eat, this is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me." No one will deny we suppose that this bread was a type of his body which would be given on the cross.

The four Witnesses also agree that, "Jesus took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them and they all drank of it."

He said in another place, This is my blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins." Yes, the blood is the life, Ex. 12:23; Lev. 17:14, therefore Jesus not only gave his body, but his life also for all souls lost in Adam, who will be saved by him.

Then as the one bread is the one body, so the one cup is the one life. Of this there can be no controversy. Any person or people who can see individual cups (lives) there, can see individual loaves (bodies) in the bread.

About 20, or may be 25 years ago a few ungodly men or perhaps women, conceived the idea (satan being its daddy), that if all christians drink from the same cup, some one is liable to get microbes from some one else and die before his time. So the least thing in the world, started this racket, while the devil who has been hunting a place to

drive his wedge, found a little microbe, inoculated a few ungodly ones and the "lump is almost leavened. Now he (Satan) laughs and says, "What fools these mortals be."
Dayton, Tenn., Route 5.

HOW ABOUT IT?

"As the Lord has not limited us to just one method of teaching, let none go to making laws for the Lord and legislate that all congregations must form no more than one group for Bible instruction. Neither let any one legislate the law that each congregation, in order to be right with God, must join more than one group. Let it be a matter for the better judgment of the elders to decide.—Ira C. Moore, Christian Leader.

Comment

But the Lord has already legislated on organization; and when you "organize classes," you have a separate organization from that which God has legislated. The organizing of the church into classes is not "a method of teaching." Yes,—we can be "right with God" without organizing into more than one group. Hence, organizing, or not organizing, is not a "matter for the better judgment of the elders to decide." God has legislated on organization, and you have no liberty to go beyond the word of God. 1 Cor. 4:6; 2 John, 9.

In the Leader, issue May 7, 1929, Moore says, My criticism of them (the brethren at Pursley, W. Va., I. B. K.) is that it appears that they are not doing enough to get their young people out in time for the profitable study on Lord's day mornings, and too many—members and all—drop down too near the rear of the house and are too badly scattered to be taught profitably. These are defects that can be easily remedied.

How will you go about it to "remedy the defects" you mention? Organize a Sunday school? Would you legislate the law, that the congregation at Pursley, W. Va. must form (organize) classes in order to be right with God? You say, "Let it be a matter for the better judgment of the elders to decide."

Why not let the New Testament decide the matter for the whole church, elders and all? Why not conduct the meetings of the church as the New Testament directs? Such meetings conducted as the New Testament directs will develop Christians and more and more of them will be able to teach and exhort.

Moreover it will "remedy the defects" you mention; without offending good brethren. There are some good brethren (late to meeting) who are conscientiously opposed to your "human organization." They have read the Bible enough to know that Christ, and not the elders, is the head of the church.

Now if the church at Pursley, will eliminate from their work and worship, those things which they cannot prove are well pleasing to God; and take the Bible and the Bible alone for their only rule of faith and practice;—it will be a long step toward unity. But if the "class system" is adopt-

ed something will surely happen. "Better judgment of the elders." Huh?

There are some elders, who if they would be more discreet, and exercise "better judgment" in the examples they set before the members they would have more influence for good! And I don't mean maybe.

—Ira B. Kile.

FAULTS

Every one of us is at fault every day unless we conform our daily work and worship to the teachings of the New Covenant. Paul wrote in Gal. 5 that "if a brother be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness considering thyself lest thou also be tempted." For the sake of your soul, brother, keep the faults behind and don't get drunk or so engrossed in worldly things that they will overtake you.

You are at fault when you fail to take God's Word at its face value whether it suits your convenience or not. Conveniences and customs, if made, are not recognized in heaven.

You are at fault if you fail to regard the Lord's Day service as a pleasure and a duty regardless of all worldly pleasures.

You are at fault if you fail to exemplify the life of our Saviour in being kind, considerate, meek and pleasant to all people.

You are at fault if you're trying to walk the Highway, (Isaiah 35), and at the same time stepping off into the thicket occasionally to renew your friendship with the devil.

You are mistaken if you think God will accept any secondary service. Malachi 1:8. God is not blind, neither does he sleep. Be careful lest you be found offering the lame or the sick as a sacrifice. You are at fault if, where God gave no specific command but gave an example, you substitute a thing in the example with something else. Christ did nothing upon earth which would be sinful for a Christian to do. He did right, therefore all things in conflict with his ways are sinful.

Let us all strive to finish each day nearer to God. If a difference arises over the mode of teaching let's teach as Christ taught. "He taught the multitude." No where does it say he classified them.

If a question arises over how many cups to use in the communion, let's use the number Christ used. If we do this we are sure to be right.

J. E. Whigham, Kinston, Ala.

TIME FOR MEETINGS

I have the month of August open for meetings. Write me at once if you want a meeting. Brethren the time is so short for us to work here, so let us do all the good we can and save the lost, and strengthen the saved. Let us reach as many as possible with the Gospel call. I have preached here at home most of the spring. Hoping to hear from some place that wants a meeting now soon, I am Your humble servant in the one faith,

—W. T. Taylor.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, AUGUST 15, 1929

No. 14

LET THE TRUTH BE TOLD Harper-Cowan

The debate which was to have occurred between Brother Harper and I on the "cup" question failed to materialize. When the debate was called off at Elk City, Brother Harper wrote me challenging me to meet him at Healdton, Okla., July 2. I readily accepted his challenge. In the meantime, I arranged a debate with J. W. Chism on the Sunday school question for Ardmore, Okla. The Sunday school people at Ardmore refused to have the debate at Ardmore, and we moved to Ringling, Okla., and had the debate.

Brother G. W. Phillips has reported the Ringling debate. Brother Harper attended this debate, and was seemingly pleased with my work. He informed me that the Healdton brethren would not have the debate on the cup question at Healdton, and he tried to get it at Wilson, Okla., and they turned him down, after announcement had been made that it would be there. It was on Friday night that the debate was announced at the last session of my debate with Chism. On Saturday morning, Harper left without saying a word to me, and went home. On Sunday evening Brother James D. Phillips came to see me, and told me that Harper had left. That he was afraid Harper had not informed me. I will here give from memory what Phillips said to me in the presence of G. W. Phillips, of Ardmore, and C. H. Eatmon, of Healdton. "Harper got mad and went home, saying before he left that he was done. That he was going back to teaching school. He left without telling any one goodbye except me and would not promise to write to anyone else. That he would not stop anywhere for worship on Lord's day." The above statement was made to me by Brother James D. Phillips at Ringling, Okla., Sunday evening, June 30, 1929, in Thompson's Tourist Park. James D. Phillips showed me a check Harper gave him for money to go home on."

I am unable to figure how a report can be made this time that I backed out. I have never backed out, Harper's paper to the contrary, notwithstanding.

J. N. COWAN.

Reply

The foregoing appeared in the Apostolic Way, July 15, 1929. It shows what a man who has no regard for the truth will say, and evidently to try to destroy the influence of a brother that stands above reproach. Cowan was evidently trying to call off attention from himself in his cowardly backdown at the behest of his hunchmen, as cowardly as any S. S. man ever has shown himself in getting out of debate.

Cowan has never told the Way readers that the

Elk City debate with Musgrave was called off by his six CUPS brethren who went to Musgrave and had it done, and that each one said he would not endorse Cowan.

No; and he has not here told that Fish and Stewart of the Ringling church backed by Geo. W. Phillips, of Ardmore, stood between him and debate at Ringling, Okla., where the Tabernacle had been promised for the debate. There was time for him to preach, but debate he refused.

Cowan and I had had some correspondence, and in one of his letters he spoke of wanting my "public confession" while at Healdton, and I did go to see him and mentioned to him that Brother Harper had left for home. I did not say, "He got mad," but I said, "Harper was hurt over the matter." I did not say, "He was going back to teaching school." I told him that I "supposed" he would teach school, as that was what he had followed with his editorial work for years. Brother Harper told me that he did not have to "preach for a living" and that he was not going to sacrifice the truth as some had done and are doing to get a living from preaching. And I wish we had more just like him, —I do.

I did not say, "He left without telling any one good-bye except me." I made it plain that he left with Dr. Watkins and his family, who were going in a car to Gainesville, Texas, to save fare as far as possible, and that I was the only one of the rest of the brethren present when he left. Dr. Watkins was almost ready to start when the word came from Wilson, and I did not know whether they had gotten word to Cowan or not, and mentioned the matter to Cowan. Cowan says I said, "He would not stop anywhere for worship on Lord's day." I said nothing of the kind. Cowan was very inquisitive. I was asked whether he was going to stop for worship, and I said, "He didn't say anything to me about it."

I can clearly see how a report can be made, and that truthfully, that you did back out, for you had a chance to do it but crawled behind two or three brethren to keep out of it. And it is the same old song as you yourself tell it—"I have evaded (yes, you said it right—"evaded") a discussion for the 'cup' question for four long years." And you keep evading it. Why don't you meet Dr. Trott in the Way if you will not meet us in "The Truth"? Your arguments will be torn to smithereens and you know it—that's why. Now let the Way make this correction. They can not afford not to do it.—Jas. D. Phillips.

—o—
"Anybody that does not believe in debate ought not to present his side of it."—Jas. Allen.

THE WAY PUTS ON SOFT PEDAL

"The columns of the Apostolic Way have been mainly devoted for years to combatting innovations which have been creeping into the church. It has devoted too much space to this line of writing." G. A. Trott, A. W., 15, 1929."

AN OPEN FORUM IN PART ONLY

"We recently spent a day and a night with Dr. Trott. I heartily concur in the Doctor's expression the general purpose and policy of the paper will not change, it will still be an open forum to that degree that when we publish one side of a question, we will allow those opposing to express themselves." R. F. D. in same issue.

Again he says: "If in our judgment it is not best to fill the space with a discussion of any question, those who do want to discuss it can put it in tract form, allowing those who want the tract to pay the expense thereof."

Remarks

"All the same Firm Foundation." Thus have they protected their Darling, the Sunday School; and now The Way proposes to give the CUPS advocates the same protection in,—rather out of—its columns. Poor Darlings, they will certainly need it. Their knees have been shaking ever since THE TRUTH was started. The space of the Way will now be needed to advertise the "EGO" of its primer (He might take the fourth grade in the public school) President and Littlefield College, with the "Wild Cats" on one side and the "Tom Cats" on the other in the football team, etc., etc. Yes, this must all be kept in the eye of the public together with the "real estate" boom, or rather BOOMERANG, for it has already started back, and those that cannot get out of the way may be badly hurt (financially). In our last issue we predicted the "sweet spirit"—Digressive spirit—which the "policy" of the Way was about to assume. Some have wondered how this editor learns so much of the inside workings of the Apostolic Way digressives. The answer is this; simply judging the future by the past. Digression is all alike, and digressives travel the same road.—Ed.

APPLIED LOGIC

"Every time a version of the Bible says 'sing' it excludes the use of an instrument made by man."—A. B. Barrett.

Yes, and every time a version says "cup" it excludes CUPS in the communion service. And this is every time in every version. And Barrett knows the rule of logic as well as we do—The expression of one excludes all others.

STRANGE THINGS

I am made to wonder when I see a man trying to ride two horses at the same time, one going one way, and the other going another way. But I see some preachers trying to do somethnig just as absurd as this. When they are with the brethren that believe in using just one cup in the communion, these preachers will tell them that they are absolutely right—walk by the divine rule. And they will tell the brethren that one cup can't be wrong. But when these preachers get with brethren that use "two or more cups," and think it is not necessary to walk by the divine rule, but that this is a matter of Christian Liberty, these preachers will throw right in with them and endorse their stand. Do these preachers think that Christ does not know their works? Rev. first and second chapter tells us the Lord has his eyes on them. We should warn the brethren against such men. J. S. Hall pretends to stand for the use of only one cup in the communion, but the brethren at Graham and California creek-Kerby, Keel, Pursley, told me that he had the cups put in and divided the church at Graham, and good brethren were driven from the worship, and Hall told the one who carried the basket to put in two cups.—Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

COURTS IT

Courts what? Well, read and see: "The truth has nothing to lose in the long run from an investigation, fair or unfair. We believe we have the truth; hence we court investigation."—R. F. D. in A. W.

Remarks

And when you do not court investigation, we believe that you know you have not the truth. Now, you courted investigation with Showalter on the S. S., but it was a one-sided courtship—your courting was not reciprocated. Now we are going to court you on the CUPS question—there is no question about the use of "a cup," of which the Bible speaks. We will know that you know that you have not the truth. Now push Cowan and Johnson to the front against "The Truth" as you did against the F. F. on the S. S. if you dare. Are you going to put in the CUPS at the College church at Littlefield; and will it be Johnson's "Individual Cups," as at Roswell, N. Mex.? We believe we have the truth; hence we court investigation. Shall this be a one-sided courtship, too? Now if "truth" is what you want, come on. Cowan says, "The time is ripe for this question to be debated." We have offered him space in "The Truth," but he says he and Trott will, when they think it is time, discuss it in the A. W. But Trott and R. F. D. have bid farewell to such a thing, and Cowan is safe. Now talk about S. S. cowards, will you? —Ed.

"We need 'The Truth.' A very good church here—one cup, Sunday Schools and musical instruments debarred."—A. D. Thomas, Imperial, Calif.

HERE AND THERE

I attended the debate at Sentinel, Okla., July 29 and 30, between Alva Johnson, of Turkey, Texas, and our boy preacher, Jas. Douglass Phillips, of the cups question. Brethren at Elk City, 30 mi. north of Sentinel, attended, and we are happy over the discussion and can commend the brethren generally for their Christian conduct during the sessions of the debate. The moderators had nothing to do but keep the time.

Brother Johnson tried hard to accuse the brethren who stand for one cup of causing the division, but Brother Phillips quickly showed the people that the CUPS are unknown in the Scriptures with the communion. He then gave Paul in Rom. 16:17, showing that we should mark them that are causing divisions "contrary" to the doctrine which we have received.

I am unable to express my appreciation of the firm and earnest manner of debating, cool and level-headed at all times, though his opponent seemed to try to rile him on many occasions. Brother Phillips just got to business and stayed with it during the whole of the debate. Johnson even accused Phillips of not being a gentleman, because Phillips smiled at his harsh terms applied to Phillips and his brethren. Johnson CRIED big, loud, and LONG, like the prophets of Baal, but it brought him no help, for he went down under the withering fire from God's eternal truth in the hands of Bro. Phillips, and all could plainly see it but those blinded by prejudice.

Phillips had given Thayer's lexicon for the definitions of some terms in the New Testament, for Thayer is the Standard authority on the terms of New Testament Greek, and Johnson made a big flourish about wanting "just the Bible," as though we did not take just the Bible. And he wanted Phillips to read a page of Greek. Phillips told him to cite just one passage in the Bible that mentions cups for the communion and he would spend the rest of his time in debate in reading Greek. He did not have to read. And all could see it.

The debate was an outstanding victory for the truth of the Bible way as upheld by Brother Phillips. We need more debates to arouse the brethren to studying this question. Some who came thinking that there was nothing to the question; that it was an "untaught question," a "foolish question," had their eyes opened and said they were glad that they came. I say we need more of these clean, honorable, awakening Bible investigations; but Johnson refused to meet Brother Harper at Elk City, where we had agreed to furnish the place, and where he had just held a meeting for those who stood for the cups. They were down to hear Johnson and they did not want it at Elk City, you see. Why not let the brethren hear it? Like the S. S. side, are they afraid "It will unsettle many?" Have they come to that so soon? I want to say that what Bro. Phillips did for Bro. Johnson in this debate was enough. Johnson did not know that Bro. Harper was around, but he got in from his meeting at Memphis just in time to

get off the train and go to Sentinel with us. And Johnson seemed to be surprised and dumfounded at this. Let us have more investigations.—Bob Musgrave.

Jas. D. Phillips, 225 E. Cleveland Ave., Montebello, Calif., Aug. 2, 1929.—I closed a meeting last Lord's day night at Sentinel, Okla., without visible results. The Sunday School faction got a man to come and conduct a singing school for them in order to keep their members from hearing the truth. The Cups faction, that recently left the church so they could have their cups, regardless of what the Bible says, sent to Texas and got Herbert Hall, an individual cups factionist preacher, to come and hold them a meeting to keep their members from hearing the truth. This was the first time the cups faction worked against me by running an opposition meeting.

The cups brethren challenged us for a debate, and called on Alva Johnson to represent them. Johnson proved nothing in favor of his contention. He seems to reject Thayer and Webster as authorities on the meaning of Greek and English words, but sets his own definitions up against theirs.

I am now at Elk City, Okla., attending a nice, clean debate between Bro. H. C. Harper and Bro. Freeny Saunders on the cup question. The cups digressives, who became so excited over the proposed Cowan-Musgrave debate, which they called off, would not put up a man to defend them (they said they would not endorse Cowan on the question). So the S. S. people put up Bro. Saunders. He is a much cleaner debater than Johnson is, and is putting up a much stronger fight; but Bro. Harper is defeating his every effort. A report of this debate will appear later.

Brother Bob Musgrave, of Elk City, will begin a meeting at Loco, Okla., tomorrow night. I was to have held this meeting, but circumstances seemed to demand that I get some one to take one of my Oklahoma meetings off my hands, so I could get to other work. So Bro. Musgrave will hold this one for me. Bro. Musgrave has recently closed a good meeting at New Castle, Texas, and we hope he has a good one at Loco.

I begin a meeting tomorrow night at Eola, near Elmore City, Okla. It will last two weeks.

Brother Harper will begin a meeting for the loyal brethren in Elk City, Okla., tomorrow night.

I expect to go from Elmore City to Charleston and Spring Hill, W. Va., for some meetings. From there I return to Calif.

—o—
 "What if Duckworth never openly advocates the CUPS? He is sponsering those who are advocating them, even to the dividing of churches, and the Individual Cups are going right in, following the "two or more." Is he not a partaker of their sins? He certainly is. It is more honorable in a man to get right out openly and divide churches than it is to be "a snake in the grass," pretending to stand firm but compromising the truth all the time.—J. A. B.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

"Take another example: In "The Truth" Harper says that on the Lord's table the container represents the new testament. Can you beat that?" —J. N. Cowan, 3-30, '29.

No; and nobody else can unless he can tell a bigger one, for Harper never said it in "The Truth" nor anywhere else. Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," and Harper is going to leave it that way. Jesus did not use a word that means "container," which might be pitcher, barrel, basket, bottle, etc., etc., but he used POTERION, which means "a cup, a drinking vessel," a specific term.

* * * *

"Harper says in "The Truth" that cup always means a solid, and never means a liquid. (I have the paper marked.) Now you can see how foolish it would be to say Drink ye all of this solid. Or take this solid and divide among yourselves." —J. N. Cowan, Ib.

Now if Cowan was trying to see how big a fool he could make of himself while trying to act "smart," we do not see how he could better the job. "Cup," in its every use in connection with the communion, is the name of a solid, and is a container, but does not mean "container." The word in the Bible is POTERION, which means "a cup, a drinking vessel." And if that is not a solid, what is it? We are sure if Cowan knew even a decent smattering of English that his "smart" antics would disappear and he would talk less nonsense. That "cup" is sometimes used by metonymy in connection with the communion, is evident to anyone who knows the a b c of English.—"Container and the thing contained," where both are involved, for "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which a object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it." In which use the name of the container, which is "cup" in connection with the communion, is given to call to the mind what the container, (cup in this case) holds, the unnamed contents. And in case the contents are

names, the figure metonymy disappears. In a metonymy involving "Container and the thing contained," which is one of the ten leading kinds of metonymy, the solid, be it cup, bottle, jug, or what not, is always named to suggest the contents, which are never named.

"I know the word (cup) is often used to name a literal, material vessel, but it is not so used in connection with the Lord's supper."—J. N. Cowan.

But J. H. Thayer, Chicago University, Harvard, et al, say it is, and we know that you are wrong, and we challenge you to the proof. For example take Mt. 26:27, "the vessel out of which one drinks, ek tou poterion." Out of the cup, if you please. Thayer, p. 510. "The vessel out of which one drinks" is "a literal, material vessel." And you are off your base here, for no one could know whether the cup had any contents were it not for the context. And this is not the case with cup used by metonymy. And if it is not literal in use here, pray tell us in what figure it is used. You can't do it.

* * * *

"No one denies the cup being in a container, nor that it was impossible to preserve the cup without a container; but I know that Christ could speak of the contents without including the container, and I know he did it in every place he used the word cup in connection with the Lord's supper."—J. N. Cowan.

You better not "know" so much than to "know" so much that isn't so. Why not give a little proof as you go along? "Assertion is the argument of fools." The "cup," in connection with the communion, was not only not "in a container," but it was the container used, whether "cup" was used literally or by metonymy. (I have given proof; meet it if you can.) And your talk about "the cup without a container" is nonsense also, for "the cup" is the name of the container here, as elsewhere.

Yes, Christ could and did "speak of the contents without including the container." For example, Mt. 26:29. This context shows that what is here named "fruit of the vine," was in the cup when "He took a cup." But when he said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," "cup" is the name of the container, and it matters not whether "cup" is here used literally or by the figure metonymy. "Fruit of the vine" is the name of the contents of the "cup, a drinking vessel." And you don't know so much after all.

"I have not misrepresented what they teach, if their own statements are what they teach, and many of them published in "The Truth'."—J. N. Cowan.

Yes, you have, brother, as I have shown, but it is mainly, I think, your ignorance of English that has caused you to see what was not there at all.

* * * *

"Trott said the container represents the New Covenant, and that we had the word of the Lord for it. When I pressed him for the word of the Lord, he said he did not or would not make an argument on that but offered it as his opinion."—J. N. Cowan.

Listen: If you have not the courage to meet Harper in "The Truth," which has been thrown open to you for a discussion on the cups since it started, we hope you will meet the Doctor (Dare you do it?) in The Way. The Doctor is able to take the twists out of what you say—that we know: and we think you KNOW, and that too without proof.

EDITORIAL

MORE INCONSISTENCY

The Standard, in its issue of May 4, publishes an article by W. P. Keeler, on the individual communion cup question that is certainly most astonishing in its statement, which is evidently indorsed by The Standard, as they offer no editorial criticism of the same article. The writer, Mr. Keeler, states that when the question came up in the Englewood church, Chicago, whether or not they should adopt the individual communion cups, there was a division of sentiment among the members. The matter was left to a "vote by ballot," resulting in a ratio of about seven favoring to one opposing the change. The next question was how to satisfy the feelings of the minority, who desired to continue the use of the "common cup." It was finally arranged that on each tray should be placed a large (common) cup, thus permitting those who preferred the common cup to drink out of the same cup, while those who favored the individual cups could be served from the same tray. The Standard writer thinks this a very happy solution of a perplexing question, and freely commends their course to other churches where the issue is forced upon them.

We now call attention to The Standard's inconsistency again. They have been most intolerable in their criticism of the Hyde Park church (Chicago) and others that have expressed a willingness to admit members to the congregation who had not been immersed, in which position The Standard is, of course, scripturally correct. But now, in the case of this communion service, they virtually sanction it, knowing the apostolic practice and teachings of the Scriptures, and they encourage each member to exercise his own will or act from personal choice.

Immersion is right, or it is wrong; the common cup is right, or it is wrong; and the individual cup is right, or it is wrong. It should require no more

time for The Standard to decide the question of scriptural deportment in the use of the individual cups than it took them to decide the unscriptural course in receiving the unimmersed. The manner of participating in the Lord's supper is stated in Holy Writ just as plainly as is the "mode" of baptism. After the very pronounced stand taken by Prof. McGarvey on this very question of the individual cups, we are astonished that The Standard would permit an article like this one (by Keeler) to appear unrebuked. This is not a matter of opinion nor a matter of expediency. It is a matter of scriptural fact, and The Standard has proven indifferent to its opportunity to rebuke something that is at entire variance with scriptural precedent." By F. L. Rowe in reply to The Christian Standard, of Cincinnati, Ohio (Digressive) in The Leader and Way, of Cincinnati, O., in 1910.

The Digressives, led on by The Standard; and the Christian-Evangelist, of St. Louis, introduced the individual cups. Then to save time they offered thanks for the loaf and these cups both at one time. And then to save more time they passed both the loaf and the cups at the same time. They finally got so tangled up that Garrison, of the Evangelist, proposed that they call a meeting of leading ministers and elders to form a ritual for observing the Lord's supper.

And for the past five years the Christian Leader, Rowe's paper, has been leading the few loyal churches left, into the use of the individual cups, following right in the slimy trail marked out by the Digressives, whom they fought on it a few years ago, and now all going into Babylon together. And such a mess of it as these loyal (?) churches are having, who have left the Bible. They, too, will need a "ritual," a Pope, or some Popish elders to "Lord it over God's heritage."

Just see what we are coming to in this already. Who shall be able to effect the unity of the church if we cut loose from the Bible?

Let us notice Cowan's effort. Here is his plan, but he was not Pope enough then to enforce it. But notice it: "That in the communion service only a sufficient number of cups be used to conveniently wait upon the congregation, say two, or four, as the occasion may require. Thanks be offered for the cup while in one container, then after the giving of thanks, it may be distributed in the other containers as an act of distribution."

This was rejected, and another human plan was proposed thus: "As to the communion let us proceed as follows: We will see to it that one or more common drinking cups is provided for those who desire to partake thereof, also a sufficient number of individual cups to accommodate those who care to partake thereof; let thanks be given for the wine while in the common container; after which it may be divided into the aforesaid cups and passed round."—M. A. Meclister, C. M. Yater, Elders First St. and Richardson Ave., Roswell, N. Mex.

Johnson says, "Let the Elders or leaders decide it." So unless Cowan can manage to bind and enforce his creed on all the churches, there can

be no unity on a human standard for the churches. The Leader has now gone with the Digressives and Cowan and Johnson and others are carrying the Way into the same quagmire of humanism. If the Standard was Digressive in 1910, the Leader is now, and it is not alone.

REPORT

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., July 24, 1929.—I closed a series of meetings with the faithful brethren at Unionville, Ind., the 14th. inst. This was my fifth effort with these good people, and I certainly enjoyed the association with them. I am certain that some of my very best friends reside in that part of Ind. The meeting resulted in two being restored to the fold and one baptism. The meeting, I feel certain, closed entirely too soon, as the interest increased with every service, and the house would not hold the crowds near the close, but it was all the time that I had to spare, so had to move on.

I am at this writing, in a good meeting with the faithful brethren at Atlanta, Texas. Began last Friday night, and have had one baptism to date. Bro. H. E. Robertson, of Lebanon, Mo., is with me. We go next to Springdale, Ark. Pray for me and mine.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, July 24.—I have just closed a meeting at California Creek in Young county, Texas. This is J. Y. Morgan's home, and he and his children are staunch supporters of the church, and I have never enjoyed a meeting more than I did this one. All the members of the body there seemed to want just what the Lord commands and they made me think of Cornelius and his house — We are all here present before God to hear all things that are commanded you of God. Acts 10:33.

These brethren do not care for the wisdom of men, but just what the Book teaches, and I did the best I could with the Book as my guide. I preached on the CUP, the cup, one cup, and taught it just as the Bible reads and I know this is the true way and I know the preachers know it, but Paul said some would depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing men, men who would lead them wrong religiously. And he said a strong delusion would come over many, those who receive not the love of the truth that they might be saved. 2 Thes. 2:10-12. I am sorry for such, but they cannot be reached with the truth until they make up their minds to want it.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.—I began a meeting at Slocomb, Ala., on the 27 of July. Here is where I debated some time ago with E. M. Farmer. And they invited me to hold this meeting for them. I am to hold a meeting at Mt. Carmal, beginning the second Lord's day in August, and one at Jakin, Ga., in September. I have held meetings this summer at Webb, Ala., and at Sweetgum, Fla. I sure hate it that your typewriter was stolen, and I hope the brethren will see that you get help for another one. I am to

meet J. Eli Horn (Russell) in an eight days' debate in Houston County soon. My prayers are for you in the good work with "The Truth," and may you be spared long to us for the fight that is now on for the faith once delivered to the saints.

SPEAKING AS THE "ORACLES OF GOD"

By Victor W. Kelly, Urbana, Ill.

Peter says, "If any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God" (1 Pet. 4:11). Certain other expressions are commonly used by members of the "Church of Christ." Among these may be mentioned the following: "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent;" we should be able to give a "thus saith the Lord for every item of our faith and practice;" "we do nothing in our worship but what the New Testament teaches by precept or example;" "When people leave the New Testament, there is no stopping place." These expressions had their origin in the Restoration movement. Some of them served as the basis upon which the early restorers made their plea for a return to primitive Christianity. The others probably came into being in the fight against digression.

What do the above expressions mean? There are at least two possible interpretations. We may say that they refer to the major items of work and worship, or we may take the position that they apply to every little detail in carrying out the will of the Lord. Let us examine these two methods of application in order to classify our thinking and help us to a clearer understanding of these expressions.

1. The application to the major items of work and worship.

In the conflict with the denominations, we have contended that they have "left the New Testament" in practicing infant baptism and sprinkling and pouring for baptism, because the "one baptism" is a command to believers and is clearly taught to be immersion. The Bible calls the church and its members by names revealed by the Holy Spirit, and we have rightly charged our religious neighbors with a failure to speak "as the Oracles of God" when they claim the right to substitute human names for these God-given ones. Paul teaches very clearly that the finances of the church are to be secured by "laying by in store as we have been prospered" and our debating brethren have put to hopeless rout and confusion those who would raise money for the Lord by festivals, shows, etc. The New Testament also clearly teaches that the music ordained for the wor-

ship in this dispensation is vocal, and few of our digressive brethren can now be persuaded to deny the accusation that they have "left the New Testament" when they place another KIND of music in the worship. Other examples could be given, but these will suffice to show that in our opposition to sectarian we have applied these expressions only to the Major items of work and worship.

2. **The application to the Details of work and worship.** More recently, certain groups or factions out of harmony with the great body of the "church of Christ," have arisen among our brethren. The most prominent of these have been (1) Those who teach and practice a specific "order of worship;" (2) those who oppose the teaching of the Bible in "classes" and the use of "literature" in such teaching; (3) the "one cup" hobbyist; and (4) the anti-Bible College factions. Each of these groups is contending for the application of the quotations at the beginning of this article to the details of the work and worship, and is charging all who do not agree with them with digression.

Churches of Christ in many places (including many congregations where extremists and hobbyists worship) begin their services with a song, read an "opening lesson," have a song leader to direct the singing; sing an "invitation song;" use two or more cups to distribute the wine; lay the contribution on the table, or collect it in a basket; select a "treasurer" to take care of the funds and a "secretary" to keep the minutes of the business meeting; have preaching once per month, twice per month, or every Lord's Day; hold one or two "protracted meetings" each year; have an "annual meeting," and a "basket dinner" occasionally; and teach the Bible to "classes" before the regular worship hour. This list might be extended, but these serve to illustrate that every congregation in its work and worship does things the details for which cannot be found in "precept" or "example." Are we to conclude that brethren who practice any or all of these things are digressives? Have they "left the New Testament?"

The above should make it clear that the New Testament does not attempt to give all the details of how things should be done, and that brethren are in gross error when they apply the quotations which serve as the basis for this article to such details. Every necessary thing in carrying out a command is implied in the command. The command to "go" implies that we have liberty in choosing the means of travel in going to preach the gospel. If we follow the examples of the New Testament, the modes of travel would be very

limited indeed. The command to "sing" carries with it the necessity of learning to sing, and the use of hymn books and a song leader to promptly conduct this important part of the worship. The command to "teach" allows liberty in the methods of teaching. The admonition to give as we have been prospered implies that we will use our common sense and good judgment in selecting one of our number to take care of the contribution. No congregation can escape the charge of digression when measured by the yardstick of those brethren who say that, "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent," applies to the details of the work and worship. Let us stop hindering the work of the Lord by making laws where God has made none, thus causing confusion and strife in the church for which Jesus shed his precious blood. Satan is never more pleased than when he succeeds in causing division in the "one body."

Remarks

The import of the mottoes and slogans used by those who sought to restore primitive Christianity is too well fixed as matters of history for anyone at this late day to successfully pervert them. That those who sought to restore the New Testament order of things applied these mottoes and slogans to all items of faith and practice, or work and worship, goes without question with those who are informed. It was not until digression set in that this supreme presumption of "major items of work and worship" was sprung to make a way for items of work and worship that lacked a "Thus saith the Lord," and that could not be brought into the work and worship and "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent."

"Major items of work and worship," indeed! Who but a digressive would have the cheek to say that "the fathers of this restoration movement" applied these mottoes and slogans only to the "Major items of work and worship"? They had better sense than to try to differentiate between major and minor items of worship. Such presumption originated with Cain, and was worked to perfection by Nadab and Abihu, and has been practiced by degressives all along the line to the present time. And those who sought to re-establish the New Testament order of faith and practice never would have gotten very far away from Catholic and Protestant with these mottoes and slogans applied only to "Major items of work and worship." It remained for that later development of digression which has headed up into the "Disciples' Denomination," and the modern Sunday School element in the churches of Christ which is on the same road of degression now, to differentiate major and minor items of worship.

Kelly says, "The New Testament also clearly teaches that the music ordained for worship in this dispensation is vocal."

But what of it? This is one of the minor items, so says the digressive, and we do not apply these mottoes and slogans to "details."

Yes, Paul orders to lay by as we have been prospered for the finances of the church. But what of it? We are not bound only in "Major items of work and worship," says the digressive (Kelly included), so here they go with "festivals, shows, etc." And Kelly does not seem to recognize his relatives, his brethren.

The Missionary Society digressive jumps on "Go," and since the motto "be silent where the Bible is silent" applies only to "Major items of work and worship," and we are not limited to a "Thus saith the Lord" in "details," this is the "way" we will do it.

But we tell him that "Go" is an item covered by the Bible, and that organizing a Missionary Society is not going, nor is it a way of going, and that he is digressive.

The Sunday School (I guess Kelly has not gotten to this name yet as they have in Texas and other states, for he still speaks of Bible names as the Holy Spirit gave them)—I say the Sunday School digressive jumps on "teach," and since the motto "be silent where the Bible is silent" applies only to "Major items of work and worship," and we are not limited to a "Thus saith the Lord" in "details," this is the way we will do it.

But we tell him that "teach" is an item covered by the Bible, and that organizing an assembly into classes is not teaching, nor is it a method of teaching, and that he is digressive.

I suppose he gets the "Pastor," the Sunday School, the Ladies' Aid, the Young Peoples' Meeting, the "incipient Missionary Society," with other things all into churches of Christ under "details," just as those he calls digressives get the organ, the Sunday School, the "Pastor," the Missionary Society; and there is no difference between the two digressives but a little time: one started before the other, that's all. And Kelly and his faction can join hands with the organ faction and say: "We apply these expressions—mottoes and slogans—only to Major items of work and worship."

When any body of Christians breaks off from the Bible in its faith and practice, it is a faction. The organ faction was small at first, but it soon became more numerous than the body that still held to a "Thus saith the Lord" for its faith and practice. And the true church was "out of harmony with the great body of the church of Christ" that had gone into degression. This "great body" finally became the "Disciples' Denomination."

Next there was the "Sunday School" faction, small at first, but it soon out-numbered those who held to a "Thus saith the Lord" for their faith and practice, and the true church was again "out of harmony with the great body of the church of Christ" that has gone into digression, following on the same line that the other digression had taken. And now we have (1) the S. S. faction, (2) the "Pastor" faction, (3) "incipient Missionary Society" faction, (4) the Bible College faction, and (5) the "cups" faction: none of which things can

be sustained by the New Testament, and we challenge any man that these factions will endorse to try to sustain them in discussion by a "Thus saith the Lord."

Yes, "Every necessary thing in carrying out a command is implied in the command." But the things you are challenged to defend are not necessary to carry out any Bible command, no not one. And here is where you go digressive. And if you will stop your making laws for the people of God to follow, and that a "Thus saith the Lord," the contentions against you will cease. But you think more of your "laws" which separate the people of God than you do of the Unity for which the Son of God prayed.—Ed.

WHAT THEY SAY

"Bro. Tidwell says that "The Truth" is creating quite an interest in the East and is growing in favor because of the straight-forwardness of your contention for principles of truth."—Elder C. A. Stark, Dallas, Tex.

"We are so anxious for "The Truth" to grow that we will send to you from time to time. We have confidence in you that you will run the paper to the advantage of the CHURCH, and that this is your sole aim.—Chast. T. Cook, Montazuma, Ind.

THE TRUTH FUND

Chas. T. Cook	-----	\$10.00
Bob Musgrave	-----	1.00
Bob Musgrave	-----	\$1.00

Erratum: In our edition for August 1st, the report of the Roswell debate the mention of Hagerman should have been Dexter, N. Mex., as to the individual cups, though it was brethren at Hagerman that invited Johnson down to preach.—Ed.

"I began a meeting for the church at Hatch, New Mexico, the first of August. These are fine brethren and worship in line with the New Testament"—J. F. Thomasson, Artesia, N. Mex.

"I believe the time is now ripe for the discussion of this (the cups) question."—J. N. Cowan. All right; "The Truth" is open to you when you can get up the courage to enter it with us.—Ed.

I held a meeting for the brethren at Loco, Okla., the last two weeks in July. This makes the fourth meeting I have held at Loco.

Bro. Sam L. Shults held a meeting for us at Colony, Okla., the last two weeks in July. Bro. Shults does not shun to declare against all innovations in the church, and we were well pleased with his plain preaching. I have preached some and I want the brethren to know that I stand for one cup in the communion, and I am ready to go where the brethren need preaching.—P. A. McCracken, Colony, Okla.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, SEPTEMBER 1, 1929

No. 17

APPEAL FOR COUNSEL AGAIN

In my former articles, I have insisted that the readers of this paper study the subject. I hope they have done that, and are now ready for counsel. A few have offered objections to my proposal on the ground that legislative counsels have caused all the trouble and digression in the church. But in this, they oppose something that I am as much opposed to as they are—a thing that I never proposed. And this is no reason for opposing the scriptural counsel that I have been calling for. True "The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to naught; he maketh the devices of the people of none effect." But on the other hand, "The counsel of the Lord (and this is what we need) standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." —Ps. 33:10, 11.

There have been heathen counsels, and there are yet such, to establish human devices. These are of no avail to the people of God, and for this reason our work is failing in God's sight. We have not taken counsel of the Lord and his ways—have not reasoned together with God; are not agreed, and division, and more division is coming among us.

"Without counsel purposes are disappointed, but in the multitude of counsellors they are established." Prov. 15:22. Some think that we should study, preach, and work according to our own individual conceptions, and that to counsel together with God would make a bad impression on the brotherhood. But if we neglect this kind of counsel with the Lord, it means more divisions, because there are many devices in the heart of man; but "The counsel of the Lord, it shall stand." Prov. 19:21. Shall we go blindly along, each after his own way, neglecting the thing the Lord has ordained for our guidance and safety? And why, when attention has been called to it, do some actually persist in our doing so. Read the fifteenth chapter of Acts, and note the warning there given by Gamaliel.

It is the Lord's purpose to save the people by preaching the Gospel. I Cor. 1:21. This preaching must be done by men, therefore we are to carry out the Lord's purpose, and must have counsel, for "Every purpose is established by counsel," and without counsel purposes fail. Prov. 20:18.

There are some that are anxious to act as the Lord directs by taking counsel together of the Lord, and find what the Lord has spoken, and it is to be hoped that they will be just as willing and anxious to get an understanding of the truth when we get together.

I should now like to have some suggestions as to the place and time, when and where, we shall meet. And I want to hear from others who have

not yet written me in regard to this matter. We want a complete restoration of the Divine Creed, discipline, and rule of "faith and practice." Will you now do all you can to this righteous end? May the Lord help us all to do his will—to receive his word with meekness. Js. 1:21. Let's counsel together and ask of the Lord that our work may stand in the Judgment. Address me: Geo. M. McFadden, Arkoma, Okla.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Bro. T. C. Hawley, 218 South Olive St., Santa Paula, California, now offers his pamphlet "Building According to the Pattern" free for the wrapping and postage, which will be about 5 cents each. He has only about 500 and this is an excellent opportunity for individuals and churches to get one of the best things ever put out by the brethren. Send for these, brethren, by the dozens, and hand them out. A good plan is to only loan them and get them back and hand them out again. Pamphlets of this size sell regularly for forty and fifty cents, but Brother Hawley will mail them out for postage and wrapper. Be sure to address him as above and put in the postage. He is anxious to do his part in this missionary work gratis, and may the Lord bless him. Let every preacher of the true church send and get a few dozens of these good tracts, and hand them out. Any brother will pay five cents for one, and you can soon dispose of them.

A. W. Johnson

PHILLIPS-JOHNSON DEBATE

This debate was held in the school auditorium at Sentinel, Okla., July 29 and 30. Phillips affirmed: The Scriptures teach that it takes a literal drinking cup and the fruit of the vine to constitute "the cup of the Lord." (I Cor. 10:21; 11:27)

Johnson affirmed: The Scriptures teach that the fruit of the vine is the cup of the Lord, and that as occasion may demand, more than one drinking cup or container may be used in waiting on the audience.

The debate was well attended. T. F. Thomasson moderated for J. D. Phillips and H. Hall for Alva Johnson.

Preachers present who stand for the use of one cup were: T. F. Thomasson, Artesia, N. Mex.; P. A. McCracken, Colony, Okla.; Sam L. Shultz, Lexington, Okla.; Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.; H. C. Harper, Sneads, Fla.; Geo. W. Teel; A. C. Richmond, Cordell, Okla., Star Route; Jas. D. Phillips.

Cups preachers were: H. Hall, Rawls, Texas; Clif. Johnson, Oklahoma City, Okla.; N. R. Win-

ters, Burlin, Okla.; Alva Johnson.

S. S. preachers were: J. C. Carman, Elk City, Okla.; S. F. Vance.

(For lack of space we were not able to insert the arguments in this issue, but hope to do this later.—Ed.)

Joseph Miller, 1004 N. Lambert St., Brazil, Ind.—Send me some sample copies of "The Truth" to Kinmunday, Ill. The Lord permitting, I shall begin a meeting near there Saturday night, August 10th.

H. C. Welch, Littlefield, Texas.—I have just (Aug. 12) closed a good meeting near Crosbyton, Texas. Large crowds and good interest, and five baptized; one a Presbyterian 70 years old, one a Missionary Baptist and his wife, the other two had made no profession. Please remember us in your prayers.

New Mexico Notes

I am now assisting the few brethren at Salem, N. Mex., six mi. north of Hatch, in a protracted effort. The meeting is well attended and we are hoping and praying that much good may be done. I go from here to Arrey, N. Mex., for a meeting; then to El Paso, Texas, and after this I shall go home to be with Bro. Homer L. King in his meetings at L. F. D. near Roswell, and at Greenfield on down the Pacos Valley. I recently had the pleasure of attending the Phillips-Johnson debate at Sentinel, Okla., a discussion on the cups question. The debate was a nice affair, the speakers conducting themselves in a way becoming gentlemen and Christians. I moderated for Bro. Phillips and Bro. Hall for Bro. Johnson. All we had to do was to keep time. I shall not repeat the arguments, but I wish to say that the truth was triumphant in the hands of Bro. Jas. Douglas Phillips. You need not fear to call on him to handle this question. I cannot see why we should not have a debate like this in every community—an investigation for the truth.—T. F. Thomasson, Artesia, N. Mex.

Bro. Homer L. King of Lebanon, Mo., closed a meeting here at Unionville Lord's day night, July 14, with much interest, one restored to the fellowship and one baptism. I baptized her, as Bro. King had to leave immediately for meetings in the West. Bro. King is held in high esteem here. He has made several trips here, and each time the church has been strengthened and the truth magnified. Find my renewal to "The Truth" enclosed.—Otis F. Young, Rt. 6, Bloomington, Ind.

Hagerman, New Mexico.

To The Readers of The Truth:

We notice in the August the 1st issue of The Truth paper that Bro. Harper made the statement that "The Hagerman church that had shortly before put in Individual Cups and divided the church, invited Johnson to come and preach for them."

Now so far as putting in individual cups and dividing the congregation is concerned this statement is false, either Bro. Harper has just surmised this, or he has been misinformed by some of his followers. We deny that at any time since the church has been established at this place, that there has ever been more than one container used in the communion service, and we wish to state the fact that the congregation here is in perfect peace upon this subject.

As for asking Bro. Johnson to preach for us. We would be glad to have him with us at any time, and believe that he would teach the Bible and the "Bible only" as he did during the cup discussion at Roswell.

Now, Bro. Harper, we the undersigned, in behalf of "The Church of Christ" at Hagerman, ask you to be honest enough to correct this false statement, through the columns of your paper, in the next issue that shall be published. We do not understand why a man with the knowledge of the Bible you possess, should have made such a public statement since you have never met with us and could not have been positive that you were stating facts.

H. Clay Lemon, G. B. Devalt, Alfred Meyer,
R. B. Bealer, O. C. Lusk.

Remarks

We have made this correction already, but publish this also for them.

The brethren with whom I was talking mentioned both Hagerman and Dexter, and I understood that it was the Hagerman church that put in the individual cups and divided the congregation, but it was Dexter, they say. We are glad to make this correction. And we wish to say a word or two as to this statement.

Elder McGuffin of the non-Sunday School church in Roswell that put in the individual cups and the church divided and formed the church at L. F. D. ranch in the country, told me that he was preaching once a month for the Hagerman church, and he moderated for Johnson in the debate, and some one who spoke for Hagerman publicly at the conclusion of the debate after Elder McGuffin had publicly stated that the church that uses the individual cups was well pleased with Johnson's defense, arose and invited Johnson to Hagerman church to preach. And since "Birds of a feather flock together," the impression made on my mind easily led to this linking of Hagerman with the individual cups; and especially so since I understood that Bro. Thomasson, a preacher who preaches just what the Bible says—"a cup"—was not wanted there. And Hagerman is in the same road taken by Dexter. Dexter finally got in a leadership that put in the individual cups and drove out some of the best brethren in the church, and the church at Greenfield was the result. And how long will Hagerman with its present "yearning"—not by all it is true—for the S. S. and the individual cups stand for "one container"?

If this church is really loyal in heart to "one container," and not acting the hypocrite, could they, or their leadership, boost for the cups?

Never. It shows that "There is something rotten in Denmark." And it will be manifest to all before "many moons."

They think Johnson "would teach the Bible and the 'Bible only' as he did during the cup discussion at Roswell," when as a matter of truth they know, if they know anything about the Bible, that neither Johnson nor any other man can "teach the Bible and the 'Bible only'" and teach the use of cups, be it "two or more" or "individual cups," in the communion service. And we do not understand why brethren with the knowledge of the Bible that they possess should be led to make such a public statement, for they could not if their lives depended upon it furnish us the "chapter and verse" for such teaching. Just furnish "chapter and verse" "Where the Bible speaks"—for "two or more cups" or the "individual cups," and I am sure there will not be one soul in the Hagerman church, or any other church that claims to be patterned after the New Testament, that will object to their use.

Neither Johnson nor Cowan dares to affirm the following proposition: A church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use cups in the communion service. They have been tried.

And they dare not deny the proposition that—A church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in communion service. They have been tried. They want to wiggle around on the ground of "expedient," "liberty," etc., occupied by the Sunday School and organ Digressives. Talk about their teaching the "Bible only." The above propositions show what they are teaching is not in the Bible. Now let the brethren watch Hagerman church a few years.—H. C. Harper.

COMMENDED

I have noticed with pleasure the writings of Bro. Ira B. Kile, of West Virginia, in "The Truth," and I want to commend his stand for the word of God unmixed by humanisms. I admire his love for the truth. So many preachers and writers are afraid to take a stand for fear they will lose influence and not get meetings. They will not preach on things unless they know the leaders like them and they will get a good support. This kind of preachers and writers has buried their influence for the good of the church. Here is my hand and my heart, Bro. Kile, hew to the line, and let the truth fall on whom it may. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is the saying of Christ. Let us have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. May God bless you, Brother Kile. Bob Musgrave.

GOT PLENTY

At the close of the Phillips-Johnson debate at Sentinel, Okla., Bro. Harper challenged Johnson again as he did at Roswell, N. Mex., to meet him at Elk City, Okla., but Johnson refused and gave his reason that the church that favors the CUPS there and for whom he had just held a

meeting did not want it. He called the church there that Bro. Harper was to hold the meeting for "heretics"—the church that favors but one cup in the communion. It is very strange that Johnson and the church that favors the cups are unwilling to expose these "heretics," is it not? Can it be that these Cups digressives have gotten plenty of debating already? It really seems so. Where is H. T. Evans, who was so anxious for debate on the "cup question" in Elk City that he challenged for debate there? He attended one session of the debate at Sentinel. It does not seem to take much to get enough now.

When Bro. Phillips gave the standard authorities on the meaning of words to show Johnson was not an authority as he had set himself up, Johnson said he would never meet any man again on this question unless he would sign up to use nothing but the Bible. Bro. Phillips then proposed to give up the debate if Johnson would give just one passage from the Bible that mentions cups in the communion. He showed plainly to all present that Johnson had no Bible at all for his cups in the communion. Johnson wanted everybody to take his assertions, his definitions, and his think-sos for the Bible, and it appears that some did—those who wanted it so.

Johnson now has another hole to get out of debate—you must not take a dictionary or a lexicon to define terms and show up Johnson's non-sense or he will not meet you. Good-bye, Johnson, we don't expect to hear of your debating the cups again any more, not even if the church will let you. —Bob Musgrave.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., August 2, 1929. —I closed a series of meetings with the faithful brethren near Atlanta, Texas, the 28th, ult. This was my second effort with these good people, and to say that I enjoyed the work with them, is putting it mildly. I think that there are some of the very best people on earth there, and they certainly know how to make one feel at home. While there were only five baptized, yet I regard it as one of the best meetings of my life. The interest and crowds were fine throughout, and increased with each service. The meeting should have continued another week, but it was the best that I could do at this time. They have asked me to return next summer for a longer stay, and I hope to be able to grant the request. Bro. H. E. Robertson, of Phillipsburg, Mo., was with me, and assisted much in reading, prayer and otherwise.

I am now at Springdale, Ark. in a meeting, which is but two days old at this writing. I expect to close here the 11th, inst., then go via home to Palestine, Ark., to begin a series of meetings the 16th.

After closing at Atlanta we went to Shreveport, La., for a visit with the faithful ones there, and preached Monday night to a very attentive audience. All seemed glad to see me again, and I was more than glad to meet them again.

"When You Need PRINTING You Need Us" Give us a trial on your next job. No matter where you are, we are your neighbor by parcel post. Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

"Harper says in 'The Truth' that cup always means a solid, and never means a liquid. (I have the paper marked.) Now you can see how foolish it would be to say Drink ye all of this solid. Or Take this solid and divide among yourselves." —J. N. Cowan, 3-30-'29.

Yes, Cup is the name of a solid; we know of no liquid that is named cup. If there is such, is it white or yellow, or what color? Is it sweet or sour, bitter or brakish, or tasteless? And from what is it manufactured or derived?

"Of means from; from means out of." See Lexicographer's Easy Chair, The Literary Digest, 1929. Harper can drink Of, From, or Out of, a solid; but maybe to do so would choke Cowan. "And he took a cup . . . , saying, Drink ye all of, from, or out of, it." Mt. 26:27. "And they all drank of, from, or out of, it." Mk. 14:23. This is how they "divided among yourselves," for this is what they did on that occasion. "And having received a cup, and having given thanks, he said, Take this and divide among yourselves." Lk. 22:17. "Cup" is a translation of *poterion*, which means, "A cup, a drinking vessel." And this is what was taken,—not a jug or bottle or pitcher or skillet or kettle, or any other solid than one named *poterion*, "A cup, a drinking vessel." —Thayer. And in sharing, or dividing, the cup, "They all drank of, from, or out of it." Mk. 14:23. And they drank "fruit of the vine," for the context shows that this is what was in the cup.

And now you can see how "foolish" it is for Bro. Cowan to oppose the truth.

* * * * *

"I know the word (cup) is often used to name a literal, material vessel, but it is not so used in connection with the Lord's supper." —J. C. N. Cowan, Ib.

But the scholarship of the world says it is used in connection with the communion "to name a literal, material vessel." — "a cup, a drinking vessel." — Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Harvard University, Chicago University, et al. And even when it is used by metonymy, it is "a cup, a drinking vessel" that is named in a way to suggest that it has something in it. E. g. "Drink the cup," I Cor. 10:21.

"You say you don't see how any one could be so ignorant as to offer thanks for the container. If the cup always means a solid, and never a liquid as Harper claims, and the container is the only solid in connection with the cup, and if he offers

thanks for the cup, the solid, and never offers thanks for a liquid, he must be as ignorant as you think no one could be." —J. N. Cowan, 3-30-'29.

The Bible says, "And he took a cup, and gave thanks." Mt. 26:27. And if Cowan's life depended upon it he could not disprove that Jesus gave thanks for all that he took. Cowan had the chance to meet Harper at Ringling, Okla., after the Chism debate and deny the proposition that "The word 'cup' as used in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid," but he would not do it and show us how smart he is and how "ignorant" Harper is. But he has not the courage to do this, and it seems he would rather show his ignorance in what he is writing to young preachers. He talks about "the only solid in connection with the cup," when the solid is the cup. And again he talks about "the cup while in the container." 2-19-'29. But the cup is the container. His brethren should take up a collection and send him to Littlefield College to learn the rudiments of English. When the Bible says, "Drink the cup," does Cowan think that Harper thinks that they were commanded to drink a solid? And does Cowan think that, in this case, "cup" is the name of a liquid? If so, he is wrong, for "fruit of the vine" is the name of the liquid, and "cup" is the name of a solid, "a cup, a drinking vessel," *poterion* if you please. "Cup" is used by metonymy in "Drink the cup," but this does not signify that "cup" here is the name of a liquid, not by a long way. When you have to argue with a man and teach him English at the same time, it is an up-hill job.

"Nothing would give me more joy than to see you brethren drop the extreme position that when Jesus said, divide the cup among yourselves, he meant by all drinking from the same container, and that it could not have been divided among them otherwise." —J. N. Cowan, 4-11-'29.

To call a position that enables the church to "keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:4)—the Unity that Christ prayed for (Jn. 17), the Unity that enables a child of God to "walk worthy of the vocation" wherewith he was called—and that enables the church to speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent, an "extreme position," meaning a dangerous position, one not supported by the Bible, indicates an imbecility or a perverse mind, one or the other.

If Cowan's life depended upon it, he could not prove that there was more than one cup present on this occasion. And he is bound to admit that the apostles, on this occasion, did do that which the Lord here commanded. And he took a cup . . . saying, Drink ye all of (from, or out of, as given in the translations, just as we have "for" (unto, with a view to, in order to, as given in Acts in the translations) it." Mt. 26:27. "And they all drank of (from, or out of) it." Mk. 14:23. And even Bro. Clark admitted that "The disciples on that occasion all drank from the same container."

But when driven to admit this, they say, What of it? That doesn't teach that we should do it now. And the sprinkler says the same; for he

says, "Suppose I did admit that the apostles immersed, is that any reason that I should do it now? And he says, "No." And the CUPS man says the same thing. So it is not worth while to show what the Bible teaches: it is no authority with them.

"I have not misrepresented what they teach, if their own statements are what they teach, and many of them published in 'The Truth'."—J. N. C., *Ib.*

But you do misrepresent us, however we do not think it intentional, for we do not think you know enough about English to know what we mean by what we say. You need a good course in English before you undertake to argue this matter.

* * * *

"I have never offered anything as proof in debate that I did not have the goods along with me." J. N. C., *Ib.*

Well, let us see "the goods." We have been waiting five long years now, and you crawled out at Ringling because Geo. W. Phillips got behind Fish and Stewart and had them object after we secured the promise of the Tabernacle. You may have goods, but if they are not "shoddy," why do you and your cups brethren refuse to show them?

* * * *

"If I had the word of the Lord for a thing, I would make an argument on it."—J. N. C., *Ib.*

Well, now, we judge this is the very reason why you never make an argument for the use of CUPS in the communion—you do not have the word of God for such a thing.

"We can eat a watermelon cut into slices and call it eating one watermelon, but if we drink the cup (fruit of the vine) in more than one container it is drinking two cups. A very simple rule with which we are all acquainted, if applied, would settle the whole question, viz: The whole of anything is equal to the sum of all its parts. The wine, after thanks are given may be separated into parts and each part would be a part of the whole. And only one whole cup would be drunken."—J. N. Cowan, 3-28-'29.

Cowan, if he could fool the buying public as he is fooling some brethren with his nonsense, should go into the "junk" business, and "get rich quick." Just get a lot of broken stuff—dishes, stoves, farm implements, furniture, etc., for a "song," and then with his wonderful logic (?) just show each customer that "The whole of anything is equal to the sum of all its parts" and get them to believe this applies to his broken stuff, and sell it to them at full price for whole stuff. By his application of this rule of logic the broken table is equal to the whole table unbroken, etc., you see. Nonsense.

And Cowan can not, even if his life depended upon it, by any law of language or logic, put "the fruit of the vine" into "two cups" and then drink both cups and by so doing "drink the cup," or "drink a cup."

And Bro. Trott says he is ready to join the S. S. ranks when it is shown that we can put the contents of the cup into cups and call it "the cup." Cowan with his sophistry, to be where he belongs, should join the class advocates.

If there is anything in Cowan's contention here, why wait till "after thanks" to separate the "wine" into parts if "only one whole cup would be drunken," as he contends, after the "wine" is separated into parts? We say, if this were true, only one whole cup" would be blessed when "separated into parts." Sure. He seems to think this foolishness of his argument—unanswerable argument.

"No one denies the cup being in a container, nor that it was impossible to preserve the cup without a container."—J. N. Cowan, 3-30-'29.

We deny it, brother, for the container used on that occasion was *poterion*, "a cup, a drinking vessel," and it was not "in a container" of any kind, but it was a container, for the context shows that it contained "the fruit of the vine."

* * * *

"D. J. come out of such stuff as that, and help fight such foolishness out of the church. Such foolish contentions are a stumbling block to the world, who know the meaning of english."—J. N. Cowan, 3-30-'29.

Well, a page or two of Cowan's "english" will certainly open the eyes of the "world" to his knowledge of English, and his "screaming logic" would make an idiot blush.

* * * *

"What does 'in the same manner' mean? The way he did the bread was to give thanks and break it in pieces. If he did the cup the same way, then he gave thanks for it and divided it into parts or pieces. This is too much for the one cup extremists." J. N. Cowan, 3-30-'29.

But the Bible language shows that Cowan has no conception of the meaning of the English here, for the Savior gave it to the disciples to "divide," or "share," as most translators render the Greek *diamerisate*, here. *Meta to-deipne-sai*, that is, "after having supped," he gave it to them to share among themselves, saying, "Drink ye all of, from, or out of it." Mt. 26:27. "And they all drank of, from, or out of, it." Mk. 14:23.

"I propose to worship with both parties until I am disfellowshipped by one or both; for I do not know how to choose in the absence of scriptural teaching. When you say, 'I am willing to adopt 'one cup',' you are on dangerous ground. If I should attend a meeting such as you suggest and which ----- suggested some time ago, I should be compelled to say, 'Let the issue be dropped and let the churches decide for themselves,' and that would be of no value. The brotherhood will have to be taught that it is a vain issue and that the only sensible thing is to be governed by expediency in the absence of divine authority. — J. N. Cowan, 3-19-'29.

If Cowan is right, a church is on dangerous ground if it adopts a practice that enables it to "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent." Cowan has refused, time and again, to deny that—A church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the communion service. Is he now ready to deny it? If so, let him tell us. He has not been willing

to deny this, still he says he does not know how to choose in the absence of scriptural teaching. Shades of logic and reason. "Absence of scriptural teaching" and yet can "Speak where the Bible speaks." When a church speaks where the Bible speaks, it has the "scriptural teaching," brother. And you have not dared to insert CUPS here and affirm it with us. You have been tried. Your "expediency" is nothing but "bunk" of the Digressives, both the organ and the S. S. stripe. It is their stock in trade.

The Bible speaks just as plainly on potation, "a cup, a drinking vessel" as it does on baptism, "immersion, submersion." And if one is "a vain issue," so is the other; and sprinkling or pouring or immersion is a matter of indifference. The Bible is silent on sprinkling or pouring here, and so is it silent on the CUPS here. And Cowan has shown that he knows it by refusing to affirm the proposition with CUPS to defend where the Bible speaks. "Let the issue drop." Never, brother, as long as we can find a man who has the courage to meet it, and that is more than we can say of you. You are the one that is on "dangerous ground," not endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit where the Bible speaks.

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

"The Scriptures teach that man is wholly mortal."
Hodges' Last Affirmative

I am glad that Bro. Phillips sees that man's present body is wholly mortal and that the promise of God is that this wholly mortal shall become wholly immortal. Good for you, brother. We are getting nearer in agreement. It is only left for us to learn whether the spirit is part of man, or whether it is wholly of God, and furnished man to enable him to function. This, we believe is the truth about the matter.

We are agreed that man's body is God's. The spirit that man uses is spoken of as man's spirit in some instances and so it is, just like a man's operating on another's capital, it is his as long as the benefactor sees fit to let him use it. And without any impropriety he can say my spirit or God may call it his. Both are correct. It is man's to use, subject to the call of God who gave it. The fiat of God was, "Let us make man in our image." "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Remember this was before any spirit was given him. This text alone proves man in his primitive state is wholly mortal, and we still bear the Adamic body.

After man's creation, God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul or the opposite of what he was before God's spirit entered his nostrils, viz., a lifeless form. Living souls are subject to death. Listen: "Every living soul died." Rev. 16:3. All living souls died at the flood, except what were saved in the ark, all in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. Gen. 7:22. God became impatient with his creation and made a call for His Spirit to return to Him, and every living substance was destroyed, and the Power that gave them life returned to

God. Why becloud the issue by bringing in what the Sadducees believed. I am not a Sadducee nor the son of one. They did not believe in a future life nor angels or spirits. In this respect I am a Pharisee like Paul. Acts 23:6-8. A figure or similitude can be pressed beyond its meaning and spoil the lesson intended to be taught. Paul, in I Cor. 15:37-49, is contrasting the mortal man with the immortal, the terrestrial with the celestial and uses the "bare" grain in comparison with the glorious stalk it produces in the future. Our mortal bodies by the glorious stalk in all its beauty. Our bodies are sown in weakness, i. e., because of sin we die and are buried (planted). "It is sown a natural (wholly mortal) body, it is raised a spiritual body," (wholly immortal) as Bro. Phillips agrees. "The first man is of the earth, earthly (wholly mortal), the second man is the Lord from heaven," and wholly immortal. "And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall bear the image of the heavenly."—Paul. We can not understand how grass grows, to us it is an unfathomable mystery, as is the resurrection of the body. God has promised and we take His word for it, and we are better and happier for such a hope, even if we should fall short and miss the goal.

"Who only hath immortality." I Tim. 6:15. If God only hath immortality, as this text declares, we naturally conclude that no one else has it only as it is given by the Almighty. Mortal man is a subject for immortality, but in his earthly state he is wholly mortal and waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our bodies." Rom. 8:23. "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies." Rom. 6:12. If our bodies are mortal, they are nothing else and hence are wholly mortal, as Phillips agrees. The spirit is an attribute of God and subject to His call and is no part of man.

Last Reply

I have believed and taught all the time that man's body is "wholly mortal" and that man's spirit is "wholly immortal," and I am glad to see "We are getting nearer in agreement," for he now concedes this. And "We are agreed that man's body is God's," as he says. And we must agree that man's spirit is God's for the Bible says, "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" I Cor. 6:20. Then God loaned the body to man as well as the spirit, and both are subject to the call of God.

God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. 1:26. This is enough to show that "man" consists of more than the dust of the ground. In fact we read, "The Lord formeth the spirit of man within him."

Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts 7:59. And Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Lk. 23:46. Did not Jesus have the same spirit in his body at his resurrection? Was it another Jesus when he arose? Will not Stephen have the same spirit in his body at the resurrection? Will it then be another man, and not the martyr Stephen? "The body without the spirit is dead." Jas. 2:26. But the spirit is not subject to death. Mt. 10:28. The

body of Abraham was dead, but his spirit was not dead. Hence God said, "I am the God of Abraham," and yet, as Christ says, "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." Lk. 20:38. And this does have much to do with the issue in clearing it up. And the illustration given by Jesus in John 12:24 and by Paul in I Cor. 15:36-38 if the "grain" is to the point in this issue. They say the "grain" dies, and the Bible says man dies, but this is not to say that all of man dies nor all of the grain dies. And if the grain wholly died, there would not be another except by creation; and if man wholly dies there would not be another except God create one, and there is no resurrection, as the Sadducees reckoned; but seeing that the spirit of man lives on after the body dies, they saw that the resurrection is provided for.

He says, "Man in his primitive state is wholly mortal." "Mortal" means subject to death. "Primitive" means first. And since "death came by sin" (Rom. 5:1), and there was no sin until Adam sinned (Rom. 5:12 and 17), "Man in his primitive state" was not mortal, much less "wholly mortal." His body was not then subject to death, and the spirit is immortal, as he admits.

"God only hath immortality." Yes, for man has a mortal body. Christ took a "body" (Heb. 10:5 and 2:14) for the suffering of death, but now Christ only hath immortality. Phil. 3:21 and Rev. 1:18. The spirit is a part of man and constitutes him after God's image, and individualizes man. Lk. 16:19-31; Rev. 14:13.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

INNOVATIONS WILL NOT DIE OUT OF THEMSELVES

Dr. W. W. Stone.

Through the kindness of Bro. J. W. Tompkins I was permitted to see a copy of your good paper, and I was surprised to read the account of some five or six brethren at Elk City requesting that the debate to be there between Cowan and Musgrave on the use of the cups should be called off for the sake of peace. That certainly is only compromising the truth with error for the sake of peace, which is no peace at all. This is a very dangerous thing to do. You just call a debate off on the use of instrumental music in the worship. Stopping that debate does not establish peace among the brethren by any means. Some brethren are getting tenderfooted when it comes to maintaining the truth, and this shows where they are drifting. I am ashamed of such cowardice among us. I say it is nothing but an indication, perhaps unintentional, that brethren are slipping on degressive ground. Get off, brethren, then you can stand to have the Bible brought forth for proof. I love peace, but I can not afford to sacrifice the truth for it. To obtain it at such a cost

is too dangerous for me. Then I see another paragraph that makes me blush for shame. A brother advised his mother that if the church put in one cup for her to say she would not meet with them. That is certainly very strange advice for any Christian to give. All admit that it is scriptural to use one cup, and there is not a man who is well informed in the Scriptures who does not know that there is not one word in the Scriptures for the use of cups. But it is perfectly safe to use one loaf on the table and one cup, so far as the Scriptures are concerned.

Men certainly manifest a decided weakness when they give such advice, and they are not safe teachers. It manifests a prejudice that may shut us out of heaven, and is very bad for one to entertain.

When the Lord's supper is recorded in Matt., Mark, and Luke, the singular number is used always in speaking of the loaf and the cup. And these singulars are just as plainly given as are those of Eph. 4, where it says "one body," "one faith," "one baptism," "one Lord." Language could not make it plainer. Like Israel of the olden times, the trouble is not a lack of clearness in regard to the will of God, but it is with the people who are constantly hungering and thirsting to be like the nations around them. And the leaders will have it so, for the people want it so.

A plurality of cups has been, as it was with the instrument of music, borrowed from Babylon. These things originated not in the Book but from man. Satan saw that by working them into the worship of the church, he could disturb the peace of Zion, hence they were introduced, and discord has followed. The excuse put forth that to use one cup is liable to endanger health by contagious diseases is a complete give-away of the lack of faith.

To offer thanks for and invoke the Lord's blessing on these as God appointed them and then claim that disease germs are in them and that it is dangerous to partake of them is an open confession of a lack of faith in the Lord. That is no faith at all. He that eateth without faith is condemned already. "He that doubteth is damned if he eat." Rom. 14:23. To ask the Lord to bless these things and then doubt that he did, is to eat in doubt, and this puts one under condemnation. Let the advocates of the cups extricate themselves from their inconsistencies they are in if they can. Brother Harper, here is my hand to you, and my prayers are for you. May the Lord bless you in this fight for the truth.—Palacios, Texas.

LORD'S DAY VS. SABBATH

"Many there are who believe that Pentecost came on Sunday, and that that, for some reason, adds a sanctity to the day. But Pentecost did not come on Sunday; and even if it had, without an express command to substantiate it, that would be no argument for Sunday observance."

Again: "What proof we have on the subject indicates that the Pentecost marked by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit came on the seventh day."

This may look well to Sabbatarians but it does not look well to one who knows the Bible. Even though the Sabbatarian could prove that Pentecost came on the Sabbath, it would be worth nothing to his cause. From Lev. 23:9-21, we learn that Pentecost came on the first day of the week.

Everything that Christ died to establish took place on Pentecost. On this day the Church of Christ was established; the law went forth from Zion; the Holy Spirit came; Peter announced the resurrection and coronation of the Messiah; and believers were for the first time baptized, by authority of Christ, into the name of the Father, Son, and of the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sin, and were translated into the kingdom (See Isa. 2:3; Mich. 4:2; Acts 2:1-4, 38; 11:15; Col. 1:13-14). So this leaves the Sabbatarian out of any claims to the birthday of the Remedial system being on the Sabbath; it was on the first day of the week, the "Lord's day," Rev. 1:10.

Upon this day Christ met with his disciples (John 20:19-29); the church at Troas came together to break bread (Acts 20:7); the Churches were commanded to lay by in store (1 Cor. 16:1-2); David calls it "the day the Lord made," i. e. "Lord's day," (Psa. 118:22-24), and, hence, John "was in the Spirit on Lord's day." (Rev. 1:10)

If I understand Sabbatarians, they, in order to prove that we should keep the Sabbath, make the four following assumptions:

1. The Sabbath was given at creation.
2. It was given to all men, and was to be observed during all time.
3. It was observed on the seventh day of the week.
4. The law of which it was a part has been done away.

We answer these assumptions in the numerical order in which they are given:

1. If it was given at creation it is remarkably strange that no one ever heard of it for 2,500 years afterwards! (Ex. 16:22, 23.) Gen. 2:2, 3 does not help them any, as it does not mention the Sabbath, but the seventh day. No one at that time was commanded to keep it.

2. It was given to the Jews only, and was re-

quired of them because of the fact that they were delivered from Egyptian bondage (Deut. 5:3, 15, 27). No Gentile was ever commanded to keep the Sabbath and this leaves the Adventists out. Poor fellows!

3. No one denies that during the Jewish age, they kept the seventh day.

4. But the law of which it was a part has passed away. This law was given to Israel at Mt. Sinai. (Ex. 20:4-8; 5:3). This law ended at the cross of Christ (John 1:17; Eph. 2:14-16; Col. 2:14; Jer. 31:31-35; Zech. 11:10-12; Heb. 8:7-10; 10:9).

The Sabbath was a part of the law that passed away at the cross, and, hence, we are not required to keep it. If we go back to the law of Moses for justification, we are fallen from grace (Gal. 5:4). The Sabbatarians have already gone to the law for justification on the Sabbath question, hence, have fallen from grace. It is time for us, who are spiritual, to lend them a helping hand, and this we will do as we have time and opportunity.

Jaś. Douglas Phillips.

CONFESSION

Confession, according to Webster, means to admit, to assent to, to concede. "With the mouth confession is made unto (eis, in the direction of, with a view to) salvation." Rom. 10:10.

Confess Whom? And Why?

"That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. Rom. 10:9. "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him also will I confess before my Father, who is in heaven." Matt. 10:32.

In Prophecy

"For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." Rom. 14:11. Again: "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." Isa. 54:23.

When we confess Christ, we assent to his teaching, his law, "the law of faith." Rom. 3:27. In Isaiah we have the word "swear," which means, according to Webster, to make a promise under oath. But in the "perfect law of liberty" the word "confess," to assent to is used. Jesus said, "Swear not at all." But we have confessed to be a disciple of him and to obey his laws. This is taking allegiance to him.—W. D. Adkins.

NOTICE

Bro. N. L. Clark has agreed with me to write a 1200-word supplement to his debate with me for my reply. We shall then run the whole debate in one issue of "The Truth" so all can get it together. Those who want extra copies to save or hand out can get them at the rate of about 5 cents each if they want them, and remit for them so that we can pay the extra printing bill.—Ed.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, SEPTEMBER 15, 1929

No. 18

TO ALL WHO LOVE THE TRUTH

That a eight-page paper can not be published twice a month at one dollar a year and devote all its space to Christian teaching and carry no advertisements, is evident to any one who will take the pains to figure a little. We never figured that it would, but we put the price at one dollar a year to help those who were not able to pay more, and expect to make up by donations any additional funds that are needed, and we have succeeded well in this to a certain measure, having missed but one issue since the paper started.

The paper intends to stay with the Bible teaching for our faith and practice. It has no school or secular College to boost and turn its space to for the brethren all to pay, no big secular printing outfit to run a county paper and dabble into politics, and boost land sales.

We need a paper to boost the church of Christ, the church purchased by his blood, and of which he is the Head, a paper to keep before the people and the church the difference between what man says in religion and what God says, a paper that is not afraid to 'declare the whole counsel of God,' a paper whose editor is not afraid to stand for the truth and not ride the fence to keep on the good side of all regardless of what they teach, a paper, in short, that will "earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints."

Now, if all will help just a little from time to time, there will be no cause to miss a single issue of the paper. So let us all get behind it in dead earnest, and push it to the front, since it is the only paper now that stands unflinchingly for the church of Christ in its New Testament purity and refuses to enter the entanglements that will squander the brethren's money in secular affairs. Let every reader call attention to the paper and hand out your copy or get samples to hand out. Many do not yet know that there is such a paper published. So mention it to others, and ask them to take it. This has been a hard year for us all, but let us keep behind the paper. Now send in your subscription and a good donation for upholding the Truth, Sneads, Fla., and do it now, the funds are needed.—Bob Musgrave.

P. S. I am sending in mine to-day. M.

WANTED

One or more Christian families of the "one faith" to move in here and help us establish a church of Christ true to the Bible in its faith and practice. This is a fine farming country around Lexington. We raise almost everything, and have good seasons. Please write Geo. A. Moore, Lexington, Nebr.

UNITY

There has been much said and written along this line, but a few reminders may not be amiss. Unity is mentioned three times in God's volume as follows: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Ps. 133: "Giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the statute of the fulness of Christ." Eph. 4:3-13.

United is found once in the scriptures. Gen. 49:6. "O my soul, come not thou into their council, unto their assembly, my glory, be not thou united, etc." While these are the only times and places the above words are spoken, however, the principle is taught throughout inspiration. Sectarians are preaching and writing a good deal on "union". (Not unity). Many of our brethren are writing and preaching on "union" too. Such a word as "union" is not in the Sacred writings. But "union" sounds so much like unity that most of the people do not know the difference between them. The artificial or counterfeit is so nearly like the true or genuine that one needs to be a very close observer to discern the difference. We are warned against Satan's "cunning craftiness," Second Cor. 13:13,14. God is the author of unity, but the Devil is the author of union. Unity is oneness, while union is manyness. David said, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Ps. 133:1. This verse teaches that unity causes the Lord's children "to dwell together (not away from each other), hence the oneness. Thus it is "good and pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity." There is no unity or oneness in union. Then why preach union? Paul commands, "Giving diligence to keep the unity (oneness) of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Eph. 4:3. He adds, "Till we all attain unto the unity (oneness) of the faith, etc." Verse 13.

The importance of unity is seen from Rom. 12: 16. "Be of the same mind one toward another, set not your mind on high things, but condescend to things that are lowly. Be not wise in your own conceits." Unity is a command of God. God's commandments are important, therefore we see the importance of unity. Unity will cause Jehovah's people to be "humble, not wise in their own conceits, etc." It takes some effort on the part of the followers of Christ to have and "keep the unity (oneness) of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

"Come brothers and sisters and join in the fight,

Our Saviour and Captain has bidden us
come,
Then on with the armor, and dare to do
right,
Press on in the struggle till Christians
are one."

The conversion of the world depends upon the unity or oneness of God's people. Jesus prayed "that they may all be one, even as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, that the world may believe, that thou didst send me." Jno. 17:21. There is the unity between the Father and the Son. Thus they work together. It is the will of God and Christ, "that they (their followers) also may be in us." This teaching signifies the complete unity or oneness that should exist among God, Christ and their children. The above statement primarily applies to the apostles of Christ, but secondarily to all Christians. Look at Ro. 12:5. "So we, who are many are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another." Eph. 4:16 purports the same. Zephaniah shows that God intended for his people to be one. "For then will I turn to the people a pure language that they may all call upon the name of Jehovah, to serve him with one consent." Zeph. 3:9. The Lord's people are to be one instead of being divided. Hence the necessity of unity. We can not be united unless all of the disciples of Christ speak and hold to "The pure language" (teaching) which Jehovah has given. There is no walking and working together "except they have agreed." Amos 3:3. There are many examples evidencing in the New Testament the unity or oneness of God's people. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers, and fear came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles and all that believed were together (not divided) and had all things common." Acts 2:24-44.

Should the Lord's people "continue steadfastly in the apostles teaching", etc. Now, as they then did we would still be "together." (Not divided). Hence be of "one accord." Acts 5:12. "One heart and soul etc." Acts 4:32.

How we may have and keep the unity of the faith. Paul commands, "Only, whereunto we have attained, by the same rule let us walk." Phil. 3:16. If the children of God would all walk by the same rule (N. T.) we would be a united people. But there is too much union, instead of unity. Let us come to the unity and not union. The Lord commands, "Speaking as it were the oracles of God," etc. 1 Pet. 4:11. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them." Isa. 8:20. Should the above instructions be followed thus God's sons and daughters would be "speaking the same thing and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1:10. Thus it is seen how the unity among the saints of God may be had and kept. The Lord willing, I may take up the other side (division) later.

"The pray'r of our Saviour impels us
move on,
Its words are still sounding. the call of
our King,
And Paul in devotion doth echo the song,
I beg you, my brethren, to speak the
same thing."
—Joseph Miller.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—I just (Aug. 19) closed a short meeting at Loco, Okla., with good interest. These brethren are like Cornelius (Acts 10:33) They want the preacher to stick to the things commanded of God, and not the modern preacher with his "expedients" to justify the organ, the S. S. and the Cups in the communion. Take away the expedient argument and sprinkling falls together with the organ in the worship, the Cups in the worship, the Sunday School, and all the clap-trap of the Digressives. But give them the "expedient" and they can set aside any law of God for they apply it to suit their case. Yes, they set aside anything that God says if they don't want it. Just watch any one of them when he is concerned on the Bible and see how he runs to this expedient to justify his practice. How many cups can they read about in the New Testament? Just one. Everybody knows that. Just one for the church at Corinth. Just one when Christ set his table. But this "expedient" takes in "two or more" or "individual cups"—just what they want.

Now, why will brethren with the Bible in hand, which thoroughly furnishes us, and claim to "Speak where the Bible speaks," leave this Book and go off to "expediency" for their practice? Is it not unbelief to do so? I think so. Just see how Israel went off from God. Just see how they tried to justify their practices that were not of God. Read your Bible and act as God directs, for you must meet his will, which it contains, at the judgment. And I pray God that you may meet God in peace there. The way that is right can not be wrong. Then walk with God by walking by faith, which comes by hearing his word.

—Bob Musgrave.

A PLEA FOR UNITY

David said, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" Perhaps, only those who have had the sad experience of division can really appreciate the force of David's words, and can know "how good and how pleasant it is to dwell together in unity" As I view the sad state of affairs in the Church of Christ today, and see the dear Church of Jesus being torn to pieces over the innovations that are being forced into the work and worship, it makes me sick at heart. How brethren can love those things, that cause division, (even if those things were permissible), better than they love the unity, for which our blessed Savior so earnestly prayed, is more than I can understand.

I just can't understand how brethren, who, even profess to love the cause of the Lord, can afford to contend for the use of societies, instrumental music, classes, women teachers, human

literature as a text, and a plurality of cups in the observance of the Lord's Supper, when they are aware of the fact that such contention will ultimately cause division in the Church of God. It appears to me that there must be something seriously wrong with a man's heart, who will admit that the commands of Jesus can be obeyed without the use of the above things, and then keep up a contention for them to the dividing of God's people. Brethren, can it be possible that you love those things better than you do the unity of God's people? You admit we can worship God without them, then why not give them up that we all might be one? There are brethren, whom I dearly love, who are giving their time to contending for one or more of the above mentioned things, and it pains me to see them sowing the seed of discord among brethren by such contention. May God help us to heed the language of Paul, thus: "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." Rom. 14:19. Why not, brethren?

Submitted in love, Homer L. King

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Aug. 19, 1929.—I closed a good meeting with the brethren at Springdale, Ark., the 11th inst. This was my first effort at Springdale, and while there were several things against us in the meeting, yet we believe that much good was accomplished. The meeting was conducted under a tent in the city park, and resulted in eight being baptized into Jesus. The Church seemed to take on new life, and seemed resolved to do greater work for the Master I am, at this writing, at Palestine, Ark., in a meeting. I go next to Sullivan, Ind., for a two-weeks meeting. Pray for me and mine. Find money order enclosed for subs.—Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Jas. D. Phillips, 225 E. Cleveland Ave., Montebello, Calif., Aug. 15—I closed a meeting last Lord's day evening at Eola, near Elmore City, Okla., with four baptisms and one restoration. The church at Eola is a good one. The Sunday School faction that left them a few years ago are gradually going down, while the sound brethren are gradually building up numerically and spiritually. And under the leadership of Geo. J. Johnson and others they will continue to build up. While at Eola I visited several times with Thomas Nowlen, an old soldier of the cross and one of my father's best friends. Bro. Nowlen has put the Mormons, Adventists, Baptists and other sectarians to flight in Ark. and Okla. He has always stood for "that which is written" in both doctrine and practice. He is in feeble condition physically, has not been able to attend meeting for about four years. And while he is not aware of many departures from the truth, he says he was badly discouraged over the sickly sentimental preaching he heard from "our" preachers during the past two or three years of his public life as a preacher. I am now at Brazil, Ind. Will begin a short meeting here tonight. I leave next week for Spring Hill, W. Va. From there I go to

Charleston, where the Phillips-Moore debate was held, for a meeting. I would like to debate the cup question with Bro. Boore while there; but I predict that he will not meet me again on any question.

I shall return to Calif. in Sept., the Lord willing.

Chas. F. Reese, Yuma, Ariz.—I had a good meeting at Ceevee, Texas. Sixteen in all added and set the church to work, baptized eight, all grown people. I am in a meeting at Mud Creek, fifteen miles from Ringling. Three baptized to date and think more to follow.

EDIFYING ONE ANOTHER

"Last Sunday a commercial traveler, claiming membership in the First Christian Church, Omaha, with our local hotel man (I do not know whether he is anything or not) dropped in on us at the time of worship. I met and welcomed them. We had a splendid meeting, at least twenty or more taking part in the worship, in songs, prayers, reading, teaching and exhortations. All was done unto edifying and all this strictly in accord with 1 Cor. 14. I could but wonder what our visitors were thinking about. The contrast, with what they had been used to, was sharp.

"I heard from it this morning. They said they went home and had a long talk over the matter. They both decided it was scriptural and just the way to develop the young folks. And so the scripture in 1 Cor. 14:24, 25 is once more vindicated. It takes years to build up a church "able to edify itself," but it can be done if Christians have faith. The great trouble all over is that the leaders would rather preach and "my people love to have it so," and so it keeps on in the same old rut. No preacher, "nothing doing."

"I rejoice exceedingly over this little incident. I have given my life to the building up of the church here. I have always had great faith in the teaching in 1 Cor. 14, but this is the most direct and pointed vindication of it that has come to my knowledge. I do wish our brethren generally could get a vision of this and work accordingly. I know we would have more strong churches. I am sure the pastor or preacher system will not build the strong churches."

Remarks

The foregoing from the pen of Bro. D. J. Poynter appeared in the "Leader" a few years ago. It is plain and teaches the plain truth on the subject of mutual edification. Now let the churches train their younger brethren to "go and do likewise." The practice of many churches of letting one man do it all, be he a preacher, elder, or what not, will never develop any workers in the Lord's vineyard.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

FOR "THE TRUTH"

Joseph Miller, \$2.00; Bob Musgrave, \$1.00; Tom Smith, \$1.00; E. Wood, 50c; Abe Smith, \$1.00; E. Landon, \$1.00; W. S. Smith, \$1.00.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

KEEP SWEET

The publisher wants to keep our brethren informed, especially new readers, that the Leader is set for the defense of the faith and it is the publisher's purpose to constantly protect its columns against the discussion of questions of pure expediency or questions that would develop strife or bitterness. There is enough common ground in the word of God for us to occupy our attention so that we do not need to exploit untaught questions or even to question certain harmless practices of the local congregation. We have always contended that each congregation in its own government and we do not want any writer to assail the integrity of a local church. We are all one on fundamental truth and as long as we continue along that line we are certainly preserving the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. It is not right nor fair for any outsider to introduce an untaught question or force a divisive situation in a congregation that is living in peace. Some preachers have been guilty of egregious blunders, sometimes agitating little questions that do not involve the principles of the doctrine nor the scriptural application and demonstration of those principles.

The Leader must be wholly constructive and if any division develops in any local congregation, it must not be through anything that has appeared in the Leader. The local church in the enjoyment of its own freedom is as immune from outside interference as each lawabiding family in a community.

F. L. R.

Remarks

This is F. L. Rowe, publisher of the Christian Leader, a paper that has been fighting innovations with "soft licks" for the past ten years, trying to cater to the preachers and the churches by winking at their departure from New Testament order of things. He has just now turned completely Digressive — "So sweet-spirited, you know," as we used to say of the organ churches. He now gives notice that he wants the churches and preachers to be let alone by all writers for the Leader. And he prates often about "pure expediency," "untaught questions," "wholly constructive," "immune from outside influence," "certain harmless practices," and all such stuff as we have been hearing from the other Digres-

sives for the past fifty years. So the Leader has "gone to the dogs" to the same tune that has been sung by the Sirens of Satan from the fall of man.

"Wholly constructive," eh? Yes, just so you "build," for it makes no difference to the Publisher of the Leader now whether you build "on the rock" or "on the sand." Just be constructive — it matters not to him whether you go to heaven or hell. And it seems with him, from the way he has been turning down writers, that all questions of "faith and practice" are "untaught questions." If a church puts in the organ, no writer can now hit it or the preacher that did it, for "The local church in the enjoyment of its own freedom is immune from outside interference." You must hold your pen from ever hitting any innovation of "the local church," and "Keep Sweet", oh, so "Sweet-spirited," you know. And keep the "unity of the spirit" of the devil by saying nothing about those that "build," whether on the "sand" or not.

God's apostle says, "Untaught questions avoid," and I suppose Rowe thinks that means that we should say nothing about such questions; if not, he has taken the wrong attitude toward such questions. The truth is, the apostle warns us not to practice such things as are "beyond that which is written," as he shows the church at Corinth, 1 Cor. 4:6. And the apostle writes and warns against such practices, not authorized in God's word, but in the "commandments and doctrines of men." Col. 2:21, 22. And we should fight such "untaught questions," and make men be silent where the Bible is silent, by using the Word on them, because they are leading us to destruction, as both Jesus and Paul have shown. Mt. 7; Col. 2; Titus 1:9.

O, you sissy Rowe; you may be able to rake in the money by being a time-server and a money-getter, but the eternal cost is too dear for us to pattern our steps after you. Of some Jesus said, "Verily, they have their reward."

"Common ground." The only "common ground" is "where the Bible speaks, we speak," "A 'Thus saith the Lord' for our faith and practice,"—"All other ground is sinking sand." And you know it. Then why play into the hands of the devil by playing shut-mouth, and failing to "Contend earnestly for the Faith which was once for all delivered to the saints?" Do you expect a "crown of righteousness" by such conduct? If so, you have read the Bible to little profit. Who is the cause of the division—the man that contends for a "Thus saith the Lord" for the "faith and practice" of a church, or the man that advocates, or tries to put upon the church, a practice for which "the Bible is silent," an "untaught question?" The Leader can not any more fight the organ nor any other question on which the Bible is silent. And it would as well take out, for the Christian Standard, the Christian Evangelist, and The Christian Century have beat the Leader to its present goal, Digression.

DON'T FOGOT YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO THE TRUTH.

REFORMATION "FIZZLED OUT"

"Every great religious awakening in the history of the world has begun in individual zeal and personal consecration and fizzled out in an ecclesiastical institution."—James A. Allen, in Gospel Advocate, July 12, 1923.

Yes, every reformation since the deflection of Apostolic Christianity which resulted in the Roman Hierarchy, "the Mother of Harlots" and parent of all apostacies from "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6), has begun "in individual zeal and personal consecration and fizzled out in an ecclesiastical institution," as the Editor says: and, as a rule, the thing is in about as bad a condition, after it has "fizzled out," as the thing from which it started.

And "The Great Reformation of the Nineteenth Century," as the grand Restoration of a century ago was called, is no exception of this rule. How many men have we now in our midst who are to be compared with Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, Walter Scott, Robert Milligan, et al—men who, though mistaken in some things, tried to give the people a clean gospel free from human tradition and speculation, and a clean ministry? What have we now? A bunch of money-grafters, a set of Judases, a set of "pastors," who play the role of a priest and set themselves up as rulers and legislators for the church of God.

Who made the laws that we should have the organ, the S.S., the M.S., the C.E., "two or more cups," as Cowan advocates, or "individual cups," as upheld by Johnson? Yes, who? Did God make them? No. And do we have to obey these human legislators in order to be saved? Nay, verily—we will be lost if we obey them (Acts 2:42; 2 John 9).

Truly, then, the Restoration "has fizzled out in an ecclesiastical institution," almost as corrupt as the Baptist and Presbyterian churches from which the Restoration came.

There are men now in our midst who are crying from another reformation. Brother J. N. Armstrong said in the Living Messages a few years ago:

"Worldly wisdom is fast fashioning the church of our Lord * * *

"I mean by this that the church is headed that way and that it will go on and on till it lands in the ditch. It is doomed, I think. Some of the best preachers and strongest churches we have are in front and they plan no change. The course appeals to the flesh, both of the preachers and of the churches. It is the way of least resistance. So I expect 'us' to travel on, rather gallop on, until we go into denominationalism head-over-heels.

"Finally, a small remnant will, no doubt, draw out and start it all over again, just as it was done in the beginning of the restoration movement. It will grow so bad and the claim to be Christians and only Christians become so hollow and empty that the remnant cannot endure it longer and will turn aside from the great movement to begin again a simple church of New Testament order. Again, the church will go through the testing, the fire of persecution, that they that are

approved may be made manifest.

"The signs, brethren, are all about us. Open your eyes and behold 'the signs of the times.'"

Yes, "a small remnant" have even now drawn out and are starting all over again. And we do not intend to give up in our labors and prayers until God shall again make Jerusalem a praise in the earth. And we ask all those who love Zion and seek the peace and happiness of Jerusalem to stand by us in our efforts to restore simple New Testament Christianity. We have no time to lose. Satan, who transforms himself into "an angel of light" is doing all he can to devour us. And he is doing a good job. And the saddest part is, men who pose as gospel preachers, are allowing him, for "filthy lucre's sake", to transform them into "ministers of righteousness," and Satan is using them to put in the innovations that will damn the ones who submit to them. And these "ministers" are, at the behest of Satan, kicking out the brethren whom they can not "bring to time." So, brethren, get busy, and help us bring about a restoration of the simple gospel of Christ and the N. T. order of things in religion. Yes, do.

—Jas. D. Phillips

ANOTHER BACKDOWN

What is the matter with Johnson and Cowan, who have been challenging for 100 debates with the S. S. preachers? When these S. S. preachers got behind the church to keep from meeting in debate those who stood ready to deny their practice, they were held up as the laughing stock of the S. S. ranks to the brotherhood. And now Johnson and Cowan are resorting to the same tactics of getting behind the church when it comes to defending the practice of the CUPS churches, a practice that neither of them has had the courage yet to affirm is in the Bible. They have both refused time and again to affirm that—A church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use cups in the Communion service. Anybody knows that if they could turn to the Bible for the proof of such a thing, they would not hesitate to affirm it. Neither will they deny—they have both been tried more than once—that—A church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the Communion service. And this shows that they know that the one-cup brethren can turn to the Bible for the proof of their practice.

The CUPS brethren are in the same boat with the organ and the S. S. digressives. While they know that they can not "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" for their practice, yet they will not give it up to maintain the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:4) in the body of Christ, but continuing to walk UNWORTHY of the vocation wherewith they were called. So all digression is again seen to be alike, as has so often been said. And just like the organ and the S. S. advocates, who call these, when questioned for debate, "silly and unlearned questions, too little and foolish to be debated." And thus they seek to avoid debate with

those who can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" for their practice. And again I say, What is the matter with Johnson and Cowan. And the evident answer is, They have the Digressive fever—and they have it bad. They are sick—yes, very sick. And if this Digressive fever is not broken up, these CUPS churches will divide on the CUPS—I mean the non-Sunday School churches that use CUPS will divide, for some of them now have the Individual Cups, which Johnson says break up the communion and Cowan says he will affirm—That the Individual Cups are deceptive and divisive. Bro. J. D. Phillips has the letter where Johnson makes this statement and Bro. T. F. Thomasson, Artesia, N. Mex., has the information as to Cowan's proposition. Yet when in debate with Bro. Harper at Roswell, N. M., where he held the meeting this summer for the Individual Cups church there that does not have the Sunday School, in answering the question, "Do you oppose the use of the individual cups?" he says, "Not if needed." And in answer to the question, "Will you deny the proposition that—The individual cups are deceptive and divisive?" he said, "Couldn't say. It might be true of places and untrue of other places." But Cowan makes no exceptions in his proposition, and Johnson should accept Cowan's proposition like a man, and meet him on it and expose Cowan's false teaching in this matter if he thinks it is untrue of places. In fact Cowan and Johnson, by the logic of their contention on the cup question, are driven to accept the individual cups. If the fruit of the vine alone is "the cup"—one cup—no matter in how many cups it may be held—and they say they advocate the use of one cup, then they advocate the individual cups, for this is yet one cup by their contention. And moreover, they are logically driven by their contention to accept the class system of teaching in the assembly, for by their contention the assembly can be put into any number of classes and yet be just one assembly, as Dr. Trott has pointed out to us.

In one of his speeches at Roswell, Johnson bragged that his debate there would silence Harper on the debate matter of the cups; and when Harper came back, he challenged Johnson to repeat the debate at Elk City, Okla., the last of July, when they would both be there in meetings—Johnson for the CUPS brethren, and Harper for the one cup brethren.

Johnson merely replied that he would consider it. But he left without making any promise to debate again. And the following letter was mailed to him:

Mickey, Texas, June 20, 1929

Mr. Alva Johnson,
Turkey, Texas,
Dear brother:

We will furnish the place at Elk City for the debate to begin there on or about the 29th of July, and the Lord willing I'll be there to meet you. Now let us go 50-50 for 100 debates on the same conditions proposed to the S. S. advocates at Steel Hill, Texas, where you met John M. Rice, we to furnish 50 places and you 50, each appointing three men to arrange for the debates. Please

write me at Haldton, Okla., box 93. I was not surprised that the elder of the Individual Cups church for whom you held your meeting at Roswell should state at the conclusion of the debate there that they were well pleased with your defense, and that they would have you again next year for their meeting, for I am well aware that this is the way you are headed for, and that while Cowan says he will affirm that the Individual Cups are deceptive and divisive, yet he, too, will soon be with them. I ask an early reply,

Kindly and sincerely,
H. C. Harper.

When seen at his debate with Phillips at Centinel, Johnson claimed that he did not get the letter, and said he would make an announcement as to the matter. He put it off until the last night of the debate, and then said that his brethren at Elk City did not want it. Wonderful? No, for they had attended his debate at Sentinel with J. D. Phillips and they did not want it at Elk City, No. indeed.—Ed.

ON ISAIAH 65:8, 9.

"Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it: so will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all.

"And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there."

You will notice the conjunction "and" joins the two verses together. Man has put the paragraph mark before the eighth verse, and the next paragraph mark is at the beginning of verse 11. You may take as you please; but there is no way of getting around the conjunction "and" that joins the eighth and ninth verses together.

Now let us examine the first part of verse 8: Any man that has a smattering knowledge of language, to say nothing about grammar, can see and know that "As the wine is found in the cluster," is not a positive statement. Leave out the word "as" then it is a positive statement. The writer is making a comparison of as to the wine in the cluster as to the seed that is going to be brought out of Jacob, and we all agree that that seed was Christ. Furthermore, we know that that seed while in the loins of Jacob was not the same thing, was in the same state as it was after it passed through the woman, nature's process. So it is with the wine while in the cluster. It is not the same thing, neither is it the same state, as after it passed through the wine-press.

Let us look at it from another angle: Christ did not go into service as soon as he came out of the (cluster) nature's process. He was twelve years old when he went into service, or, in other words, was not fit for God's use—the service that God willed that he should do.

This is not a mathematical or chemical problem, but is a thing that is to be decided by God's holy Word, as the well-known Scripture keys. The Scriptures thoroughly furnish a man unto all good works. I sincerely believe, I also claim and con-

tend that the Lord's supper is a good work, and necessary to the spiritual growth of Christians, and the God of heaven commenced just a little ways this side of creation teaching people what wine was, and he had a purpose in it, just like the first prophecy about Christ. The people had to be taught, and God always commenced just at the right time, and never commanded a man to do anything that he did not place the thing in reach of man in order that he might carry out the command.

Now I will give the Bible definition of wine, and that is the best authority to be had. Gen. 9:20, 21; Gen. 19:32-37. I will just quote Gen. 9:20, 21 and ask you to read the 19th chapter of Gen. "And Noah began to be an husbandman and planted a vineyard: and (you notice "and" connects the two verses together) he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered in his tent." You notice "and" connects the drinking of wine with drunken, just like it connects the 8th and 9th verses of Isa. 65:8 and 9. Some might claim that this was strong or old wine and claim new wine would not make a man drunk. So I will give one more Scripture, Acts 2:13-15. "Others mocking said, These men are full of new wine."

Now probably if Peter had not taken the pains to tell what full of new wine meant, some men might claim they were just full, satisfied, just like being full on water. But old Peter was true to the trust the Lord had placed in him, and he was adhering to the Scriptures which thoroughly furnish a man unto every good work. So he says in verse 15: "These men are not drunken as you suppose." The same word "drunken" as was used in telling the condition the wine placed Noah in, and Lot also. Gen. 19:32-37.

The same word Paul used in telling the condition some of the Corinthian brethren were in after having drunk wine to excess so as in these few Scriptures I have brought to your notice so it is with every other Scripture that mentions wine, it is a thing that will make drunk. Brethren, study this matter in the light of God's truth. J. E. Spear, Box 731, Portales, N. Mex.

Remarks

Yes, the brethren should study this matter. The brother admits all that was contended for in Isa. 65:8, namely, that it is called wine in the cluster. No one has disputed that wine, after undergoing the process of fermentation, contains alcohol, a poison (toxin) and will intoxicate a person that drinks it, as the Bible states. But without this fermentation which produces alcohol, wine will not make any body drunk. And if alcohol wine is "the fruit of the vine," so is vinegar of wine "the fruit of the vine," for the vine produces one in the same sense that it does the other. The truth is that the "vine" produces neither.

He says, "So it is with the wine while in the cluster. It is not the same thing, neither is it in the same state, as after it passes through the wine-press." But is it "the same thing" and "in the same estate" as it comes from the press, that it was in the cluster. An analysis will prove this.

And facts cannot be refuted. Wine as it comes from the press (new wine) will not make anybody drunk (intoxicated), for it then contains no toxin (alcohol), which is produced only by fermentation.

Acts 2:13, "new wine." The Greek is glukus "sweet wine: Acts 2:13." Thayer page 118. The juice that came out without the treading, because it contained so much sugar, would make beastly drunk (intoxicated) when fermented, since the more sugar the more (toxin), poison, when alcohol is produced by fermentation.

That the Corinthians were "drunken," even intoxicated, if you please to have it so, is no wonder, "For each one in eating takes first his own 'supper.'" But most translators render it "filled" in contrast with "hungry."

I may not be much on "language" and "grammar," but I will venture to say from what I know of these that the clause, "As the new wine is found in the cluster," is just as truly "a positive statement" with the "as" as it is without it, for the "as" just puts the statement into a simile, that's all. And the simile extends no further than to the period after the word "all." The introductory "and" at the beginning of the next paragraph simply introduces another thought.

The brother's comparison of the periods of the Christ-like with new wine and fermented wine is absurd. Why stop at alcoholic wine? Was not Jesus baptized at about thirty, when he began his public ministry. Hence the new wine ("through the woman, nature's process), alcoholic wine ("twelve years old when he went into service"), and vinegar of wine (when he was baptized and went into public ministry). Why stop at alcoholic wine? So let all take vinegar of wine, which is as much "the fruit of the vine" as is alcoholic wine? —Ed.

HOW ABOUT IT?

Yes, I attended the Harper-Johnson debate at Roswell, and moderated for Bro. Harper. And if I were to tell you just how I feel about it, you who stand with Johnson for his individual cups "when needed" would likely say, "Oh, well, you are just so full of prejudice you couldn't appreciate nor see those powerful arguments that Johnson made for the cups. "So I shall just drop a hint by saying: If you feel as if Bro. Johnson or any one else can meet Bro. Harper on the cup question, just get behind your man and say you are ready for a discussion. Bro. Harper is calling for 100, he to furnish half the places and you the other half. And if you refuse to do this and get behind your man and endorse him, this will be all the evidence we need that you are convinced you cannot defend the cups.

Bro. Cowan, when here, told me he had been ready for six months to debate the question. Now, why don't you put him up? He won't debate, though, unless he finds a church where all the members favor the debate. I have seen lots of men just like that: they would fight if they knew they had friends enough to stop the fight. Yes, if they could be assured that some one would hold

them off, they would blow, and swing and beat the air like a maniac. Now, please for the sake of those who want the truth, turn your man loose. We'll catch him, never fear. —H. C. Welch, Littlefield, Tex.

HOT SHOTS

"Every time a version of the Bible says 'sing' it excludes the use of an instrument made by man."—A. B. Barrett.

Yes, and every time the Bible tells the church or individual disciples to "teach" it excludes the use of a Sunday School invented by man.

"Anybody that does not believe in debates ought not to present his side of it."—Jas. A. Allen.

Now, some one carry the news to Johnson, who says, "I think it is wrong to debate the cup question." Will Johnson cease presenting his side of the question, viz., It is right to use "two or more cups" on some occasions and "individual cups" on other occasions?

"For four long years I have been evading a discussion of the 'cup' question, though I have been pressed often to debate it."—J. N. Cowan.

"I believe the time is now ripe for the discussion of this (the cups) question."—J. N. Cowan.

Why, then, did you continue to "evade" a discussion of the question when Bro. Harper cornered you at Ringling, Okla., and secured the Tabernacle for the debate? You hid behind Brethren Fish, Stewart and Phillips, in order to "evade" it, did you? You did.

"Truth ever gains, and error uniformly loses, by discussion."—Alexander Campbell.

But errorists, knowing this to be true, "evade" a debate when they know the man to meet them is capable of exposing their error. Hence Cowan says, "I have evaded a discussion of the cup question;" and Johnson says, "I think it is wrong to debate the cup question;" and Duckworth protects them in the Way—Jas. D. Phillips.

"TOO NEAR AND DEAR"

"If they will lay down the Sunday School, and not try to force it upon the brethren, the division will cease over night. Will they do it? Hardly. Their 'Goddess' is too near and dear to them."—R. F. Duckworth, A. W., July 15, 1924.

Good! But what about the CUPS, brother? Just substitute CUPS for Sunday School in your statement and here is what we have:

"If they will lay down the CUPS, and not try to cease over night. Will they do it? Hardly. Their 'Goddess' is too near and dear to them."

Ask Cowan and Johnson if they will affirm that—"A church of Christ can 'speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent' and use CUPS in the Communion." Their answer is, No.

Ask them if they will deny that—"A church of Christ can 'speak where the Bible speaks and be

silent where the Bible is silent' and use ONE CUP in the communion." Their answer is, NO.

And hence there is no issue over what we practice. And if the brethren will leave off their CUPS, "the division will cease over night. Will they do it? Hardly. Their 'Goddess' is too near and dear to them."—Jas. D. Phillips.

COWARDLY

"Moore replied in the Leader to my article in 'The Truth' on 'Cups Not Of Faith,' and I sent in a reply to Moore's criticism, but Rowe refused to publish it, saying, 'The readers do not want a discussion of this unprofitable question.' I know this is untrue. His real reason is, that he does not want Moore to get a whipping on it in sight of all the readers of the Leader."—Ira B. Kile.

PROPHECY FULFILLED

Read and study these scriptures:

1. Jesus born of a woman, Gen. 3:15; Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:22, 23.
2. Born in Bethlehem, Micah 5:2; Matt. 2:4-6.
3. Death of children, Jer. 31:15; Matt. 2:16-18.
4. Carried into Egypt and recalled, Hosea 11:1; Matt. 2:13-15.
5. Anointed as a preacher, Isa. 61:1-3; Matt. 3:16; Lk. 4:18.
6. Preceded by a messenger, Isa. 40:3; Matt. 3:3.
7. Hailed as King, Zech. 9:9; Matt. 21:5.
8. Good, gentle, cheerful, helpful, Isa. 42:1-7; Acts 10:38.
9. Despised and rejected, Isa. 53; Jno. 1:11.
10. Betrayed by a friend who eats with him, Ps. 41:12; Jno. 13:18-26.
11. Sold for 30 pieces of silver, Zech. 11:12; Matt. 26:14-16.
12. Potter's field bought with this silver, Zech. 11:13; Mt. 27:3-10.
13. Ill treated, afflicted, Isa. 53:4-7; Mt. 26:67, 68.
14. Hated without cause, Ps. 25:19; Jno. 15:25.
15. Unfairly tried, Isa. 53:8; Acts 8:32, 33; Lk. 23:4-24.
16. Killed, Isa. 53:8; Matt. 27:35; Acts 3:15.
17. Pierced—nailed to cross, Ps. 22:16; Mt. 27:35; Lk. 24:39.
18. Classed with transgressors—grave with wicked, Isa. 53:9, 12; Mk. 15:27, 28.
19. Divide garments—cast lots for vest, Ps. 22:18; Jno. 19:23, 24.

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

The brethren are to know the next coming of Christ. "For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. . . . But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." I Thes. 5:2-4. The prophecies and revelation should be so studied that we may be able to discern even an approximate date of the next coming of our Lord. Of course that day will find us as Christians ready if we are able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length, the depth and height of love.—W. D. Adkins, Montebello, Calif.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, OCTOBER 1, 1929

No. 19

ARE YOU PREPARED TO MEET GOD?

"As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of the saints."

Recently I heard of a young man who died, and realizing that he was unprepared to meet God in peace, some of his last words were:

"Oh how sad to face the Judgment,
Unprepared to meet thy God."

It must be an awful thing to die out of Christ, knowing that nothing remains for those who die in this condition, "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries!" Heb. 10:27.

I have often thought of the death of the Lord, when He said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Or of Stephen, who said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Or of Alexander Campbell, of whom it has been said:

"An evening or so before he died, Mr. Campbell was watching the glories of the departing sun. Its last rays were streaming through the window directly in front of his bed, and fell upon it. His eyes rested inquiringly upon the quiet glory, and he was told it was the setting sun. 'Yes,' he repeated, 'the setting sun! it will soon go down. But unto them that fear his name, shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings.'—"Lectures on the Pentateuch," page 49.

When his voice had almost entirely left him, and he was struggling for breath, his wife said to him: 'The blessed Savior will go with you through the valley of the shadow of death.' He looked earnestly into her face for a moment, and then with a great effort said emphatically: "That He will; that He will!"—Ibid. And thus the "Great Reformer of the Nineteenth Century" fell

"Asleep in Jesus! Blessed sleep!

From which none ever Wake to weep!"

When we compare the remorse and anguish of soul of those who have died knowing they must soon be cast into hell with the happiness of those who die knowing the Lord will lead them safely "through the valley of the shadow of death" (Psa. 23), it is enough to make us cry out, like the sinful Jews on Pentecost, "What shall we do?"

And when we get into such a state of mind, we will receive with gladness the answer: "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 Spirit."—Acts. 2:38.

Sinner, have you seen your lost and undone condition—without hope and without God in the world? If you have, will you heed the invitation, "And the Spirit and the bride say, come; and let him that heareth say, come, and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. 22:17)? Why not? —Jas. D. Phillips.

"WHAT LACK I YET?"

I shall offer some thought on this question which may be helpful to all who might chance to read them. Mt. 19:16-22. Mk. 10:17-22. Lk. 18:18-23 Informs us of this "young man" having come to Christ and asked, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" This "ruler" was not like most of the people now-days. They think they have nothing "good" to do to obtain "eternal life." This "young man" understood he had to do something (good too) to "have eternal life." Jesus did not tell this man or anyone else they need not do anything, nor couldn't, but answered as follows:

"But if thou wouldest enter into life keep the commandments." Verse 17. (Not just part of them). Christ then names six of the commandments. Verses 18-19. The "young man" readily replied, "all these things have I observed: what lack I yet?" Verse 20. From the foregoing it is seen that this man was moral, peaceable, truthful, respected his parents, very rich, and religious too. Anyone possessing the above qualities now, some would wonder how he should be lacking in anything. Such a character in this age would be esteemed a very fine Christian. But the Lord told him he was lacking and showed wherein he lacked. The faithful in Christ should always tell the people both in the body (church) and out of it wherein they lack. See 2 Tim. 4:1:2. 1 Tim. 5:20. "And Jesus looking upon him loved him and said unto him one thing thou lackest; go sell whatever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou

shalt have treasure in heaven, and come follow me." Mt. 19:20; Mk. 10:21; Lk. 18:22. This "young ruler" like many in our time, thought more of their possessions (earthly or temporal things) than they do of the Lord, hence, are lacking, therefore do not follow our Saviour. Thus we have learned, a person may be moral, peaceable, truthful, have respect for his parents, very rich, and religious too, and not be a follower of the Redeemer. Hence under condemnation as most of the people are. "Many will say to me in that day (the judgment) Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? then will I profess unto them I never knew you, depart from me ye that work iniquity." Mt. 7:22:23:13:14. The Son of God told this man to "keep the commandments," Mt. 19:17, not just a part of them, nor the ones which are most convenient. God has required no more, no less in any age than to "keep His commandments." Those who neglect to keep the commandments are as this rich ruler was—"lacking." Mk. 10:21. Thus we read, "This is the end of the matter all hath been heard, fear God, (not men) and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. Those who fail to keep the commandments will come up lacking as this man did. God's commandments are "righteousness" Ps. 119:172. So to keep the commandments, people must work righteousness. Acts 10:34:35. Those who are "working righteousness are acceptable of God." Mt. 4:4. "Blessed are they that do his what the Lord has said and in the way he has said, hence, "He that doeth the will," etc. Mt. 7:21-24. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Mt. 4:4. "Blessed are they that do his commandments," etc. Rev. 22:14. "Try your own selves, whether ye are in the faith, prove your own selves, or know ye not as to your own selves, that Jesus Christ is in you? Unless indeed ye be reprobate." 2 Cor. 13:5.

We have learned that it is God's will that people should "keep his commandments." Those who do not "keep his commandments" are lacking and will be "weighed in the balances and found wanting." Dan. 5:27. The will of our heavenly Father must be done. Mk. 3:35. Jno. 4:34. Acts 21:14. Not part of it. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all." Jas. 2:10. This "young man" was keeping some of the commandments but refused to keep all. Mt. 19:21:22. He would not help the poor, thus he "stumbled in one point." Therefore became "guilty of

all." Jesus said, "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me." Mt. 25:45. Should a person be moral, rich, a ruler (officer), religious, etc., and disregard the poor or needy he is lacking and therefore "guilty of all." Moreover we are taught that "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever shall do and teach them he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. Mt. 5:19. James would have us understand "to him therefore that knoweth to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin." Jas. 4:17. A congregation might be meeting every Lord's day and have much "laid by in store" and yet be lacking. A congregation may be very large numerically and be lacking in many things. Out of "the seven churches" that were in Asia only two met with the approval of God. Rev. first second, and third chapters. It is hard to find two congregations out of seven now which are following the New Testament teaching and practice. The case of Martha is another example that should be observed. "Martha was cumbered about much serving, anxious and troubled about many things, but one thing is needful", etc. Lk. 10:38-42. She was lacking in one thing. Too many of mankind like Martha, give too much time and attention to temporal things, thus they lack, though they may be religious, and "have great possessions, etc." Peter would have us know that those failing to do the will of God "lacketh these things is blind, seeing only what is near, having forgotten the cleansing from his old sins, wherefore, brethren, give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure, for if you do these things, ye shall never stumble." 2 Pet. 1:5-10. Most people both in the church and out worry over temporal things while their souls are being neglected, but they go on heedless to the warning which God has given in His word. "Save yourselves." "Work out your own salvation," etc. We are commanded, "But seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things (temporal) shall be added unto you." Mt. 6:33. If the soul is taken care of by saving it, God has promised in the above scripture that the body or tabernacle in which the spirit dwells will fare all right. Then each one should be "doing our duty today, let each one stay in his place," etc.

Should more be done than the Lord requires is too much. Should less be done, is not enough. Hence the lacking in either case. Should more than one cup be used in the communion something is then being done which Jehovah has not commanded. Should a congregation or congrega-

tions have the classes or Sunday School they are doing something our Creator has not ordered to be done. Those who have the classes and Sunday School tell us they are "incidentals" etc. But "all the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes, but Jehovah weigheth the spirits." Prov. 16:2. The children of men should not trust in man or men, but in Jehovah. Ps. 4:5.

"Yes, free from all anxiety, in that home above,

Where the aching hearts will rest and feel its part of joy and love,

We are not alone on this ocean,

I see the footprints of our guide and hear him as he speaks,

I will be ever at your side."

—Joseph Miller, 1004 N. Lambert St.,
Brazil, Indiana.

WHAT SHALL WE CALL IT?

There has been a controversy going on for years about what we should call the bread and wine used in the communion service: whether we should call it the literal body and blood, emblems of His body and blood, or simply the body and blood, or a communion of His body and blood. This indicates that the language of Ashdod is still prevalent to some extent.

I am not writing this article to advocate any particular view with regard to this matter, but for the purpose of trying to heal the breach that has occurred in some places. I am sure that this question can easily be settled if we all will be governed by "the law and the testimony," being willing to speak "as the oracles of God," speaking "where the Bible speaks" and keeping "silent where the Bible is silent."

1. The loaf and the cup are nowhere called "the literal body and blood." Christ did not say, "This is my literal body," etc. It could not be the literal body and blood, for His blood was composed of both the white and red corpuscles, while the "fruit of the vine" used in the communion service is not. His body was composed of flesh, skin, bones, etc., while the loaf we use in the communion is not. Robert Milligan makes the following timely remarks:

"In all our attempts to interpret the Bible it is very important to discriminate between what is literal and what is figurative. The whole doctrine of transubstantiation is based on a misconception of a single term, and that, too, one of the smallest words in our vernacular: "This IS my body." The question to be determined is simply this: Does the copula express the relation of identity or merely that of analogy between the subject and the predicate of this proposition? Is it used in a literal or in a metaphorical sense? The Roman Catholic maintains the former, and hence infers that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are transmuted into the body, blood, soul and Divinity of our Lord and Savior

Jesus Christ!" (Scheme of Redemption, page 545).

2. Christ did not say, "This is an emblem of my body." I have examined most of the translations of the New Testament and not one that I have examined calls it an emblem. We have no authority to get up and say, "Brethren we have the emblems here"; "This is emblematic of the body"; "This cup is emblematic of His blood," etc.

But Christ says, "This is my body"; "This is my blood". Paul says, "Is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" etc. I recently asked a good brother, one that is well informed, what position the church of which he is a capable elder took in regard to this question and his reply was something like the following: "We have no trouble over that question. The Bible records Christ as saying, "This is my body," "This is my blood" (Matt. 26: 26-28). It records Paul saying, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" We call it the body and the blood of Christ, or a "communion of the body and blood of Christ." We are satisfied with what the Bible says." So should we be.

Let it be distinctly understood that I am not teaching that the loaf and the cup are the literal body and blood of the Lord; nor that they are emblems of the body and blood. But I teach that they are, in a spiritual sense, the body and blood of the Lord; in other words, "a communion of the body and blood of Christ" (1 Cor. 10:16). If I am wrong on this point, I am willing to be set right as soon as some brother will point out my error.

Let us be content to "speak where the Bible speaks; and keep silent where the Bible is silent," speaking as it were "the oracles of God," thus keeping "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). Beware of the language of Ashdod! —James Douglas Phillips

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas, Aug. 27.—I closed last Lord's day night at Gap, Comanche county, Texas, one of the best meetings in many ways, considering the difficulties that always have to be overcome when a meeting is started without pre-arrangements. We held under a fine elm grove in Bro. Ashbery Rogers' pasture. Had good crowds that increased at almost every service. We ran three Lord's days. Baptized six, three in middle life and three young persons. Had the very best attention and co-operation from all that attended. The Lord willing, I shall be with them in another meeting the second and the third Lord's days in August next year. Say, brethren, let us try more meetings in new places and in the open where folks are not organized to death. Here is my donation to the Truth fund. It is the only paper I know of that now stands on the motto: "Speak where the Bible Speaks." "Brethren, don't forget to mention the paper wherever you go. Many have not heard of it yet.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

"EVIL COMPANY"

There is much truth in the saying, that "a man is known by the company he keeps." Good company will not only improve our manners, but also our minds; intelligent associates are a source of enjoyment, as well as edification. Good company will improve our morals; being learned, they will add to our knowledge, and correct our errors. On the other hand, if we associate with the impure, profane, vicious, and immoral, their impressions will most surely be on us.

Since good manners are a part of good morals, it is as much our duty as our interest to practice in both. The best way to acquire good manners is to form good habits; and the best way to form good habits, is to imitate the examples of those that are good; to be imitators of those that are good, we must seek their company, and shun "evil company." For says Paul: "Be not deceived: Evil company doth corrupt good morals." (1 Cor. 15:33. A. R. V). It matters not how pure one may be, they cannot for long associate with "Evil companions" without becoming infected with some of their vices and imperfections.

Children of course are much more susceptible to evil influences than older persons are. It is the bounden duty of parents to guard children against every form of evil, regardless of who it offends. Many lives have been wrecked, and ruined, and many souls will be lost, all because of some vicious habit contracted in childhood from "evil companions." Many parents allow their boys and girls to associate with those who they know to be morally rotten; this is not only wrong, but very dangerous. Every one should have the courage to cut the most agreeable acquaintance they have when once they are convinced that they lack principle, and the future welfare of their children demand it.

We may be required to bear with their infirmities, yes, but not with their vices. Dear parents: if you desire future happiness for your children, yes and yourselves too, see to it that your children associate only with the pure, intelligent, and good.

Neither deceive yourselves by thinking that your sons and daughters will be immune to evil and degrading influences and vicious habits, merely by pointing them out and warning them against such things. Teach them early in life to, "abstain from all appearance of evil."—1 Thess. 5:22.

Shun 'Evil company' yourselves and teach your children to do likewise.

From impure, germ laden air, we take diseases; parents knowing this to be the case, will have their children to avoid contact with those who are known to have some contagious disease; and if their children are accidentally exposed, preventive treatment is given at once; and those who have been exposed are carefully watched; then if symptoms develop indicating that they have contracted some dangerous disease, medical aid is procured to combat it until every vestige of it is eradicated from the system if possible. Let no one think that the contagions of the soul are less than those of the body. They are greater; because they sink deeper, come on more unsuspectedly, and the symptoms are not so easy to detect.

Parents should guard their children against contagions of the soul (sin and vice) as carefully as they do the body. There is danger in "Evil company;" Hear Paul advise the youthful Timothy: "Flee also youthful lusts:—Keep thyself pure." etc. We cannot deny that from "evil company" comes vice and imperfections. Therefore if possible, avoid the company of all profane, impure, immoral, and vicious persons; for no vice is alone, and all are infections, dangerous, deadly.

—Ira B. Kile, Sisterville, W. Va.

A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

"Here is something from one of our best Bible scholars: 'Speaking of the cup in the original institution, our Lord said: 'All of you drink (Greek) out of it.' This makes it a matter of conscience to all who know what the Bible teaches."—Jesse P. Sewell in his tract, "A Way That Is Right and Cannot Be Wrong."

Yes, this makes it a matter of conscience to all who know what the Bible teaches—as much so as "Buried with him in baptism" (Rom. 6:3) makes immersion a matter of conscience to all who know what the Bible teaches on the subject of baptism.

George W. Phillips told the truth when he said, "Any man with a conscience can not defend the Sunday School." And Bro. Sewell truly says, "Drink ye all out of" the cup, makes it a matter of conscience to all who know what the Book

teaches on this matter. It is not a matter of opinion—it is a matter of Scriptural fact.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

BARR-FENTER DEBATE

This Debate was held at Unionpoint School House, 8 miles north-west of Jacksboro, Texas. J. Thos. Barr Affirmed: "It is scriptural to arrange Folks in Classes in the private assembly of the Church to teach the Word of God before or after preaching or the Lords worship of the Lord's day supper, using Woman to teach two or more of these classes. A. W. Fenter denied.

The second day, I affirmed: "It is unscriptural and sinful to arrange folks in classes to teach the Word of God before or after preaching or the worship of the Lord's day supper using woman to teach two or more of these classes. J. Thos. Barr denied.

We were to have two sessions a day, two hours each and I did announce it that way, but Barr arose and called the day session off. I spoke up and said if you call the day session off you will do it on your own accord, and he did call it off. Everything went off nicely; we needed no moderators. Brother I. T. Hays did keep time for us both. This will give the readers an idea of the progress of the Debate.

—A. W. Fenter.

REVIEW OF "CONSIDERATION" In Leader of August 6

In this article, Bro. Hutson says some mighty good things and we want to heartily commend them to the consideration of the whole Church.

He says some have the idea "That we must just preach an affirmative gospel, and let every thing else drift without opposition." This is true indeed, and if Bro. H. had said: "I am one of this class," he would have made a confession that is good for the soul.

"No opposition should be made to the truth—any part of it merely because some parties who are not following with us teach or practice it. So far as they teach or practice the truth they are right. Only what is absolutely wrong and misleading should be condemned. And this unpopular work must be done, and let no vain objector obstruct this much needed work. If we are to have a distinctive church of Christ, and a pure worship, and scriptural work, the people must not only be taught the truth but warned against the opposition."

These great truths I have been trying to impress upon the brotherhood ever since I have been able to write at all, as one who loves the pure word of God.

If Bro. H. has come to this conclusion, then I

want to take him by the hand and bid him God speed. But let us see. Has he? Thou that condemnest innovations in the denominations, dost thou uphold them in the church of Christ?

There are at least three things, (inovations) that our good brother upholds, and not only that, but he says very ugly and unchristlike things about those who oppose them.

But you see those fellows who advocate societies, instruments in the worship, etc. have no scripture for their action, and therefore they get "riled" when we ask them to give us chapter and verse.

So we will mention the three inovations above referred to, and see if Bro. H. gets "riled" or if he shows a longsuffering spirit, and uses the "doctrine" referred to by the Apostle.

1. The modern practice of selecting and appointing elders, and deacons. Is it the Bible way, or man's way, introduced about 1855 to 1860?

2. The "Pastor system" introduced in the last twenty years from the denominations. Will you please give the long suffering "laity" a few verses to justify it?

3. The latest, but by no means least, departure from the plain teaching of Christ and his Apostles to the Gentiles, the desecration of the Lord's Supper by changing it to a fashionable feast, by introducing cups galore.

Now we do hope and pray that our good brother above, or some other consecrated soul will just take these things up one at a time, and without malice in his heart, tell this poor old "hobbyist" and all these other "ignoramuses" who can't find these things in the Bible, just where to find them. You know, "Correction is grievous to him that forsaketh the way; and he that hateth reproof shall die." Prov. 15:10; "Take heed to thyself and to thy teaching. Continue in these things; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and those that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4:16.

Yours for the teaching of Christ,
Dayton, Tenn., Route 5 E. A. Lowry.

NOTICE

We have had almost no papers left from the regular mailing for the past few months, but we are hoping to be able to print a thousand more before long, and this will give us some copies to use as samples. Brethren will please renew for next year as soon as possible, and send in a good list of subscriptions as often as you can, and let us not miss an issue next year.—Ed.

Brother Harper—You will be glad to hear that the church at Spencer, Indiana, has given up the plurality of cups in the communion and are now using one cup, "the cup." And I understand that East Unity has done likewise.—Homer L. King.

Dear Bro. Harper: I see you are publishing a nice Christian paper that is striking the Bible teaching so far as I have noticed. Our Brother E. A. Brown gave me a few copies of the paper which I read with much interest, and I am about

to believe that your publication comes nearer the truth than "The Apostolic Way," which has stood so firm for truth and fairness in its past history. Let us hope that it may renew its former diligence. I see Bro. Jas. D. Phillips, of 225 East Cleveland, Montebello, Calif., is saying some very good things in the paper. He is on the right side continually, it seems. May the Lord continue his unbound mercy to you, and may we all in our laudable efforts to combat the good combat of faith come off more than conquerors ere the end comes is my prayer.

Herewith find enclosed one dollar for my subscription to "The Truth."

Yours in the one hope,
B. M. Massengale, 1515 E. Belknap St.,
Fort Worth, Texas.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Sept. 17, 1929.—I closed a series of meetings with the faithful brethren at Palestine, Ark., Aug. 25., which resulted in two being baptized into the "one body." While there I made my home with Bro. Ryan-Bennett, and was well treated. From Palestine, I went via home to Sullivan, Ind., where I assisted in a meeting embracing three Lord's days, closing Sept. 15. If I accomplished very much good, I could not see it. Troubles of a personal nature hindered the meeting very much. Had it not been for these troubles, I am certain that we would have had a very fine meeting. The attendance was all that could be expected. Visible results were three placed membership, and some of the personal differences adjusted. Bro. J. D. Phillips, on his way from W. Va., to Calif., came by Sullivan; remained the last week of the meeting with me; and coming on home with me, remained a few days before going on to Calif.

Before this reaches the readers of The Truth I expect to be in New Mex., near Artesia and Roswell, in some meetings: Here is a list of subs. for The Truth. Come on, brethren, let's reach the goal—One thousand new subscribers!

DID YOU DO IT?

Do what? Why, send in and get some of those excellent tracts on "Building According to the Pattern." Address T. C. Hawley, 218 So. Olive St., Santa Paula, California, and enclose postage for as many as you wish at 3c apiece.

Chas. F. Reese, Yuma, Arizona.—I left home in July and preached a few nights at Melrose, N. Mex. From there I went to Clevee, Texas, and began a meeting Tuesday night, the first week in August. The Baptists had just closed a meeting and it was not long till I had a good interest and things were warming up. So the Baptist preacher wanted to preach sermon about with me. He lasted just one night. And that is the way all sects last when they get up against me. I baptized eight and set the church to work according to the New Testament pattern. They now have eighteen to keep house for the Lord. Went from there to Mud Creek, Okla., and had a good meet-

ing. Baptized seven. The brethren here are all in unity with the Bible. Here I met Bro. Munrow of Duncan, Okla., a fine preacher and true to the Bible teaching. Call him for meetings; he's the one you need to preach the truth. I next went to Ryan, Okla., and preached a few nights at the Holiness tabernacle. I preached on sanctification. Had a large crowd. I had a thousand of this sermon printed and distributed in every home, so I got the truth before the people. I got next to the Sunday School folks, too. I was called to Ray's Chapel, eight miles out, to preach on the cup question. The trouble here was settled and the brethren now worship in the Bible way. I went from there to Mountain Creek, Okla., and preached a few nights, but it rained most of the time. However these brethren are true, and the rain did not stop them from going to meeting. They treated me nice, and asked me to come again. When I come, they know the truth will be preached. From here I went to Wichita Falls, Texas, where I preached a few nights. The church here is in fine shape now, having gotten rid of the Sunday School and the cups digressives. On my way home I shall stop at Reton, Texas, and preach a few nights. My wife's father and mother, 86 and 84, live here, and they want to hear me preach one more time, at least, the Lord willing. Now let all brethren in Arizona, New Mexico, and California address me at Yuma, Ariz., route 5, if they want a meeting.—C. F. Reese.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—I closed the meeting at Lorenzo, Texas, after a very enjoyable time with these brethren. I knocked down all the cob houses put up by the cups advocates, but they will have to fall, for that are not on the rock, but on the sand, as we read in the seventh chapter of Matthew, not being in the "saying" of Christ. The brethren here stand firm for the Truth. I am doing my part to get that THOUSAND subscribers for "The Truth" by the first of the year. Let us make a strong pull together now. I am glad to see the brethren are laying aside the cups, which are causing division, and if they would "mark" them that are causing division by advocating them, as some are doing, the church could stand together. I am now at Portales, N. Mex., for a few days with the faithful brethren who are opposing the Sunday School and the cups element here. I am to be at Somerton, Ariz., the first Lord's day in Oct. I want to send in 100 subscriptions before the year closes for the only Bible paper I know of—"The Truth."

FIGURATIVE, SAYS JOHNSON

Bro. Alva Johnson told us in his debate on the cups with Phillips he, Duckworth, and Cowan all believed in one cup for the Lord's table; but the table is not a literal table, the cup is not a literal cup, the kingdom is not a literal kingdom, Christ is not a literal King,—all figurative. Surely Johnson is figuring a whole lot just to try to get rid of the "cup"—just one cup—mentioned by

Christ and Paul, that contained "the fruit of the vine." Just think of it—a figurative King (and a figurative God, too, I suppose.—Ed), a figurative kingdom, a figurative table, a figurative cup. And why not a figurative "fruit of the vine" and a figurative communion? Bob Musgrave.

TURNING ON THE LIGHT

¶ Bro. J. N. Cowan and Bro. Alva Johnson teach that "the fruit of the vine" is "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:27) and that the "container," as they call it, which is "Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer, page 533), has nothing to do with it. But this is a mistake as the following will show:

"And taking the CHALICE, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this."—Matt. 26:27, Douay Version.

"CHALICE, n. (fr. OF., L. calix cup.) 1. A GOBLET; esp. the CUP used in the Lord's Supper."—Webster's Secondary School Dictionary.

"GOBLET, 1. A kind of CUP without a handle; any WINE CUP."—Ibid.

I have spelled "chalice," "goblet," "cup," and wine cup" with capital letters, in these quotations, for the sake of emphasis.

Now, according to Matthew and Webster, Christ took a chalice, a goblet a wine cup, the cup used in the Lord's Supper, a literal cup. And Goodspeed's translation corroborates this fact, for it reads, "a wine cup." And he translates where the Common version has "Drink ye all of it," Drink ye all from it." And "Of means from; from means out of."—The Lexicographer's Easy Chair of The Literary Digest. And the Emphatic Diaglott, reads, "out of." And it is backed by good authority—Thayer and Young.

So "there is no footing here for the evolutions of the theological skater," who says that "Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel," has nothing to do with "the cup of the Lord."—Jas. D. Phillips.

FRIENDS OR ENEMIES—WHICH?

It is possible, and quite probable, that there are many professed church members unconscious of the fact that they are the enemies of the gospel of Christ. We do know, that there is a class, who are "the enemies of the cross of Christ." "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ.—Phil. 3:18.

We are living in a "fast age," and many church members have joined the world in its mad rush for pleasure; and some even seem to be trying to outstrip the world, doing things that many honest aliens would be ashamed to do. The open disgrace to the teaching of the Bible, in regard to "worldly lusts," is working a hardship on the faithful preacher of the cross. The preaching of the cross, (gospel) has but little influence with the unsaved in a community, where the majority of the church members have gone "pleasure mad and speed crazy." In many instances the poor, underpaid, preacher is blamed and criticised for not

winning more souls for Christ; whereas the "jazz crazy," "fun loving," "worldly minded," "pleasure seeking," members are wholly to blame. In many places there is no soul saving work being done, and the true worship of God is so perverted by some, that the world looks upon it with disgust! We often see young people, yes, and older ones too, go to the place of worship on Sunday morning; and then spend the rest of the Lord's day in riotous living. "Excursions," "swimming parties," "picnics," "birthday frolics," and etc., are the most popular forms of amusement for Lord's day afternoons. And through the week some will even patronize the "picture shows," pool room," "dances," "card games," "ball games," and "prize fight," if it is not too far away; in which case they get it over the "radio." All these are "works of the flesh," and condemned by the apostle Peter, as "revellings," "banquetings, and "abominable idolatries."—1. Pet. 4:3.

While the demarkation between the church and the world is probably not quite so plain now as it was then, nevertheless if one will live up to what the Bible teaches on the question of worldly amusements he will still be spoken against, yes, often by church members at that.—"Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you."—1. Pet. 4:4. Says Paul: "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth."—Col. 3:2. But many would have this read:—"Set your affection on things on the earth." And some will even try to put up the "devil's" own argument that: "when we go to meeting on Lord's day we have done all the Lord requires, and can do as we please the rest of the week." But Paul says, "be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." Gal. 6:7,-8. And the beloved John says, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."—1. Jno. 2:15. Even in Paul's time the world had its attractions, for he says, "Demas hath forsook me, having loved this present world." If Demas were living in this present time he would have lots of company! But I am of the opinion that Demas actually quit the church and went back to his place among the world; the churches would have more influence for good, if those who have "given themselves to pleasure" would follow Demas example and go back where they belong. Some, professing themselves to be Christians, act as though all the pleasure they ever expected to get would be in this world, and if they were to miss any of it, it would be an eternal loss.

Truly has Paul said: "But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth."—1. Tim. 5:6. Of course this was said concerning widows, but it applies to all classes, "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world."—Titus 2:11, 12. (see also James, 5:5) "Ye have

lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter." No wonder Paul "wept", when he predicted the "End" of the enemies of the cross of Christ: "Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."—Phil. 3:19.

—Ira B. Kile, Sisterville, W. Va.

"US YOUNG FOLKS"

Question: Is it wrong to have bobbed hair?

Many say it is wrong, while others think it is all right.—G. L.

Answer: Good brethren differ on this subject. We know that long hair is scriptural, but we also know that short hair for working girls is convenient and economical. I would say that much depends on your mental attitude. If a girl bobs her hair to follow the styles she is doing wrong. If she spends from \$10.00 to \$15.00 every few months for a permanent wave, she is doing wrong. But if she can have her hair short for convenience and is modest in her deportment, I don't think she is violating any scripture. But bobbed hair for married and older women who are "keepers at home" is not becoming.—F. L. Rowe.

Comment

The above question and answer, was published in the Christian Leader, July 30, 1929.

Under the heading, "Us Young Folks," F. L. Rowe says: "This corner in the Leader is intended for the use of our young people in which they can ask any proper question that can be answered scripturally or by scriptural deduction."

Now take your Bible, turn to 1. Cor. 11:14-15 and read: "Doth not even nature itself teach you?" Yes, indeed; both nature and nature's God teach you "that if a woman have long hair it is a glory to her." When she cuts off her hair, she cuts off her glory. Just think of it, a girl, a Christian girl, with her glory cut off!

Whew! If God had said nothing on the subject, we might safely conclude that it would be all right to use our own judgment in the matter; but God has spoken, and what He says must answer the question. "Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered . . . Her hair is given her for a covering. Then to pray uncovered is to pray without her hair (verse 5), and this dishonors her head. The Holy Spirit says, "If a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her" (1 Cor. 11:15). Yes, "long hair is scriptural;" Rowe admits that it is; and then he says: "But if she can have her hair short for convenience and is modest in her deportment, I don't think she is violating any scripture." But she does, and he knows it. Now hear him again, "I would say that much depends on your mental attitude." Sure! "The flesh lusteth (warreth) against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would" (or wish). So, then, those who cut off their hair, follow the lust of the flesh; they are not "led of the Spirit," to cut off

their glory; but by their "mental attitude." See! "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh;" (carnally minded) "but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." (spiritually minded). "To be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace."—Rom. 8:5-6.

"This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh." (Gal. 5:16). But says Rowe: "Short hair for working girls is convenient and economical."

What if it is! So are overalls, knickers, and shirts. And since she goes to meeting with her glory cut off, let her go in her overalls, or knickers, according to her "mental attitude;" Better "keep sweet" Bro. But, listen! "married" and "older women," Rowe says that for you: "bobbed hair is not becoming." No mom,—it ain't "mental attitude" or "no mental attitude."—Possibly, more anon.

Ira B. Kile, Sisterville, W. Va.

FROM THE HOOSIER STATE, GREETING

A few words to the readers of the Leader to let you know we are still among the living and are still contending for the faith (Jude 3) the one faith that comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17). Not the so-called faith that comes by the think-so's of men (1 Cor. 8:2). That kind of preaching makes some people feel that God has pardoned their sins when they have not obeyed the Lord (Rom. 6:16, 17, 18), and been made free from sin. Sinners must obey the gospel in this life or they will see their mistake at the judgment day (II Thes. 1:7, 8, 9). There will be no second chance (John 5:29), as Pastor Russel taught (Jer. 10:21). You see Christ taught, do good and live, and the pastor said, you sinners will get a second chance. But the pastor is a dead man now; died suddenly (Prov. 29:1), poor fellow; but Jesus says, I am alive for evermore. (Rev. 1:18). Who shall we believe, Jesus or the pastor? I believe the Lord.

I have no love for the pastors and the pastor system. I will tell you some of their system. (You know we have the pastor, too.) They preach only 30 minutes and they are getting all the churches into the 30 minute system. The city churches think it is fine and the pastor knows it is good. Shorter hours and bigger pay is the cry of the day. From whence come the 30 minute sermons, anyway? From the same place the pastors came from, the sects, not from God. Oh, the old fogies that preached two hours. How long did Paul preach? (1 Cor. 11:1; Acts 20:7, 8, 9). Thirty minutes? No; and we must follow him (Phil. 4:9), and not men with their good words and fair speech (Rom. 16:17, 18). They will deceive us. When Mr. Campbell began in 1809 preaching the word, and not think-so, he saw that the pastors had got the people into ignorance (Rom. 10:1, 3). So he began from two to three hours preaching the word of God and he opened the people's understanding that they might understand the scriptures (Luke 24:44, 45), and the people began to obey the gospel and churches sprung up everywhere.

THE TRUTH

If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, OCTOBER 15, 1929

No. 20

THE COMMUNION

"They have lost cite of the juncture of minds instead of mouths. Our minds are all joined in partaking of the fruit of the vine, whether our mouths are touching the same drinking vessel or not. I don't suppose they commune with the Lord at all now, as he is not here to put his mouth on the container with them. And if the Lord is not in the communion, I don't care to have anything to do with it. Talk about 'hersey,' I call that hersey of the rankest type, and absolute foolishness to boot."—J. N. Cowan, 3-30'29.

Communion is joint-participation. Cowan has communion without the common, and joint-participation without the joint. His communion is "the juncture of minds." He has turned Quaker. No bread and fruit of the vine need be used. And best of all each can stay at home and commune with Christ and the church. How foolish to "come together to break bread?" Just have the time set, and "our minds" joined, then each eat the bread and drink his cup at home—why not?

Now don't laugh. Cowan is simply trying to avoid "absolute foolishness" and "hersey of the rankest type," you see. And these are the mighty, more mighty, most mighty "arguments" he has had in reserve for Trott and Harper for "five long years." No wonder his friends and some churches have been so frantic in their efforts to uphold his "prestige" by shielding him from meeting Trott or Harper. How sad that the Son of God "lost sight (sight) of the juncture of minds instead of mouths", and told his disciples all to eat of the same loaf and drink out of the same cup. And how silly in Paul to note the fact that in "communion" they partake "of that one loaf" (1 Cor. 10:17) and "drink this cup", the "cup of blessing which we bless." (1 Cor. 11:26) And the only way they can "drink this cup" is to drink what "this cup" contains. They can not "drink this cup" by drinking what these cups contain. Cowan is the man that has been teaching our young preachers how to defend the cups, but he needs teaching himself. Why not put him under Trott or Harper awhile?—T.

A man who will not "fight" in defense of, and for the advancement of, what he believes is right, is not worth his salt.—James A. Allen, Ed. G. A.

Yes, this is true; and the church of Christ, now like sectdom, is full of preachers and "journals" that are not worth their salt.

When John R. Clark, a noted Baptist minister, and Prof. A. G. Freed, a Christian minister, conducted a Scriptural investigation . . . the Baptist

preachers of Nashville, with one or two exceptions, opposed such an investigation and discouraged their people from attending . . . Out of that immense audience at the discussion, only six Baptists were present.—G.A.

Well, this makes one thing of the Sunday School side and the CUPS side of the discussions we are now having with those who advocate such things in the church of Christ—"their people" are conspicuous by their absence, and most of them oppose such "such an investigation."

THE FIRM FOUNDATION STANDS SURE

"Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His. And let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." (2 Tim. 2: 19.) And here we may find our consolation and our safety indicated. Though Hymeneus and Philetus, and many others, may err and overthrow the faith of some, yet the Divine Foundation remains sure! And that Foundation is indicated in 1 Cor. 3: 11, in these words: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And it is further indicated in these words: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever." (Heb. 13: 8.) Therefore we should "not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." (Gal. 6: 9.) "But he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved"—is another consolation.

Daniel Sommer.

Yes, the "foundation of God standeth sure" at all times. Though Editor Lappin may err and "overthrow the faith of some"—by teaching the use of instrumental music in the praise service; though Editor Allen may err in teaching the use of the Sunday School as an institution through which to teach the word of God; though Editor Moore may err in teaching that Elders may "shake in" the sects on their baptism; and though Cowan, Johnson, and Duckworth may err in teaching the use of Cups on the Lord's table.—I say, though all these men may err and "overthrow the faith of some"—"the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, 'The Lord knows them that are His.'"—Jas. D. Phillips.

Bloomington, Ind., Sept. 23, 1929.

Dear Bro. Harper:

I am writing you a few things that have come into my mind, and I hope you may set me right. I have been a reader of "The Truth" about six months. Of course, I like to read the paper. I enjoy reading all papers that try to represent the Church of Christ. But you teach so many peculiar

things and so much of a hobbieist on them that I don't see how you can have any supporters. About all in "The Truth" is the one cup question, and I have begun to wonder if you endorse a certain kind of cup or must it be a common tin cup? Can it be without a handle? I guess according to your teaching a glass would not do as it would not be a drinking cup, but a drinking glass.

I am afraid that according to the writings of "The Truth" there will be very few saved as several will fail to cross their t's and dot their i's. If "The Truth" would give us more good old gospel sermons and writings, it would have more readers and supporters.

I see in the Sept. 15 issue where Bro. Musgrave says that an eight page paper can't be published twice a month for a dollar a year without worldly ads. If you or he do not know it, the Apostolic Review, a sixteen-page weekly and a paper without ads. and a paper published for and by members of the Church of Christ has been published during the high prices of the World War and since for \$1.00 and \$1.50 a year. In a run of a year "The Truth" would be only one-fourth as large as the Review and the price is two-thirds. It looks like you ought to make some money unless the publishers of the Review is losing on every issue.

I am sending you a copy of Apostolic Review with an article on page 14 by a woman writer. I would like to see an answer to it by you in "The Truth". Hoping to see your article in "The Truth" soon or to hear from you personally, I am your brother in Christ, Noble Brinegar.

Reply

We thank you, brother, for the article from the Review. And if you can get them to review our reply to the article and publish it, we shall be glad to reply to other things in the Review for their review. In this way by a thorough investigation of matters with the Bible as the standard of proof, we could arrive at a judgment that would separate the truth from error.

Did the Review become a hobbieist when it launched its broadsides against the organ, the Missionary society, the "Our Pastor," and the Colleges that were robbing the churches of funds for their support that should have gone to the support of faithful men who were driven from the evangelistic fields for lack of support, and were turning out a swarm of "Pastors" to feed on the churches and eat their substance? No, a thousand times, NO. The pity is we did not have a thousand such papers to stifle these digressions from the N. T. church in their infancy, and preserve the body of Christ, the church, from division and derision before a gazing Sectarianism, Catholicism, and Infidelity, which were leading on to "destruction."

My father was baptized in Western Pennsylvania by Alexander Campbell, and I have been over every step of the "Restoration Movement."

Some preachers and papers have died martyrs rather than surrender to the digressionists who demanded "silence, no discussions, no mention of these things," when the digressions were brought it. Most of the preachers and papers surrendered

for "filthy locre's sake" or for popularity, or because they lacked faith to fight to a "finish." And the fight is still on, and will ever be on. Who shall be able to stand? When the demand was made not long since that the Review play shut-mouth, it fell in line. When the demand was made on the Leader, it was promptly heeded, and when the demand was made on the Apostolic Way, the "catering to it" took immediate effect. And the Firm Foundation was "whipped" into line" twenty years ago. And God only knows whether "The Truth" shall be able to stand; but we expect to "fight the good fight of faith" as long as we can keep our heads afloat, even with the sacrifice of all that we have or hope to be with the help of God and his faithful, sacrificing children—all for the church, being our motto, the blood-bought church.

I told Daniel Sommer several years ago when I reviewed him on the "baptism question" that "I never let the bug-bear 'hobbieist' frighten me from the truth." And I still say the same thing. We have stressed the "cup question" because there was and has been a propaganda put forth after the muzzling of the Apostolic Way to break the churches away from using one cup in the communion. And these digressives have resorted to the same tactics that the organ digressives did. They don't believe it is right to debate, and it is such a "little thing," and just "your little bunch" will be saved, and last, but not least, for it was the only real "argument" they had—ridicule, as the brother here does, or it may be his actual ignorance of the meaning of cup. Why not consult a dictionary and learn the meaning of words?

"More readers and supporters." Yes, God's apostle said, "Having itching ears, they shall turn away their ears from the truth and be turned unto fables." So we do not expect many. I suppose the truth does look "peculiar" to those who have been fed on "fables". Just take hold with us, brother, if you think we do not have the truth on the "cup question" or any other question. The paper is open to you, as it has been to the leading advocates of the cups, but they have turned as "Sweet-spirited" as the organ and the Sunday School advocates are,—too sweet to discuss such "little things." Nothing is little that enters the worship of God.

When you say the Review does not run "ads," you do not state the truth. And they have had their "Review Fund" to bring in thousands of dollars by donation. And the paper used is of the cheapest. And they have been years in building their list. Our list is small yet, but has just about doubled in the past year. We could print as many again papers at about one-third additional cost.

—Editor.

TURNING ON THE LIGHT

Bro. J. N. Cowan says that the word "cup" (Matt. 26:27, "He took a cup.") is the same as "the fruit of the vine," Matt. 26: 29, but as a matter of truth "cup" is the name of the solid that holds the liquid "fruit of the vine." And hence Thayer says of the Greek word translated "cup," *Poterion* a

cup, a drinking vessel. (p. 533). And he tells us in harmony with the Greek scholarship of the world to-day that **poterion** is used properly, that is, literally, in Matt. 26: 27, Cowan and others to the contrary notwithstanding.

And in such expressions as "drink this cup" and "drink the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:26, 27), the word "cup" is used by metonymy. And this again shows that Cowan is wrong in saying that the "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same, for "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220. And in giving an example of this kind. (there are more than ten kinds) of metonymy, he says, "3. Container and the thing contained; as, The kettle boils." Here "kettle", the name of the container, is named, and not the contents, which might be water, or lard, or milk, etc. And the "kettle," a solid, is named to suggest to the mind its contents. Hence Cowan's contention falls flat. And if the liquid—milk, water, wine, or whatever it may be—is in cups, the English is, Drink the cups. From this there is no escape. And Cowan goes down with those that hold with him. No wonder they do not now believe it is right to debate. When a man gets in a glass house, he does not want any-a man gets in a glass house, he does not want anybody to peck on it. I don't blame him.—J. D. P.

TURNING ON THE LIGHT

"Can any denominational leader take the Bible of his honest neighbor and read therein the passages which justify his denominational affiliation?—Rue Porter, in-Christian Worker.

No, Bro. Rue: he cannot do it: he can come no nearer reading from "the Bible of his honest neighbor" the "passages which justify his denominational affiliations" than you can "take the Bible of your honest "brother in Christ" and read therein the passages which justify" your Sunday School, and Pastor, and Cups affiliation." But he can come as near reading his "denominational affiliation" in the Bible as you can your digressive "affiliation"—he can.

"If, to receive just what Christ taught, and do just what he commanded, made folks 'followers of Christ' then, we ask in sincerity, What will a like course make of men now?"—Rue Porter. Ibid.

Well, brother, it will not make a bunch of Sunday School advocates—not by a long way. To advocate the Sunday School is to "become wise above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6), and this is condemned (2 John 9).—Jas. D. Phillips.

"As to me trying to get the brethren at Abilene to quit the 'one cup,' I made no suggestions about it to the church, but I did talk with some of the brethren privately about the matter."—J. N. Cowan, 6-13-'25.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." There is no place for idlers

in God's kingdom. Let us "work while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work." It is the duty of this generation to give the gospel to this generation. Just think—millions and millions are being lost! It will be too late after a while.

I wonder if society has anything to do with the crime wave of America? Pride precedes a fall. Is there not a clamor among the people for stylish churches and fashionable preachers who preach but little gospel, and most frequently none? Are not the sayings of this young man, Hickman, enough to call the people back to the old Book, the Bible? Had he learned the real meaning of the command, "Thou shalt not kill," he would never have committed the awful crime. Nothing but God's blessed word will stop the crime wave. Our young people see to much about killing in the picture shows. As one reads and sees, so is he. Would it not be an untold blessing if every member of the church of Christ would win one soul to God during the year 1928? "He that winneth souls is wise." Soul winning should be our chief business. Christ came to seek and save the lost. He died that sinners might live. Obedience to the gospel assures eternal life. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Dear reader, what will you do for Christ this year? —Selected.

Jno. T. Williams, Arch, N. Mex.—After my meeting at Arch, N. Mex., I was invited to hold a mission meeting at Friendship, where the Methodists should have begun a meeting, but after hearing me, they decided to have more of the gospel of Christ, so I accepted the invitation gladly, and may run two weeks. Bro. Williams of Portales wants you to get out a list of preachers that oppose the class system, the women teachers, and the cups so the churches will not be imposed on by double-dealing preachers. (We will be glad to get out this list as soon as we can get funds—Ed.)

THE TRUTH FUND

L. I. Gibbs	-----	\$2.00
H. C. Welch	-----	5.00
Brethren Calif. Creek	-----	8.00
Jas. T. White	-----	1.00
A. W. Fenter	-----	6.00
J. H. McKaig	-----	5.00
J. M. Tuttle	-----	\$1.00

Hubert H. Gaynor, Rt. 2, Bloomington, Ind.—I have been a subscriber for "The Truth" one year and think it should be in every home. When I hear and read teachings of the Bible, and nothing but the Bible, I think of Rom. 10:15, "glad tidings of good things." Enclosed find \$1.00 for renewal.

"But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my word" (Isa. 66:2).

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

WHO SHOULD TEACH IN THE PUBLIC ASSEMBLY, AND HOW?

1 Cor. 11: 4, 5:—"Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head." But "every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head," "for that is even all one as if she were shaven." In this case the woman is told to do the same the man is, namely, to pray and prophesy. There is absolutely no chance to dodge the issue here! The woman is told (in plain, emphatic, positive language that cannot be misunderstood) to pray and prophesy. And this agrees with what Paul told Timothy (1 Tim. 2: 3,9) concerning women praying. Our friends are absolutely wrong to say women are forbidden to pray in public! They tell us the word "prophesy" means: to teach, and I agree with them, for both Paul (1 Cor. 14: 3) and Webster say so. That being true, the woman is not only told to pray but to teach as well, for she is told to "prophesy." Phillip had four daughters (virgins) "which did prophesy." (Acts 21: 9.) If they could prophesy (teach), why not others? This is very plain. Paul says prophesy was to teach, edify and exhort the Church (1 Cor. 14: 3, 4), and that is what Phillip's daughters were doing. And Paul told the women in the Church at Corinth to do that, so I have no right to say they shall not.

Paul said the wives of those inspired men in the church at Corinth were to "be under obedience, as also saith the law." (1 Cor. 14: 34.) Well, what does the Law say? Go to Exo. 15: 20, 21 and you find Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, leading the song-service! Remember, we agree that "prophesy" means teach; so then Miriam was a teacher and singer. Good! Now turn to Judges 13: 8, 9 and learn that Manoah offered prayer and the Lord heard her. Now turn to 1 Sam. 1 and read the prayer of Hannah, and God endorsed it. Then in second chapter of Luke we have the history of Anna (a prophetess and a widow) who remained in the temple and "served God with fasting and prayers, night and day." So we have learned that under the Law they had women who sang, prayed and prophesied (taught);— and Paul said "as also saith the law." So here is another point that is ungetoverable!

Christ said for all baptized believers to "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. 28: 20). So the commands of Christ (his Testament) are to be observed by each and every

baptized believer (both men and women). But the Greek word for observe means: to guard, watch, protest. So we all have to assist in this guarding and protecting God's word. A lack of qualifications is the "dividing line between the work men and women are to do. A woman can not hold the office of a Bishop or Deacon, because she cannot be the husband of one wife. (1 Tim. 3: 2-12.) She cannot be an evangelist because she is not allowed to "usurp authority over the man." (1 Tim. 2: 12.) An evangelist is to use authority (Titus 2: 15) in connection with his teaching and exhorting; this a woman is forbidden to do. These things surely and certainly exclude her from holding office or evangelizing, but don't exclude her from teaching, prayer and song-service.

Some one said, "If you want to interest people tell them something they know already." So I'll tell you. "There is neither male or female" in this work, and singing is "speaking," "teaching," and admonishing." (Col. 3: 16.) Paul says a woman must not speak or teach; he surely means (taking all scripture bearing on the subject); that she must not do so as a leader of the church nor in an official way which would indicate that she was not in subjection but was trying to have "dominion over man." A sister can teach a class of women or she can teach a class of young people and not usurp authority over man. A godly Christian woman can have great influence over a class of boys and girls. All this work can and should be done. Read Mark 14: 36; also Philip. 4: 3. There is a work for every baptized believer, both men and women.

Now concerning the sixteenth chapter, first and second verses, of First Corinthians; some say it doesn't mean for sisters to "lay by in store," because it says "upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by HIM in store as God hath prospered HIM." But this will get us nowhere when we consider and make use of 2 Tim. 2: 15:—"study." Can a husband commune at the Lord's Table for his wife? (See 1 Cor. 11: 23-28.) But the Bible teaches us to study to show ourselves approved unto God, workmen that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of God.— Mrs. Geo. Blankenship, R 4, Brookfield, Mo.

Reply

Bro. Noble Brinegar, of Bloomington, Ind., sent us the foregoing from the Apostolic Review with the request that we answer it in "The Truth."

The question is, "Who shall teach in the public assembly, and how?" Does the Bible speak on this question? It does, and that most plainly. What does it say? "As in all the churches (assemblies, congregations) of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches (assemblies, congregations): for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home: for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church (assembly, congregation)." (1 Cor. 14:33-35) Again: "Let a woman learn in quietness with all

subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression; but she shall be saved through her childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety." (1 Tim. 2:11-15).

Her sphere: "Saved through her childbearing," etc. Hence the injunction: "I desire therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, rule the household, give no occasion to the adversary for reviling: for already some are turned aside after Satan." (1 Tim. 5: 14, 15) And: "That aged women likewise be reverent in demeanor, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, teachers of that which is good; that they may train the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sober-minded, chaste, workers (keepers) at home, kind, being in subjection to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed." (Titus 2:3-5) "Wives be in subjection to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord." (Col. 3: 18) "In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives; beholding your behavior coupled with fear, whose adorning let it not be the outward of plaiting the hair and of wearing jewels of gold, or of gaudy apparel; but let it be the adorning of the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible, of a meek and quiet spirit, which in the sight of God is of great price. For after this manner the holy women aforetime who hoped in God also adorned themselves, being in subjection to their own husbands: as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord; whose children ye now are, if ye do well, and are not put in fear by any terror." (1 Pet. 3:1-6) "Wives be in subjection to your own husbands, as to the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, as also Christ is the head of the church, himself the savior of the body. And as the church is subject to Christ in everything, so also let the wives be to their husbands." (Eph. 5:22-25) "Let the wife see that she treat with deference her husband." (v. 33).

"Be in subjection, as also saith the law." (1 Cor. 14:34) "The woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2:13) "And unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." (Gen. 3:16) "Any man . . . let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord." (1 Cor. 14:38)

Woman, "the weaker vessel," as the apostle designates her, has shown herself more susceptible to the wiles of Satan, and God has accordingly marked her sphere, and placed man, the stronger, to teach and lead his people under Christ. Not a woman to be an apostle; not a woman to be an elder; not a woman to be an evangelist. And Paul told Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses,

the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:1)

And in the assembly the man as well as the woman is not to "speak" if he can speak only in a language not known by the assembly unless there is an interpreter who gives what is spoken: "but if there is no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church (assembly)". (1 Cor. 14:28)

"I desire therefore that the men pray in every place," says the apostle; but "Let a woman learn in quietness with all submission." (1 Tim. 2:8-11)

But says lady Blankenship, "In this place (1 Cor. 11:4,5) the woman is told to do the same the man is, namely, to pray and prophesy." But the very opposite is the apostle's teaching. Now get the context with the text:

As is the apostles style, commendation precedes reproof, and this is true of any good teacher. So he says:-

1. Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ. (2.) Now I praise you that ye remember me in all things, and hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them to you. (3) But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. (4.) Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered (with long hair), dishonoreth his head. (5.) But every woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered (by being bobbed), dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven (xurao, to get one's self shaved, --Thayer). (6.) For if a woman be not covered (by her natural hair, but is bobbed), let her also be shorn (keiro, cutting short the hair, --Thayer): but since it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered (with her natural hair). For a man indeed ought not to have his head covered (with his natural (long) hair), forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. (8.) For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: (9) for neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man: (10) for this cause the woman ought to have power (exousia, "a sign of the husbands authority over his wife," Thayer), because of the angels. (11). Nevertheless, neither is the woman without the man, so is the man also by the woman; but all things are of God. (13). Judge in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray to God uncovered (without her natural hair)? (14). Does not even nature itself teach you that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him? (15). But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. (16). But if any man seems to dispute this, (let him know) we tolerate no such practice, neither do the churches (assemblies, congregations) of God.

The women were not only praying and prophesying in the assemblies in violation of apostolic teaching (as we see in the 14th chapter where he again prohibits it), but they were cutting their hair like men do (bobbing it), and as the men, they were praying and prophesying. And this could be expected, for we see it constantly--when

women seek to do as men, they assume masculine manners. Here the apostle condemns the bobbing of the hair, and when he comes to treat the assembly—speaking, he prohibits it on the part of the women. Not only must they be women in manners and dress, but they must keep a woman's place in the assembly, where they were "to learn in silence." (1 Tim. 2: 11).

Phillip's daughters did prophesy. Very well. Prophecy: "b. with the idea of fortelling future events especially pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Thayer) And this is what was done by these (Acts 21:9), as did Agabus and others. (vs. 10, 11, 12) Again Prophecy: "d . . . to teach, refute, reprove, admonish, comfort others; 1 Cor. 11:4, 5. etc." (Thayer) And this the women were forbidden to do, as set forth in the 14th chapter, where the apostle takes up the speaking in the assembly, saying, "As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches (assemblies)," etc. And he gives them to understand that they were not to set the standard, but they must submit to the apostolic standard, as set forth in verses 36, 37, 38, saying, "What?—was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it unto you alone? If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or gifted with the Spirit, let him be assured that the things that I write unto you are the commandment of the Lord. But if any man will not take this instruction, he is ignorant of the Lord's will. And this, with any God-fearing man or woman, settles all that may be say of Miriam (Ex. 15: 20 and 21) with her song and timbrel and dance, as well as Hannah (1 Sam. 1), Manoah (Judg. 13:8 and 9), Anna, and all the rest of them. God has spoken: let men and women take heed.

Matt. 28:20—"observe all things whatsoever I have commanded."—Christ.

"Observe, "tereo" c. to observe, Mt. 28:20." (Thayer) And is so used of "keeping the commandments of Christ." To observe what is commanded is to keep what is commanded. And the commandment of the Lord, Paul has given. Better keep it, too.

"There is a work for every baptized believer, both men and women." Yes, and the work appointed by the Lord for each is clearly differentiated in the Scripture, as has been here shown. And when women gets out of her sphere, her Master's voice she does not hear; and she becomes a goat and is no longer a sheep. (Matt. 25:31-46) Better get back before it is too late.

"Qualification is the 'dividing line.' "The devil never uttered a bigger falsehood. Sex, the distinction between male and female, is the dividing line, and it began with Adam and Eve. (1 Tim. 2: 11, 12, 13; 1 Cor. 11:1-16; 1 Cor. 14: 33-38; 1 Tim. 5: 14-16; Titus 2:3-5, and many others show this)

"Neither male nor female' in this work." Satan never perverted the word of God more than this, not even in the temptation of Christ. It has been shown that teaching in the "PUBLIC ASSEMBLY" is prohibited to women, and they are females. Paul said, "I permit not a woman to teach

(one thing not permitted by him), nor to have dominion over a man (another thing not permitted by him). (1 Tim. 2: 12) In the covenant-promise of salvation Paul shows that it is to all alike, both Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female; and here is where the "no difference" is.

I do not mind a person's telling me something. I "know already," but when they tell me something for the truth that is not so, I think they "Better not know so much than to know so much that isn't so."

"Sing," "pray," and "teach" are renderings from three different Greek words in the Bible. They are "action words," and denote three distinct actions. They are not interchangeable, not synonyms. Teaching is directed man-ward, prayer is directed God-ward, and singing after the New Testament pattern is directed God-ward—"unto the Lord," as the apostle says. "Singing the gospel" is an invention of man, an innovation upon the divine order, and very much evil has resulted to the church by this digression. No man can sustain it with an open Bible as the Book of proof.

Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:18, 19:1. "Let the word of God dwell in you richly in all wisdom (Col.), "Be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit (Eph). 2. "teaching and admonishing yourselves" (Col.), "speaking one to another." (Eph.) "Teaching" directed man-ward. "Exhorting one another," Heb. 10:25. "Edify one another, and exhort one another, even as ye also do," 1 Thes. 5:11. "For ye can all (except the woman, v. 34 and 1 Tim. 3:12) prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be exhorted," 1 Cor. 14:31. 3. "In psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs singing with loving-kindness in your heart to the Lord" (Col.), "In psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs singing and praising with your heart to the Lord" (Eph.). "Singing" directed God-ward as worship. The prohibition to the woman not to speak, not to teach, is not a prohibition not to sing.

"A sister can teach a class of women or she can teach a class of young people and not usurp authority over a man." And since the question is, **Who should teach in the public assembly, and how?** it must be that we have the explicit answer here. A woman can take a class in the public assembly, and teach that class in the public assembly, is, in short, her answer to the question. But she has not shown one scintilla of Bible proof that the PUBLIC ASSEMBLY may be divided into classes for teaching. And we have nothing to reply to here. To all she has said about a woman teaching in the public assembly, we have given Bible proof that a woman is "suffered not," "permitted not" to do such a thing, and that such a thing is "shameful." The apostle here permits her neither "to teach, nor to have dominion over a man." Neither is within her sphere. Here the woman is to "learn in silence" (1 Tim. 2:11), not even asking a question to solicit information, 1 Cor. 14:35).

The apostle said for men to speak "one by one" to the assembly, and this answers the who? and

the how? of this question. And when any one organizes the assembly into classes, the plain command of God is violated, the command to speak "one by one."

THE "LENGTH" AND THE "COST" AND THE CONDUCT

The writer will affirm the following propositions, at Kansas City, Mo., or some other central point of the United States, with any man or woman of representation and reputation, my opponent to affirm counter propositions, discussion to be oral in public and well advertised.

The New Testament clearly teaches that (1) The wearing of short hair by female members of the Church of Christ is wrong and sinful, and therefore is condemning; (2) The mothers in the Church of Christ do wrong and sin, and therefore are condemned, to cut off the hair of their female children; (3) The public appearance of women of the Church of Christ in bosomless (or low-bosomed) kneeless (or knee) dresses is contrary to the apostolic rule for shamefacedness and sobriety, and is therefore wrong, sinful and condemning; (4) The mothers in the Church of Christ, who provide their daughters with bosomless (or low-bosomed) kneeless (or knee) dresses for public appearance, do wrong, sin, and therefore are condemned, and also endanger the future spiritual welfare of their daughters so dressed; (5) The wearing of costly clothing and jewelry by either sex in the Church of Christ is wrong, sinful, and therefore condemning; (6) Male members of the Church of Christ, who neglect to try to counsel their wives and daughters according to the first five propositions, do wrong, sin, and are therefore condemned. Wm. Freeman Jones, Hancock, Mo., R. 1.

Remarks

The foregoing appeared in a recent issue of the Apostolic Review, and I thought it worthy of passing on to the readers of The Truth. I heartily endorse Bro. Jones' stand, and, since a lot of brethren disagree with him, I hope he finds one among them who will discuss this matter with him. (Since Rowe, in the Leader, tells the girls they may bob, here is his chance to show his faith by his works, but he dare not do it—Ed.

The women of America are going to cause the downfall of our nation, if some change is not made. There used to be far more virtuous women than men; but there are now more virtuous men than women. Truly "My (God's) people have committed two evils; they have forsaken Me, the Fountain of Living Waters, and hewed themselves out cisterns, broken cisterns, that hold no water." —Jer. 2:13. —J. D. Phillips.

There are times when the parting of the way must come. When the Lord "came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not," but "as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God," the parting in

the way had come. It was to stand on the Lord's side or take the side with those who crucified him. I am certain the Lord's side then was not the popular one, and it certainly is not to-day; but to be holy, right, and safe, it must be chosen.

Has not the time come when Christians should decide between ungodly fashion and godliness? Read these solemn words from Rom. 12: 2: "And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God." To those precious souls who have so sadly fallen prey to the fashion god of these bold and wicked days, will you not give most prayerful heed to these words?

Adam and Eve, before they sinned, walked in the garden amid the sweet fragrance of purity, without clothing and without being mindful of their unclothed condition until their disobedience. Since then proper covering has, according to godliness, been necessary. After they sinned their minds were changed, and they knew they were naked. Their first clothing was made, not to protect their bodies, but for the protection of their minds, that the sense of the God-given shame should not be quenched or interfered with: "And Jehovah God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skins, and clothed them." (Gen. 3: 21.)

Now read Luke 8: 26-35. When the Lord "arrived at the country of the Gadarenes," there was a man possessed with a legion of demons. The Lord Jesus cast out the demons. "And they went out to see what had come to pass; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, from whom the demons were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus: and they were afraid." (Verse 35.) Clothing and right mind go together.

God is not a God of confusion. "A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Jehovah thy God." (Deut. 22:5.)

"In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works." (1 Tim. 2: 9, 10.)

Listen to these words of the Lord Jesus: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John 12: 48.)

Sitting in the assembly of blood-bought, blood-washed people, wearing a devil-designed garment, showing portions of the body which according to godliness should be properly covered, is too wicked to be done by people who are seeking "an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." God would not have Moses to go up by steps unto his altar, that his "nakedness be not uncovered thereon." (Ex. 20: 26.) How much greater the sin of those, and of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall they be judged worthy,

who cometh into the assembly of the church of the New Testament, which was purchased with the blood of the Son of God, wearing such apparel as bodily dishonors God and all that he has said in regard to this important subject?

AWAKE, O ZION!

"We must, therefore, each become so perfectly acquainted with Christ by the light of his word and Spirit that we will relive his life, reincarnate his truth. It will then be truly said, 'Christ lives in them.' Nor will he claim us as his church and bride until such becomes the case."—J. A. Battenfield.

But many "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil," Brother John; and hence they discourage independent study of the Bible and investigations of its great truths. They have forgotten the plea of the grand old "pioneers"—"Back to the Bible;" "Back to Jerusalem;" "Back to the law and the testimony;" "Let us restore the ancient order of things in religion;" and by their actions they virtually say: "On to Babylon;" "On to digression;" "On to sectarianism."

But the plea of all loyal servants of God, both old and young, is the one made by Isaiah the prophet to Israel of old:

"Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city; for henceforth there shall no more come unto thee the uncircumcised and the unclean. Shake thyself from the dust, O Jerusalem; arise, loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion." "Up and be doing, and the Lord will be with us." —Jas. D. Phillips.

SHOULD WE YIELD?

"When I come to a congregation that uses one (cup in the communion) I yield. When they have more than one I yield. How much more yielding do you want me to do? Looks like the yielding should be done by the other side."—J. N. Cowan. 3-11-'29.

Yes, when you go to a congregation that uses one cup you "yield" enough to commune—and get their support. But you sometimes leave them in a contention over the question.

When you "yield" to the use of one cup, do you defile your conscience in so doing? You do not: you say one is Scriptural.

It "Looks like the yielding should be done by the other side," eh? Not by a long way! "The other side" is Scriptural, as you yourself will not deny. And there are many who say you are not Scriptural in your contention for "two or more cups." So when you "yield" to the use of one cup you "yield" to that which you say is right. When brethren think it is wrong to use more than one cup and "yield" to their use they "yield" to that which they think is a sin. So it is wrong for them to "yield" but right for you to "yield."

Paul says, "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died."—Rom. 14:15. But you virtually say, "Put in the cups—if they don't like them they can get out." And this is the spirit of all digression.

The organ advocates thought we should "yield" to the use of the organ, Bible or no Bible. The S. S. Advocates think we should "yield" to the S. S., Bible or no Bible. And now Cowan thinks "the yielding should be done by the other side"—the side he admits to be Scriptural. No wonder Bro. Harper says, "All digression goes the same way." —Jas. D. Phillips.

THE WAY IT SEEMS

1. There seems to be so many faults
Just every where I go or be;
They show so plain in other folks
They may show some perhaps in me.
2. I'm always making fool mistakes
So much that I am most inclined;
To pass the faults of seeming fakes
Lest they be found so near stone blind.
3. I've been a critic all my life
Just like I'll say a Pharisee;
Until I took a true schedule
Of what I'm surely taught to be.
4. Although I've tried to clear myself
I found some fault in an other guy;
But all was vain to my chargin.
In fact, I'm sure there is no lie.
5. So now in all my future time
I'll take a look about myself
If I another's judge would be;
And think of what my Lord doth see.
6. I'm sure that it's an excellent thing
Just try it, that's my real plea;
It makes you slow to criticize,
Just what you truly ought to be.

B. M. Massengale.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—I fractured my arm and have been laid up for some time. I now have a good job. Am off duty from Saturday night till Monday morning, and this makes it so much better for my preaching. Bro. Musgrave held a fine meeting at Pike City, beginning Aug. 15, and did some of the best preaching I ever heard. Eight were baptized. The Truth gets better all the time. Will send you another donation soon and I want to do all I can to get that 1000 subscribers before the year closes. We can do it if we all work. I am preparing some articles to send in later.

"When You Need PRINTING You Need Us."

LAYCOOK PRINTING COMPANY

Commercial Printing

::

Publication Work

Jackson, Tenn.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, NOVEMBER 1, 1929

No. 21

LIBERTY OF FREE DISCIPLES LIMITED

By O. P. Spiegel

In an otherwise fine editorial in the Christian Standard of Feb. 4, 1928, under heading "Let Us Paint It Larger," the editor makes what is, to my way of thinking, a very grave error when he says: "Secondly, the field is open . . . open to all forms of organization, and as many of them as free individuals wish to launch or can cause to function." This I most seriously doubt, even if I am not, perhaps, ready to deny. I am not sure but the greatest blunder any so-called free disciples ever made was to "organize" anything. I am not quit sure if what we call the church or local congregation has not been "organized" to death. Perhaps that is the trouble with many of them—too much "organization." One thing I am dead sure of, and that is we have too many organizations set up for the protection of those who have accumulated a little wealth and employing entirely too many "experts" to travel among these good people and tell them exactly how the Lord wants them to spend or invest their money. I sometimes doubt if the Lord has anything to do with it. These self-made "organizations" and self-appointed "experts" are saying and doing many things "in the name of the Lord" which I seriously doubt if the Lord ever heard of. We are no doubt top-heavy with "organizations." And the new organizations, or those of more modern times, do not seem to be an improvement on those of longer standing.

Now, just what right has any man, or any set of men and women—a divine right I am talking about now—of setting up an "organization," electing its "officers," employing its experts or "money-getters", and sending them out all over the country to inform the dear people just how the Lord wants them to spend their accumulations?

No, Bro. Editor, to tell you the solemn truth, I believe the above quotation from you was a slip of the pen. If we could dissolve several "organizations" we now have, and get a sure antidote of these "organization" germs that work on most of us, and paint larger the world's woes and our duty to preach the gospel to the whole creation, and get a better vision of the coming age when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, the redeemed of the Lord, the church, would take a mighty step forward. These human "organizations" are largely incubators of schisms and divisions because they largely engender unholy competition and rivalry.

Now, that free disciples have a perfect right to cooperate in every good word and work, both as individuals and as congregations, I have not the slightest doubt. We know that Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaius did thus co-operate, and we also have examples where congregations of disciples of Christ cooperated, but this is quite different from a few or many "organizing" a society to go out and tell the brethren what the Lord wants them to do! The thing that every minister and every disciple of Christ does have a right to do is to give to all a vision of the world's woes, and of opportunities to extend the influence of the kingdom of God in the world. They also have a perfect right to call for volunteers to accomplish the Lord's purposes as each has eyes to see his opportunities. This can be done by using time and talents and money.

The purpose of this note is to call for a redoubling of our efforts, both individually and as congregations, in the one thing the Lord told us to do, and that is to preach the gospel to the whole creation. I have been studying the matter of "organization" for the past several years, and the whole thing is a blank in my Bible. The Lord seems to have but two classes of people—the "comers" and the "goers"—"Come to me," "Go, and preach the gospel." We are weighted down with "organization," and it takes most of our time and money to keep the machinery oiled and going, and it gets so rusty it often squeaks! Mr. Editor, what would you think the results would be in the kingdom if each disciple of our Lord would just drop everything but his own business as a Christian, and get right down and work at that job faithfully for a few years? My opinion is his example would be so loud and so telling that he would have a world of imitators, and the world would be rolling toward God.

Montgomery, Ala.

Comment

The foregoing from the Christian Standard of March 10, 1928, shows that some, even in the "Christian Church," "the Disciples' Church", have learned that it is likely that "the greatest blunder any so-called free disciples ever made was to 'organize' anything." And they have also learned that some of the local congregations among them have been "organized" to death." Some among the preachers in the church of Christ have learned that the congregations have been "organized" to death." This is true of the popular "pastor," "Sunday school," "ladies' Bible class," "young peoples' meeting" congregations. But, from the above article, it seems evident that some among the "transgressives" have arisen to

shame them. What a rebuke this article from the Standard must be to the "pastors" in the church of Christ who spend most of their time "organizing" various kinds of mis-named societies.

The Christian Standard led out in the first digressive movement among the disciples of Christ, after the Restoration. But, the Standard people have arisen in rebellion against some of the very things it started out to advocate. It can see the evil effects of all this "organization" stuff. And it has taken its stand against, at least, some of these "organizations."

The Gospel Advocate, the Christian Leader, the Firm Foundation, and other publications among us are now advocating various societies, or Colleges they have exalted above the church, thus robbing God of the glory that should be given Him "in the church throughout all ages" (Eph. 3). But, we hope and pray that they, like the Standard, will yet see the evil influence of these "organizations" before they, like the "Christian Church," become another denomination. As Brother Tant truly says, "Brethren, we are drifting, drifting, drifting, and will soon be like the churches around us."

"Stand ye in the way and see and ask for the old pathes . . . the good way and walk therein" (Jer. 6: 16).

James Douglas Phillips.

OVERTAKEN IN A FAULT

"Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." See Gal. 6:1. Experience and observation have taught me that the above scripture is very much neglected. In almost every congregation, where it has been my privilege to labor, little or nothing is being done to restore the fallen brother or sister. In some instances, I have known brethren to manifest a very ugly disposition toward the one overtaken in a fault, which seemed to say, "Let them go, we are better off without such members." Brethren, that's wrong to either talk or act in such a way toward the one overtaken in a fault. Let us go to them in the spirit of love and meekness, and do all that is within our power to restore them, or else, acknowledge that we are not spiritual. Hear James on this matter, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." (Jas. 5: 19, 20). Just think what men do to save some friend or loved one from the death of the body, but how indifferent we are when it comes to saving the soul from eternal banishment from the presence of the Lord! How can we be so unconcerned about the dear ones who have gone astray from following the Master? Hear the Master, "How think ye, if a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? And if so be that he find

it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that sheep, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray. Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." (Matt. 18:12-14) Neither should it be our will that one of these little ones should perish, brethren. Then, let us try to "find them."

—Homer L. King.

BLASPHEMY UNPARDONABLE

How is it committed? and who can commit it? If Jesus did not tell us, we shall never know, for the apostles say nothing about it. What caused Christ to make the statement about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is clearly set forth in Matt. 12:22, 23. It was on account of the refusal of the Pharisees to believe that he was casting out demons by the power of the Holy Spirit, that God had given him. They brought the wicked charge against him of casting out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of demons. And this was blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. And Jesus said, "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come." Mt. 12:32. (World: aioni, age.) That is, the Jewish age and the Christian age that followed it. (See also Heb. 9:26.) Christ came at the end of the "world", age, Jewish age. And if no one in the days of Christ on earth could commit this blasphemy, why did Christ say it would not be forgiven in this age nor in the age to come? There would be no blasphemy to be forgiven "in this age" if it could not then be committed. And we know from the teaching of the Bible that it does not mean the world we now live in and the period after death, for after death no sins are to be forgiven, Russellism to the contrary notwithstanding. Let no man be thus deceived.

We see it was some of the Scribes and the Pharisees that so blasphemed when Christ was with them "working the works of Him that sent" him. Mark says, "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." If they would not believe when they saw the miracles performed before their eyes, there could be no power in heaven or earth that could make them believe in Christ. To see anything is the strongest evidence that can be given to convince any one. And the strongest evidence was given to them, but some would not believe.

When the apostles told Thomas, who was absent, that they had seen the Lord, did he believe? No. But when he himself saw, he believed. But although the Scribes and the Pharisees saw, yet some would not believe, and to excuse themselves they ascribed the evidence to Beelzebub. And thus they committed the blasphemy for which they got no forgiveness, "neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Thus we see that the unpardonable blasphemy is committed by denying the power of the Holy Spirit performing miracles, which is the true source of all knowledge, and the only one that will stand the test in our courts to-day. We to-day know that Christ performed miracles

only on the testimony of those who saw them, hence it is by faith that we know it. I want to notice some other scriptures used by brethren in this connection, but will do so later.—W. H. Purlee, Pekin, Ind.

“SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE”

Hear Paul in Eph. 4:15, “But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ.” It seems to me that we sometimes forget the above admonition, and allow our enthusiasm and zeal for the truth to cause us to express our thoughts in such manner, or to clothe our thoughts in such terms, that we lose some of our influence, and may even offend some, thus driving them farther away from the truth, instead of winning them to Christ.

Now, I think I can hear some one saying, “Bro. King is wanting to put on the soft peddles, getting sweet spirited, sugar coating, etc.” But you are mistaken if you are thinking that. No one believes in condemning error, or of fighting sin harder than I do. I believe in standing up for the truth if I must stand alone, and when it comes to fighting error, I stand for the “Unconditional Surrender”. There can be no compromise between truth and error, with me. We must, at all times, “contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.” But my idea of doing that is by “speaking the truth in love.” Let us hear Paul again, “And 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 acknowledge of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.” See 2 Tim. 2:24-26. Note that Paul says, “the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves,” etc. But again, “Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.” See 2 Tim. 4:2. Yes, “reprove, rebuke, exhort,” but we should not overlook the “with all longsuffering and doctrine.”

Submitted in love,

Homer L. King.

FAITHFUL CITY BECOMES A HARLOT

God said of His ancient people Israel, “How is the faithful city become an harlot!”—Isa. 1:21.

Alexander Campbell truly says in his “Prophetic Symbols” in the “Appendix” to the “Living Oracles:”

“Jerusalem—In symbolic or figurative language, the Church of Jesus Christ, the Christian Economy. ‘Jerusalem which is above, is free, the mother of us all.’ ‘The holy city’ is contrasted with ‘the great city,’ the true church with the apostle church; Babylon and Jerusalem. The former (Babylon) represents every professing Christian society, which submits not wholly and unconditionally to Jesus, as sole lawgiver, prophet,

priest, and king; the latter (Jerusalem), the society which unreservedly submits to him in all his official power and glory.”

And he also says (Ibid.):

“Harlot—Denotes an idolatrous community. Cities were formerly represented under the types of virgins, wives, widows, and harlots, according to their conditions: hence the true church is symbolized by a chaste bride, and an apostate, or worldly religious community, is depicted by a harlot.”

This is true. And hence John (Rev. 12) pictures the faithful city as a woman clothed with the sun, standing on the moon, and on her head a crown of twelve stars. But in Rev. 17 he pictures the apostle church—the church of Christ deflected into Catholicism—as a harlot on many waters, full of names of blasphemy; and when she was deciphured she was (and is) “Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and of the Abominations of the Earth.” Certainly when this prophecy was fulfilled in the deflection of Apostolic Christianity into Catholicism, “the faithful city became a harlot.”

And when Errett and others led the church into digression a half a century ago with the organ, the missionary society, etc., “the faithful city became a harlot.”

And when David Lipscomb, Daniel Sommer, et al, led the churches of Christ into digression twenty-five years ago, with the Sunday School, the pastor, etc., “the faithful city became a harlot.”

And now Cowan, Johnson, Duckworth, et al, are trying to lead the remnant of the faithful into digression with the cups, Littlefield College, etc., and “the faithful city” is becoming “a harlot.”

But there is a small remnant who have not “the mark of the beast” and hence they are not going to be “deceived” by Satan’s cunning schemes to “deceive the very elect.” (See. Rev. 13).

—Jas. D. Phillips.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Oct. 11, 1929.—I closed a meeting, embracing three Lord’s days, at Greenfield, New Mex., on the 6th. inst.; which resulted in six being baptized into Christ. The place of meeting is some twenty miles south of Roswell, in the Pecos Valley. The little congregation there is due, in the main, to the efforts of that good and valiant soldier of the cross, T. F. Thomasson, of Lake Arthur, New Mex. Bro. Thomasson was with me throughout the meeting, and assisted much in song, prayer and otherwise. It was my first time to meet him, and he impressed me as being a godly man and of having much ability as a preacher. He should be kept busy, preaching the Gospel. I am, at this writing, in a good meeting with the faithful, at the L. F. D. congregation, near Roswell. I go next to Deming. Here is another list of subs. for The Truth. I want to join Bro. Musgrave in an effort to send in one hundred subs. by the first of the year. Now, if we can get eight more to join us, the one thousand subs. will be assured. Get busy, brethren!

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

The Clark-Harper discussion. A reprint will appear in "The Truth" of Nov. 15, and those who want extra copies to mail out should have the orders in immediately at the rate of five cents a copy. The whole discussion will be carried in the one issue of Nov. 15. Bro. Clark has written an additional 1200-word article, and the reply follows to close the discussion. Get your orders in early so names can be listed for full number wanted.

Don't forget that list of subscribers. Have you sent in yours? Send in for sample copies. We shall be glad to furnish them now. Put them out judiciously, and let us get the Bible teaching before those in error.

The editor spent the first two weeks in October in Haines City, Fla. A Sunday School element had come in and tried to take possession of the house. We signed up with their leader who called himself the "Minister" of the church, the following proposition: "The Sunday School as it is maintained by churches with which I, C. C. Brown, have been connected, is according to the teaching of the New Testament."

But when the time came for the debate, "Minister" C. C. Brown backed out. The church has now gotten rid of this digressive element, and with the restrictive deed in effect should be able to keep free from such troubles. And brethren who contemplate wintering in Florida, will be royally treated by this church. Haines City is one of the most substantial and most beautiful cities in the State of Florida. Write Elder J. A. Nettles, Box 71, Haines City, Fla.

Are you helping to get that 100 subscribers before Jan. 1930? Our days of labor will soon be over. Will the Lord say, "Well done?" Thousands are in darkness—the darkness of the world and the darkness of digression. A little help from every one will put "The Truth" with Bible teaching into thousands of homes. Many have expressed their gratitude for having found such a Bible paper, a paper that stands strictly for a "Thus saith the Lord" for our faith and practice.

The editor expects to moderate for Bro. W. H. Reynolds in his debate with a Malinnial Dawn advocate at Pansey, Ala., beginning Oct. 14. We hope to follow this with a good meeting.

Bro. R. C. Crawford, of Plant City, Fla., will assist the church at Haines City, Fla., in a meeting this fall. Bro. Crawford stands strictly for Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. Others who want meetings will please address him at Plant City.

"Overcome evil with good." If you want to drive out evil in thought or deed, fill the heart with good and let it sink to the bottom.

What did Mary do? "Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her." Lk. 10:42.

Have you read Building According to the Pattern by T. C. Hawley, 218 So. Olive St., Santa Paula, Calif., 3c each? Scatter them out, brethren.

DO NOT DO IT

"Neither let any one legislate the law that each congregation, in order to be right with the Lord, must join more than one group."

Thus saith Ira C. Moore, senior editor of the *Christian Leader*, in discussing the class question.

Creacy says, "To make a law where God has made none is as sinful as it is to violate a law God has made." And since we know this to be true we have been begging the brethren not to make a law that the churches should organize classes in order to teach the word of God, for we know that God did not make this law, but man did, and we are exhorted "not to think of men above that which is written."—I Cor. 4:6. And we are glad that Bro. Moore has finally come out and said that we can be Scriptural, therefore "right with the Lord," without such organization.

And we are glad that the fight on the Sunday School question is on in W. Va., where Bro. Moore and others have been introducing it to the division and disgrace of the Body of Christ "which He purchased with His own blood." (Acts 20:28). I have held two debates in W. Va. on this question: one with Ried Robinson near Beckley and one with Ira C. Moore in Charleston. Robinson came first and he "fell a sprawlin'" and Moore "came a tumblin' after." And we have not heard much from them on this question since. And we are glad to see Bro. Moore advising the brethren not to make the law that no church can be right with God and not have the class organization.

No, brethren: don't legislate where God has legislated—to do so is to dethrone Christ as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." Do not do it, please.—Jas. D. Phillips.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.—The Oct 1st. issue of "The Truth" was certainly fine. Things look brighter for the paper now than at any time since it was started. We need a paper that stands for the church, and does not take up time or space in boosting a school—Sunday School, Monday school, or any other kind. Send me sample copies of every issue. There is a growing interest in the paper everywhere I go.

SUCCESS OF THE EARLY CHURCH

I copy the following from "LIVING SERMONS," page 212, under the signature of H. M. Phillips, in his sermon on SUCCESS OF THE EARLY CHURCH:

"Was it because of shows, suppers, and societies? No such was used to gain favor or to keep up the work. No foot shows, kissing a young lady, sock socials, ice cream suppers, raffling off cakes or other articles, hot dog and soda pop stands at fairs and such like to make up money for the church. No clubs, aids and societies through which to work and get their names in the papers. All worked through the church, it was ordained of God, spirit filled, led by Christ as its head, and unto God was glory in the church by Christ. (Eph. 3:21), should be the program of all now."

That's fine—very fine, Bro. Phillips, but how about the Sunday schools (Bible class, Bible study, class system of teaching, etc.), young people's meetings, women's meetings, base ball teams, Bible colleges and schools, plurality of cups in the communion? Was it because of these things that the early church met with success? In your own words is found the answer, "No such was used to gain favor or to keep up the work." "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." And Solomon has truly said, "The legs of the lame are not equal." Again we are reminded, "Consistency, thou art a jewel!" Is it not high time that we were calling a halt in this mad rush into Babylon? Back to the Bible and the EARLY CHURCH pattern, brethren,

Submitted in love,

Homer L. King.

A PLEA FOR TRUTH

Since sending in my last letters to the Truth and the Christian Leader, I have been asked by those vitally interested to write on THE SCRIPTURAL APPOINTMENT OF ELDERS AND DEACONS, and I am glad to do so.

To say that this is an important question, is putting it very mildly. There is no more vital question connected with the propagation of the kingdom of Christ. It is the main pillar upon which the church stands. God is now punishing the church for its ungodly and unscriptural elder-ship. I have been trying to warn the churches of this calamity for twenty-five years. Just as sure as we depart from God's teachings, just that sure will God give us "confusion and shamefacedness." It has not been many months since I wrote on this subject, but as well as I can remember, only one of the above named papers published it. I shall try this time to be more explicit, and maybe others will read it and see the need of returning to God and his ways.

We shall first examine in an impartial way the present mode of appointing elders, that we may contrast it with Paul's teaching on the subject.

An evangelist will go into a neighborhood for a day, or perhaps for a meeting. It is a small congregation with one or two leaders, and maybe doing very well. He wants to do something for them, so he selects two or three for elders, and asks the church to "honor and obey" them. He then goes on his way, and writes the paper that he has "set a church in order. I have known this to be done in my home congregation while I was away preaching.

Another method, a more common one, is for an evangelist to ask privately a few members to meet him in a caucus at his room, and at his suggestion, some of the members of this caucus would be chosen, and he with great elation asks the "laity" to accept these honored ones, or give a reason why not.

One brother will write, "This is the way we did it." Another will write, "This is the way we did it," and although it differs from the other, there is no controversy. So nine-tenths of the preachers have no idea that God has spoken on this subject at all.

Jesus says, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and appointed you, that you should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide." John 15:16. Here we see that two things are to be done: the choosing and the appointing (ordaining). Jesus chose his disciples one by one as they followed their occupations; and after they had been taught by him, he ordained them, and sent them out to preach the gospel of the kingdom. But Jesus did not introduce this method, for it was age-old. Please turn to and read Numbers 8:10, 11 and 27:18-22. What method Jesus used here is not made plain, but "When the Holy Spirit is come, he shall teach you all things." John 14:26.

I next call your attention particularly to the ordaining of the deacons as recorded in Acts 6 chapter. I shall ask a question first, and I hope to have an honest answer from every devout Christian who reads it. Why did not the Apostles choose those seven men? Did they not know "who is who" better than the "multitude of the disciples"? If it was not to form a precedent for the future churches to follow, then I can not see the reason. Certainly they being full of the Holy Spirit, could have made a better choice than the church members. Brethren tell me that the "multitude" to-day do not know enough to choose elders to rule over them, but the Apostles evidently thought they did. They told the "multitude of the disciples" to choose seven men "full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we will appoint over this business."

Appoint, ordain, separate, set apart, are synonymous terms and mean practically the same thing. So we can see if we will, just what the Apostles did to set apart these men for the work designated, and how the same thing should be done to-day. Here it is: "And they prayed, and laid their hands on them." What for? To impart to them the Holy Spirit? No, for they were not only full of the Holy Spirit, but Wisdom. Then there can be no other reason than that they were

doing it for an example to others.

These seven men were guided by the Holy Spirit received by the laying on of the Apostles' hands on a former occasion, and now having the qualifications (1 Tim. 3:8, 9) they could proceed with the work immediately.

This act of the Apostles coupled with that of the leaders in the church at Antioch (Acts 13:1-3), establishes beyond a quibble the manner of ordaining by fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands.

In Acts 6:1-6, we have the example of ordaining deacons; in Acts 13:1-3, ordaining evangelists; in Acts 14:23, we have the ordaining of elders. To say this was done one way at Jerusalem, another way at Antioch, and another way at Lystra, where Timothy was ordained (1 Tim. 4:14), is bringing a grave charge against the Holy Spirit.

When Paul said to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint (ordain) elders in every city as I gave thee charge" (Tit. 1:5), do you think Titus would act like some of our modern evangelists?

Now let us see whether we can get the Bible method of procedure. In a certain community, a meeting is held and a number of men and women are converted, and it is necessary for them to have leaders. These leaders are selected by the congregation at a meeting called for that purpose. Of course these men can not have all the qualifications called for when selected, but when they have prepared themselves, and are "proven" (1 Tim. 3:10), then they are to be ordained by an evangelist, Acts 14:23. Evangelists are ordained by the leaders of the church or elders. Acts 13:1-3; 1 Tim. 4:14.

Let us conclude by answering the weak arguments put forth by those who have presumed to cast aside God's way, and adopt man's way. They say, "The Apostles conferred the Holy Spirit upon the seven at Jerusalem when they laid their hands on them." But the seven at Jerusalem were full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, when they were chosen. When a thing is full, can it be made fuller? The very fact that the Apostles had the disciples choose the men, shows us clearly that it was an example for the churches to follow.

Let us further examine Acts 13:1-3. "Now there were at Antioch in the church that was there, prophets and teachers, Barnabas and Symeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Maneon the foster brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit said: Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then when they had fasted and prayed, they laid their hands on them and sent them away."

Now any honest man can see that instead of an Apostle laying his hands on somebody, he had hands laid on him. Was it to impart the Holy Spirit? Nay verily, for Paul had received it about ten years before this. Dare any one say that Symeon, Lucius, and Manaen could impart

the Holy Spirit? No. So it was not for that purpose, but to "separate" them, ordain them to the work of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles. Well, you say that looks silly. Yes, to our wise-acres no doubt it does; so does burying a person in baptism look silly to many worldly-wise men who claim to be of the elect and call themselves "ministers" in the church of Christ, but when that great Day comes, Christ will say, "I never knew you."

We must call your attention to another example, recorded in 1 Tim. 4:14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophesy and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Listen, you big preachers, and answer will you? Were these presbyters Apostles? Could they impart the Holy Spirit? But you say. "There was a gift." Yes, a gift just like Paul and Barnabas received namely, set apart to preach the gospel. And if these men did not and could not confer the Holy Spirit, what was the purpose of laying hands on him? If they did, why did Paul speak thus to him in his second letter?—"For which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee thru the laying on of my hands." 2 Tim. 1:6.

Again, in writing to Timothy concerning his respect for the elders, Paul says, "I charge thee in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands hastily on no man, neither be partakers of other men's sins; keep thyself pure." 1 Tim. 5:21,22. Was Timothy an Apostle? No. Then he could not confer the Holy Spirit. But he laid hands on people. Whom? Evidently those whom he found prepared, or "proven" to be ready to take to themselves the responsible work of an elder or deacon. This must be the conclusion from the meaning of the verses immediately preceding this quotation.

We think it is not necessary to carry this thesis further at this time, for all who read the history of the church, know that from the time the church was organized in Jerusalem until about 75 years ago, elders, deacons, and evangelists were ordained by fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands. Then it was, in the first Bible School, perhaps, Tennessee had ever begun the substitution of man's ways for God's ways, and it has continued until it would take all the "lanterns" in the world to find a congregation carrying out God's plan for the churches.

May God have mercy upon us and patience with us and bring us back to the "old paths," that we may walk therein, is the humble prayer of

Yours in a plea for truth,

E. A. Lowery.

A. A. Patterson, Littlefield, Texas—Find enclosed \$2.00 for the soundest paper in the brotherhood. Keep the good work going.

THE TRUTH FUND

A. A. Patterson ----- \$1.00

ALVA JOHNSON

Says, "You (J. D. Phillips) don't want a Bible debate, utterly refused and so did Brother Harper." But anybody who knows "Brother Harper," knows that Brother Johnson has not told the truth. And I know that Brother Phillips will quit his work, as will I, any time to meet Johnson or Cowan, or any other man the cups advocates will put up, in oral or written debate. Dare Johnson or Cowan say the same thing? If so, just say it, and arrangements will be made forthwith.

What is a "Bible debate?" Ask Trott; ask Cowan. Ask any man of sense. It is a debate in which one affirms and the other denies that "The Scriptures teach," or an equivalent wording. Have not our debates with the organ and the Sunday School men been "Bible debates?" Let Bro. Johnson answer. Has not Cowan used the dictionary and Greek lexicon in his debates? Does a "Bible debate" exclude the correct meaning of words and the rules of logic? Johnson knows that he refused to meet Harper at Elk City, Okla., on the same proposition debated at Roswell, N. Mex. And so do those who attended the Phillips-Johnson debate know it.

The expression, "keys of the kingdom," is metaphorical, it is true; nevertheless the Lord has "a literal kingdom," and the Scriptures so teach. Now get Duckworth to open up the Way, and we shall be glad to divide space with you in "The Truth" if you or any man you will endorse will deny it. And the "cup" is "a literal cup" that Jesus used in the Communion, and the Scriptures so teach. And you can have the same terms in a denial of this. And the Lord had "a literal table" in the Communion service—trapeza, "I. a. a table on which food is placed, an eating-table: Mt. 15:27; Mk. 7:28; Lk. 16:21; 19:23; 22:21, 30; the table in the temple at Jerusalem on which the consecrated loaves were placed, Heb. 9:22 — Thayer. (Now you can see why Johnson, like the organ man and the sprinkling man, wants to rule out the lexicon.) When we called his attention to Lk. 22:21, in replying to his tomfoolery on this same line, he again displayed his ignorance of the meaning of language by saying that if there was a literal "table" there, Christ was on it. He finally said they ate on the floor. We have never met a cups man yet that would not prevaricate worse than any organ advocate, sprinkler, or S. S. sophist. "You should not blame Brother Duckworth, for he doesn't believe in more than one cup on the Lord's table neither does Cowan or Johnson."

Finally, then, "Duckworth, Cowan, and Johnson," it is made known, are together on the cup, we should say cups, and Johnson let "the cat out of the bag." We knew it all the time, but there has been a strong effort made to make it appear that Duckworth stood with Dr. Trott on the cup question, and Doctor has been led to believe Duckworth stood with him, but if so, Dr. Trott stands with Cowan and Johnson, or Johnson does not know whereof he speaks. Duckworth has said that he can partake of "the fruit of the vine where more than one cup is used." And from this he knows,

and Johnson knows, too, that more than one cup is used, even to individual cups, and his sophistry avails him nothing with people of sense.

"The little sheet you call The Truth (falsely so-called)."

Yes, "The truth" is a "little sheet," eight pages, just about as big now at one dollar a year as the Way is with eight pages at two and three dollars a year, since it has "shrivled" from a "sixteen page paper." And it used to stand "four-square against all innovations," but it has been catering to the "money bag" until it now is the advertising medium of "Littlefield College" and College real-estate booming.

"The Truth (falsely so-called.) No, it is your ignorance again. When the Review jumped onto us for using "the" before "Apostolic Way," we showed up its ignorance, and it soon hushed. This is the title under which we write, seeking to maintain 'the truth' as given by Jesus Christ, not that we expected all that appeared in it to be the truth, for we expected to use something from Johnson, and Cowan, and Duckworth on the cups in its columns. And if Brother Trott succeeds in getting into the editorial chair of the Way at Littlefield and undertakes the Herculean task of cleaning out the "Augean stables," and putting the Way back on the Bible track whence it has departed, he has a task deserving the sympathy of every true Christian, and here is our hand.

—H. C. Harper.

CHRISTIAN LEADER BACKS OFF

The Christian Leader refuses Bro. Kile space to reply to Editor Moore's article in defense of the cups. Moore crawls into his hole and hides.

Bro. Kile has finally smoked the editor of the Leader out into the open—he has come to the defense of the cups, yes, the Individual Cups, once more in the Christian Leader, and here we take up "the gauge of battle" with him.

When we were in West Virginia last Oct., as moderator for Bro. Phillips in his debate with Moore on the thing the Leader calls "Sunday School," we offered to deny—That the use of the Individual Cups in the communion is authorized by the Scriptures. But we could not get Moore interested enough to attempt to defend their use. We offered to affirm—That a church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the communion service. And we offered to deny this if he would add "s" to the word "cup." But he would not do it.

He talks about exposing the "sophistical and deceptive use of 'cup' and 'cups.'" Well, this is an exposure of his exposure. If the use of the Individual Cups is not "a doctrine and commandment of men," let Brother Moore find the "doctrine and commandment" from God. When he does this, our opposition to the practice of their use will cease.

Let us go to the Bible and see what God says. It reads, "And he took a cup." Mt. 26:27. "Cup" is not used here by any figure of speech. And

the Greek word **poterion**, as Thayer points out, is here used in its proper meaning, namely, "a cup, a drinking vessel." p. 533. The context shows that this cup which he "gave to them" had "fruit of the vine" in it. v. 29. And no law of language can make "cups" or "individual cups" out of this language. So much for the proper (literal) use of "cup."

Now for metonymy: Is "cup" used also by metonymy in connection with the communion? Yes, namely, "drinking cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:21) —"drink the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:27), for example.

Metonymy defined; "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which a object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams' Comp. and Rhetoric, p. 220. The same author mentions ten leading kinds of this figure, and under "3" he gives "Container and the thing contained."

The "contents" are never named in a metonymy. The "container" is named to "suggest" the contents. The container without contents can not be used by metonymy; and the liquid apart from a container can not be used by metonymy. In other words, it takes "container and the thing contained" to constitute this kind of metonymy. And this chasm, neither Brother Moore nor any other living man will ever cross to reach cups. Metonymy gives no authority to change from the singular to the plural—from "cup," as it is in the Bible, to "cups," as some men have it.

Yes, "Drink" is the statement of the Lord. And we have by metonymy, as has been cited, "Drink the cup," and properly (literally) "Drink of (from or out of) it." Mt. 26:27. You just wait until some one does "literalize" Paul's language, "Drink this cup," before you hitch your cable to it. This perverseness originated in the Leader, in trying to stigmatise the contender for "cup," not cups. You may know no better; if not, I'll take it back as a case of "perverseness." Otherwise it stands. Now come on!

Not "drink" "crude stone vessels," or "swallow wine-skins." Now didn't you say something that shows how wise you are, or rather what a fool a man can make of himself? Just about as silly as the following from your pen, namely, "And that fruit of the vine was 'the cup' whether it was in 'a pitcher, a bottle or individual cups (vessels) or in a wine-skin'—a thing easily asserted, but which neither you nor any other living man can prove, for it is an absolute falsehood. The fruit of the vine is not, never was, and never can be 'the cup,' or a cup, 'a pitcher' or 'a bottle.'" The fruit of the vine in a cup made of "crude stone" or any other material, may, by the figure metonymy, be suggested to the mind by naming the cup that contains it. The fruit of the vine is not a container—a pitcher, a bottle, a cup, a wine-skin, or any other container whatever. Hence the fruit of the vine is not, never was, and never will be a cup, a pitcher, a bottle. But by metonymy the fruit of the vine, if in a pitcher, may be suggested to the mind by naming the pitcher; if in a cup, by naming the cup; and if in cups, by naming

cups, but not cup. And there is no word in connection with the Communion, found in the Bible, that means cups.

J. M. Tuttle, Newkirk, Okla.—Here are subs. and donation. Don't let up on the cups heresy; drive those advocates to the Digressives with the Sunday School and the organ where they belong. We are behind you as long as you stand where the Bible speaks. I see you now have them on the run just like the S. S. and the organ digressives. They are as dishonest with their souls and with the church as was old Pharaoh and you may tell them and others so for me. If they had the Bible on their side, we all know that they would not wait. "four long years" for a debate, and then wiggle out, and wiggle out, and wiggle out. "The Truth" is now the only paper I know that is worthy of my support.

Chas. E. Parish, Worthington, W. Va.—Please excuse my tardiness in remitting my subscription to "The Truth." I hear three of your discourses at Columbia St. church, Fairmont, W. Va., and I consider you one of the best reasoners that I ever listened to. Mail to the same address—The Ark Hotel.

Jas. D. Phillips, Montebello, Calif.—I have been having throat trouble, but am much better after an operation that caused me to quit work for a few weeks. I shall hold a meeting in Bakersfield soon, and expect to be in Northern California and in Oregon for some work this fall.

C. W. Smith, Floydada, Texas.—The last two issues of "The Truth" have been fine.

Ed Swindler, Bloomington, Ia.—Considerable interest has been stirred up here as the result of the meeting held by Bro. W. H. Purlee, of Pekin, Ind. The Russell people are coming forward for debate. We shall try to have this written so that the readers of "The Truth" can all get it, if we can. We need a strong man here for another meeting next year.

A. J. Thompson, Sabinal, Texas.—I think "The Truth" is the best paper of them all. I don't want to miss an issue.

THE TRUTH FUND

W. H. Bonneau\$5.00
J. D. Phillips 4.00

NOTICE

The Nov. 15 issue of "The Truth" will contain the Clark-Harper debate on the cup question. Those who want extra copies to hand out, should write to the office at Sneads, Fla., immediately, and remit at the rate of five cents a copy.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, NOVEMBER 15, 1929

No. 22

The Clark-Harper Discussion On The Number Of Cups To Be Used In The Lord's Supper

PROPOSITION

The Scriptures authorize the use of more than one container in the distribution of the wine used in the Lord's Supper.

This proposition is not stated exactly as Brother Harper has suggested. To me it is simple, clear, and covers the exact issue. If Brother Harper is not satisfied with it, he may state it as he sees fit.

Only one or two terms need defining. The word "authorize" here means make room for, "sanction," "warrant," "justify," "furnish ground for." (Webster.) The word frequently means "to authorize," "to empower," with the notion that a thing is expressly stated or commanded. For example, we are authorized to assemble for worship by explicit statements and clear examples. We are also authorized to provide a meeting-house as a convenience but no man can find where the Apostles ever said for us to build meeting-houses. We could meet and worship without such houses, but it might be quite inconvenient at times. We sometimes put a baptistery in a meeting-house as a convenience. The Scriptures say nothing about a baptistery, yet Brother Harper will hardly deny that it is "authorized", that is "sanctioned," by the Scriptures. This explains my use of the word "authorize" in the proposition. The rest of the proposition is clear.

Brother Harper and I agree that only one container should be used till after thanks are given. We must agree that the wine is divided in or during the process of partaking of it; for when one worshiper drinks of it, it is thereby divided into two portions, and so on to the last. So, the real and only issue is whether for convenience we may divide it after thanks and before the worshipers drink. If Brother Harper can show any reason for requiring every worshiper to drink from the same container, he makes out his case. Otherwise, he fails.

For the sake of narrowing the discussion to the real issue, I concede the following points:

1. Jesus used only one cup in the institution of the Supper;
2. The Apostles, on that occasion, all drank from the same cup. (Nobody can prove this, but I shall not deny it);
3. Wherever the subject is mentioned in the New Testament, the word "cup" is singular;
4. In a small group of worshipers, one container is usually sufficient for all purposes.

I hope that Brother Harper will not spend time in contending for any of these points, for they are all admitted.

My first argument in support of my proposition is that the number of containers used is an incidental to the worship. Other incidentals are the number of worshipers, the amount of wine used, the degree of fermentation of the wine, the manner of passing the container from one worshiper to another, the posture of the worshipers during the service, etc. On all these points two congregations may vary widely, not only between themselves but from time to time in the same body. To illustrate: One body contains a dozen members.

Half a wine-glass of wine supplies them. Another body has five hundred members. It takes a gallon of wine for them. A small vessel and a small loaf show all the unity designed in the one case; a large vessel and a large loaf are used to show the same unity in the other. The difference in the amount of wine used is considered a necessity; yet if a small quantity could be dropped out to the worshipers, it would suffice for many. So we see that the quantity of wine used is, after all, a matter of convenience, left to our choice. Likewise, the matter of distributing the wine is a thing that must be left to our convenience. When Jesus instituted the Supper, one container was ample for the eleven worshippers present. But when Pentecost saw three thousand added to the Jerusalem church in one day, circumstances came to alter the case. Will Brother Harper contend that these disciples all drank from the same cup? Acts 2:42 and the rest of the chapter clearly show that these thousands were for sometime closely associated with the Apostles and with one another, and that they observed the Lord's Supper. Here is work for you, Brother Harper. It may be very easy for you to clear up, but I am unable to believe that three thousand disciples drank from the same cup.

My second argument is that Jesus gave the wine, not the "cup," as the memorial of his blood. This being true, the symbolism of the institution lies in the fact that the fruit of the vine, the blood of the grape, represents his blood. Moreover, its separation from the loaf (body) shows his death. The only point of symbolism in the number used is in the one loaf to represent one body. This is one till it is "broken." This takes place after thanks. "He blessed and brake." Likewise, one vessel containing the emblem of the blood from the one body is first blessed and afterwards divided. Question: Since it is Scriptural to divide the bread after thanks and before eating, why is it wrong to treat the wine in the same way?

N. L. CLARK.

FIRST NEGATIVE

The practice you affirm is not only not authorized in the Scriptures by statement, command, approved example, or necessary inference (and in no other way can the Scriptures authorize a practice), but it is anti-scriptural.

Please define "container." The Scriptures say nothing about "container." The question you ask I answer: For the same reason that it is wrong for the priest to drink all the wine, or to sprinkle for baptism. Listen: "He took the loaf, and having blessed it, he broke it." (Mk. 14:22; Mt. 26:26; Lk. 22:19.) And Paul says, "The loaf which we break." (1 Cor. 10:16.) But of the cup, Jesus commanded, "All drink out of it." (Mt. 26:27.) And Paul says, "Let him . . . drink out of the cup." (1 Cor. 11:28.) "And they all drank out of it" (Mk. 14:23.) And the Greek connotes "a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer), or "a drinking cup" (Berry). What cup? "The cup of blessing which we bless." (1 Cor. 10:16.) But you do not drink out of the cup which you bless. For "convenience" your practice is to pour the wine into cups and drink out of them. And the Pope, for no better reason, says the priest to drink all the wine. And you both are anti-scriptural; for "When God chooses a certain way of doing a thing, this excludes every other way of doing that thing." ("Bible Briefs" by Showalter and Davis.)

Question: If "the number of containers is an incidental

the worship", why do you contend "that only one container should be used till after thanks are given"?

Do you know that all the disciples in Jerusalem took the Lord's supper in one congregation? Show us the bridge before you ask us to cross it. These Jews seemed to know how to eat "a lamb" at the Passover even if many thousands were to eat, and they were closely associated, too. You should know that "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses." (Neander, Vol. I, p. 402.)

You say, "Jesus gave the wine, not the 'cup,' as the memorial of his blood." As a matter of truth, Jesus said: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." (Lk. 22:20.) And you can not have "the cup" without having the contents in a cup. And Paul said to "drink the cup." When you can show us how to do this without having the contents in a cup, we are ready to learn. You can not have the wine in cups, as you contend, and drink "the cup" from them. The only way that you can "drink the cup" is to drink out of the cup. You can no more dispense with the "cup" or make it "an incidental" to the worship, than that man whom the Lord called "a fool" could separate the Temple from the gold or the altar from the gift. (Mt. 23:16-22.)

If you please to call drinking from, or out of, the cup "dividing the wine," all well: the Scriptures authorize this; but not the practice you affirm in your proposition.

You say, "A small vessel and a small loaf show all the unity designed in the one case; a larger vessel and a large loaf are used to show the same unity in the other." True; and "the loaf" signifies "one loaf," and "the cup" (1 Cor. 10:16), signifies one cup. And Paul says, "Let him . . . drink of the cup." (1 Cor. 11:28.) And in so doing he "drinks the cup." (1 Cor. 11:26.) But the practice you affirm is to drink out of cups. Why not have loaves, too, as the Catholics do? Would it not be more "convenient" than one loaf for all?

Question: Do you contend that all the disciples in Jerusalem ate from the same loaf? Tell us how large a loaf it would take for twenty-five thousand.

It is said that "The devil has many tools, but a lie is a handle that fits them all." And it seems that digression has many excuses, but "convenience" is a handle that fits them all. Some people are too lazy to serve the Lord; some are too stubborn; some are too ignorant, and some serve him only when it suits them. There is no objection to "convenience" only when it hinders us from obeying God. For "convenience" the Christian Church practiced at several places the giving of thanks for both the loaf and the cup at one time. And for "convenience" some of the "Holiness" use water on the Lord's table. And your practice in using "cups" is not sanctioned by the Scriptures—not any more than theirs is.

I have the same authority for all drinking from one cup that you have for "only one vessel before thanks are given," or for one loaf for a congregation, or for breaking the loaf, or for giving thanks, and that is the word of God.

You have not produced even a "necessary inference" for your practice. You admit that "The Scriptures say nothing about it"; hence "necessary inference" is the only plea you have open. So try again. I do not care a snap on what ground you use cups, whether "convenience", or not, just so you sustain the practice by the Scriptures. And remember that the same Bible that says, "This is my blood," also says, "This cup is the New Testament." And while we tell the Pope the Bible says, "All drink," we tell you it says, "Drink out of the cup."

H. C. HARPER.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Much of Brother Harper's first reply is irrelevant. Much of it is true. A few things in it merit attention. We are discussing a practical question. Several times I have met with several hundred disciples for worship. At least a gallon of wine was used. Brother Harper, what is your practice in such a case? Do you break up the assembly into small groups and give one cup to each group? You quote Neander concerning Jerusalem. Do you mean to imply that the Lord forbids large assemblies? Does Neander say that the multitude of disciples in Jerusalem divided into small groups for their worship? Is there an intimation in the Bible that the Lord has placed a limit on the number of disciples who may worship together? You ask how large a loaf the Pentecostans had. Large enough, no doubt, for all worshippers present. Did they all drink out of the same cup, Brother

Harper? If so, how big was it, and how long did it take? I insist that you tell us exactly what to do when hundreds come together for worship. You say the "Jews knew how to eat a lamb at the Passover even if many thousands were to eat." Exactly, I am glad you said that. Now turn to Ex. 12:4 and find how they did this. It was left to the judgment and convenience of the individual Jew to select the neighbor whom he joined in the service. This is what we do in the Lord's Supper. The Lord designated the kind of animal for the Passover. He appointed the day, even the part of the day, for its slaughter; but he gave them reasonable latitude as to time, in order, no doubt, to provide against emergencies. He required that all the lamb be eaten within a reasonable time (before morning). He then left the arrangement of details to the convenience of families.

This, I agree, is what we find in the Lord's Supper. The Lord has appointed the day. He has provided the elements (bread and wine). He has indicated the approved order of eating and drinking. He has shown who may participate and in what spirit. But He has left to our convenience details that must vary with circumstances.

You paid no attention to my definition of "authorize," exemplified by the meeting-house and baptistry. There is no statement, command, approved example, or necessary inference in the Scriptures for these. Are they authorized? If not, do you oppose them? If not authorized by the Lord, can you approve of their use? If so, on what ground?

Now to the only argument you have made, Jesus said: "Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine," etc. (Matt. 26:27-29). You translate ek "out of" (v. 26), make the pronoun "it" refer to the "cup" (container), and draw the conclusion that Jesus designed to command all the disciples in any assembly till the end of time to drink from the same cup.

In this argument are several fallacies, two of which I shall discuss. 1. The word ek occurs 890 times in the New Testament. Its primary meaning is "out of," but it is far more often rendered "from" to indicate source, origin, beginning, etc. For examples: "His chains fell off from (ek) his hands" (Ac. 12:7); "He riseth from (ek) supper" (Jno. 13:4); "If I be lifted up from the earth" (Jno. 12:32); "Dried up from (ek) the roots" Mark 11:20). Surely ek does not mean "out of" in these examples. It simply denotes the source or beginning point in time or space. When one vessel on the Lord's table containing wine is emptied into other vessels, every person who drinks from one of the actually drinks from (ek) the original vessel. Proof: Jno. 4:12, "Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof (ek) himself, and his children, and his cattle?" I take it that Jacob's sons or servants drew the water out of the well and dispensed it among the people and the cattle by using buckets or other vessels. If they used one bucket it destroys Brother Harper's position, for in that case they did not drink out of (ek) the well at all, but out of a bucket!

2. I seriously doubt that the pronoun "it" (v. 26) refers to the "cup" (container). My doubt is based upon the language that follows: "Drink ye all of it ('wine')." This comforts blood . . . (This should read: This comforts with the words, "This is my blood.") I will not drink of (ek) THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE." I admit that "it" may refer to the "cup" (container), but grammar and logic argue powerfully that "it" and "this" occurring twice in close succession, refer to the same thing, but the latter modifies "fruit of the vine." Hence the conclusion: "Drink ye all of it (wine)." This comforts with the word "drink," which implies a liquid. Jacob, his children, and his cattle could all drink of (ek) the well in Samaria by drinking some of its water. From this reasoning, we are bound to conclude that the one requirement is to drink some of the wine used for the communion.

Brother Harper asks: "Why do you contend that only one container should be used till after thanks are given?" I answer: To distinguish a particular volume of wine set apart from all other for sacred use. Thus provided, it fitly represents the whole of the Saviour's blood, viewed as separate and apart from His body, and suggesting His death. For this emblematic blood we give thanks, thereby completing its dedication to this sacred use. Afterwards all the worshippers drink of it as the Lord commanded.

N. L. CLARK

SECOND NEGATIVE

Proposition: The Scriptures authorize the use of more than one container in the distribution of the wine in the Lord's Supper.

Brother Clark so affirms. He has advanced no new arguments. According to Webster his practice is unauthorized. If the Scriptures authorize a thing and yet furnish neither "statement, command, approved example, nor necessary inference" for it, the Scriptures authorize the Sunday school, the organ in the worship, the Missionary Society, the "individual communion cups,"—yes, every innovation that has corrupted the church.

If Brother Clark wants to deny that the Scriptures "authorize," a suitable place for baptizing and for meeting for worship, I am ready to affirm it; and I will not stand on the silence of the Bible to do it! It is now clear to me why Brother Clark did not affirm that he could "speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" for his practice.

His arguments are: 1. His bare assertion that "the number of containers used is an incidental to the worship;" 2. That "Jesus gave the wine, not the cup, as the memorial of his blood."

I called his attention to the statement of Jesus, that "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," but he passed it up and let his argument (?) go down. In the Apostolic Way of September 1, 1925, he says: "The one issue is whether we may use more than one cup in the service; the other is whether we should use individual cups."

Now, will he please be good and define "container" in his proposition, so we can tell what the "issue" is before going further? This is twice I have requested him to do so. Is it cup?

As to the number of containers being "an incidental to the worship," the fact that he contends for the use of "one container" prior to and during the giving of thanks, of itself refutes his argument, for an incidental may vary with every whim, as he points out.

The Passover no more comports with his practice of using cups than it does with the Pope's in drinking all the wine; both run rough-shod over the Scriptures. Had the Jew followed such a course, he might have slaughtered a swine instead of a lamb. "But in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines, the commandments of men." (Mt. 15:9). And to place "it" beyond the shadow of a quibble, Paul says, "Let him drink out of the cup." (1 Cor. 11:28). And the word here translated "cup" as in Mt. 26:27, connotes "a cup" a drinking vessel." (Thayer). And neither grammar nor logic requires that "it" relate to anything but "the wine-cup" (Goodspeed's tr.) just antecedent.

Acts 12:7, etc., forsooth! Who contends that ek should be rendered "out of" in these places? Ek may be used of source, supply, etc., hence the rendering "thereof." But in drinking "out of" a bucket no one thereby drinks "out of" a well! Neither, when one vessel on the Lord's table containing wine is emptied into other vessels, does every one who drinks "out of" one of these actually drink "out of" the original vessel! I know you did not say he does, but the unwary reader would readily infer this from your statement. But to say that one who drinks "out of" a cup filled from a pail thereby drinks "out of" the pail, is to talk nonsense.

Thayer says: "Pino ek (drink out of) with a genitive of the vessel out of (Yes, out of) which one drinks." And he cites "ek tou portierion" (out of the cup) in Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:28; 1 Cor. 11:28, where the Greek connotes "a cup, a drinking vessel." And he makes a clear-cut distinction between this use and that of "ek with a genitive denoting the drink of (Yes, of) which as a supply one drinks," citing Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25, relating to the Lord's supper.

I called Brother Clark's attention to the fact that Paul says, "Let him drink out of the cup," the Greek connoting "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer). What cup? "The cup of blessing which we bless." (1 Cor. 10:16. This is "the cup," and he is to drink out of "the cup." Moreover, they all drank "the cup." (1 Cor. 11:26, 27). And the contents (for this is a metonymy) must be in "the cup" to be called "the cup." Escape this you can not.

Question: Does Brother Clark favor the use of one cup prior to and during the giving of thanks on the ground that the Scriptures so require?

Question: If, as he says, "the number of containers used is an incidental to the worship," and "the one requirement is to drink some of the wine used for the communion," is not the use of "individual cups" or the use of "more than one cup," regardless of the "one container" to hold the wine prior to and during the giving of thanks, an acceptable practice with the Lord?

Question: On what ground does Brother Clark oppose the practice of one person drinking all the wine?

He says "the loaf" was large enough for all worshippers present; and I say, on the same authority—the Book! so was "the cup" (1 Cor. 10:16).

We want to know what I would do under given circumstances of communion. I should do just as I do when baptizing—prepare to do what the Lord says to do. Neander says: "In large towns, where such a place (private house) of assembly could not accommodate all, it became necessary that smaller portions of the community dwelling at a distance should choose other places for their meetings on Sunday." (Ib).

God pity the people who follow those who make a mockery of worshiping Him through "convenience." Ah, yes, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem." (1 Kg. 12:28). God is honored in his appointments, not man's. (Col. 2:21, 22). And Brother Clark, unless he is going with the Pope, must admit that the commands and approved examples of the New Testament are for us to follow till "He comes."

H. C. HARPER.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Harper wants to show authority for a meeting-house! He is dodging. I claim authority for the meeting-house on the score of necessary convenience in obeying the Lord. Brother Harper, what Scripture gives any more authority for a meeting-house than it does for two or more cups to distribute the wine? I believe the motto: "Speak where the Bible speaks," etc., but no man can make this fit every detail of the Lord's work. If so, away go your meeting-house, baptisteries, song-books, blackboard, invitation-song, women in the Communion, etc. etc. This cannot apply to the Sunday-school, etc., for they are separate organizations, not necessary to do the Lord's work. But in a large assembly more than one cup is necessary to carry on the worship in decency and in order.

A "container" is any suitable vessel for the distribution of the wine. Brother Harper, what do you mean by a "cup"? Will an ordinary glass answer the purpose?

In my last article I gave a reason for one vessel prior to the distribution of the wine. Let Brother Harper answer me and quit his quibbling. We are discussing one point only, the distribution of the wine after thanks.

The division of the Paschal lamb, as I showed, was left to the convenience of the Jews. Brother Harper did not touch my argument on it.

He says: "In drinking out of a bucket no one thereby drinks out of a well!" But Jno. 4:12 says that Jacob drank (ek autou) "out of" it (the well). The same witness said: "The well is deep." How did Jacob and his children and his cattle drink out of this well? Anybody can answer. But Brother Harper says this is one kind of genitive with ek and drinking out of a cup is another kind. Here is the exact issue. How does Brother Harper prove this? By finding where Thayer possibly cites a passage as an example. The very same Greek phrase (ek autou) occurs in Matt. 26:27 and Jno. 4:12. When Jesus said: "Drink ye all of it," he meant: all of you drink of its contents. When Jacob drank of the well, he drank some of its contents.

The word "cup" when used in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper always refers to the wine it contains. On this proposition I stake my case. Proof: (1) Jesus gave the cup, saying: "Drink ye all of (out of) it, for this is my blood. . . I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:27). Here "the cup" containing the wine is mentioned with direct reference to the wine; (2) "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup" (1 Cor. 11:27). How can one "drink this cup"? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way. Even Brother Harper admits that this is a figure of speech called metonymy, in which one thing is put for another that usually accompanies it, such as: "She sets a good table." In this case "table" is used for the food placed on it; (3) "This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

me" (1 Cor. 11:25). This word "cup" here undoubtedly refers to the wine, which Jesus calls his blood. Furthermore, he says, "ye drink it." (4) "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of (ek) that bread, and drink of (ek) that cup" (1 Cor. 11:28). What does this mean? If ek before cup means "out of" and Paul meant literally **drink out of the cup**, then he also meant eat out of the bread! It could not mean eat the bread. He meant eat of that bread what can be eaten and drink of that cup what can be drunk. We can eat the bread and drink the wine. That is all. If we substitute the word wine for the word cup in any passage that refers directly to the Lord's Supper, it makes complete sense and gives the exact thought. Hence I conclude that Jesus and Paul used the word "cup" for its contents, which is in all language a very common form of expression.

Brother Harper, how can a man drink a cup? By what law of language do you make the word "cup" both literal and figurative in the same passage? Again, I insist that you tell us plainly what you would do if one thousand disciples should meet with you for worship? Some of your questions are entirely irrelevant to the issue, but these pertain directly to the proposition.

Finally, I urge you, Brother Harper, to come right to the issue, quit quibbling, dodging, and talking around. Show, if you can, by logical reasoning that I have misapplied the Scriptures and thus reached false conclusions.

N. L. CLARK

THIRD NEGATIVE

Harper has been "dodging" only as he has been following the meandering wake of Brother Clark's sinking "vessel," which he endeavored to ballast with "container." No word in the Bible connected with the Lord's Supper means "vessel" or "container." And the Bible in no way "speaks" of more than one cup. And Brother Clark, in thrusting his practice upon the church, is not "silent where the Bible is silent." When he is gone, how shall the church know how to observe the Lord's Supper unless he leaves it his ritual?

He tells me: "I do not believe in the use of individual cups unless extraordinary circumstances warrant it." And must the church take his ipse dixit as to when such circumstances arise? Is it only in cases of sickness, as sprinkling came in?

His contention for only one container while thanks are being offered refutes his contention that "the number of containers is an incidental to the worship," no matter what we are discussing; for this is in the worship.

And when Jesus says, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," it forever refutes Brother Clark's contention that "Jesus gave the wine, not the cup, as the memorial of His blood."

Container: Any suitable vessel for the distribution of the wine," he says. And he tells us: "Brother Harper and I agree that only one container should be used till after thanks are given."

Can a person drink "the cup" by drinking the bottle, or the jug, or what-not? I once knew an elder to take the bottle, and begin: "We thank thee for this cup." He may not have lied, but he did not tell the truth. Does a person drink a barrel in drinking a cup, if the cup was filled from the barrel?

That "genitive" is Thayer's, not Harper's and Brother Clark can not refute it.

If disciples were compelled to eat the Supper in large assemblies, there might be something in the brother's question about one thousand and one cup. And when Brother Clark answers my question as to "one loaf" and twenty-five thousand, he can answer his own.

The man who sprinkles for baptism can claim just as much of "decent and in order" for his practice as Brother Clark dare claim for his.

Brother Clark can never argue out innovations like the Sunday school and the organ, and yet keep his that stands on the same ground.

He now says they "drank 'out of it' (the well)" and ruins his former effort at an argument, when he said: "If they used one bucket, it destroys Brother Harper's position, for in that case they did not drink out of (ek) the well, at all, but out of the bucket."

If every practice I endorse is unscriptural, this does not make his practice scriptural; but let him try out the meeting-house by these (Ac. 20:8; Ro. 16:5-15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:5), and then furnish "as much" for his practice.

He has finally abandoned his "vessel" for "cup," and is now endeavoring to get ashore on "The word 'cup' when used in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper always refers to the wine it contains." He says: "On this proposition I stake my case." And I accept the "gauge of battle." The Greek word translated "cup" in these passages: Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:20 (first mentioned); 1 Cor. 11:25 (first mentioned); 1 Cor. 10:16, refers to "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer.) And Goodspeed translates it "wine-cup," which he could not do, if the word did not refer to a literal cup. And Thayer refers to these passages, and says: "The vessel out of which one drinks," which he could not do if the word did not refer to the cup, and not the wine.

And Thayer gives Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:20 (second mentioned); 1 Cor. 11:25 (second mentioned); 1 Cor. 10:21, where "the cup" refers to "the drink of which as a supply one drinks."

(This should read: And Thayer gives Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; "the drink of which as a supply one drinks," and Lk. 22:20 (second mentioned); 1 Cor. 11:25 (second mentioned); 1 Cor. 10:21, where "the cup" refers to "the contents of the cup.")

Cup: Webster.—"A small vessel used chiefly to drink from, with or without a handle. Also large or ornamental forms, as wine cups." And his fifth definition is: "A drinking vessel and its contents," Brother Clark to the contrary notwithstanding.

Had the Jew at the Passover acted on Brother Clark's notion of what the Word of God "authorizes," he might have peddled "the lamb" throughout the camp of Israel. Brother Clark pays about as much attention to what God says on the Lord's Supper as he does to a last-year's almanac.

The use of the word cup for its contents is simply a metonymy; and when Brother Clark contends that the word "cup" in the Bible in connection with the Lord's Supper is always the figure metonymy, he has the scholarship of the world to face to the contrary; and this means defeat for him. Now let him correct Thayer; and Goodspeed, of Chicago University; and Ropes, of Harvard, if he can.

The "show" is yours, brother; and your "show" is no better with this proposition than it was with the first one. Show us some "logical reasoning," and maybe we can learn some of it. How in the name of reason could you "misapply the Scriptures" to your proposition when you admit that the Bible is silent on it? All you have done is to nibble at the Scriptures I have produced as rebuttal.

H. C. HARPER.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Harper says: "No word in the Bible connected with the Lord's Supper means VESSEL or container?" Later he quotes Webster: "Cup, a small VESSEL used chiefly to drink from." Plain contradiction! Brother Harper destroys his own position. If both Harper and Webster are correct, the Saviour had no cup at all! Brother Harper, did Jesus have a "cup," "a small vessel," or did you simply make a mistake?

But that elder says Harper, made a mistake (almost "lied") when he called a bottle a cup! That elder knew that Jesus and Webster both call the wine of the Communion the cup, no matter what contains it. Even Brother Harper refers to six Scriptures in which he (Harper) says that "cup" means "the DRINK OF which as a supply one drinks." Brother Harper, why not admit this to be its meaning in the five other passages you cite? This is the easiest way to surrender your entire position. We will then shake hands and forget it. Your cause is hopelessly lost if Scripture, language, reason and consistency are to be regarded. Your third reply is the weakest yet. If you have any argument, let us have

it. I now return to my affirmative argument.

On the table are one loaf of unleavened bread and one vessel of wine. This is the Lord's Supper. One loaf is used to symbolize the one body of Christ; one vessel of wine to symbolize the one volume of blood drawn from the body. Their separation represents the death of Christ. One volume of wine also separates it in the mind of the worshiper from all other wine. Putting these emblems on the table dedicates them to divine use. Giving thanks sanctifies them to the good of the worshiper. The vessel containing the wine, no matter about shape, size or material, is simply the container of the thing to be drunk. Every Scripture that connects the act of drinking with this institution refers to the wine, for only a liquid can be literally drunk. A meal is composed of food and drink. The bread is the food; the wine the drink. The container of either has no more to do with the Supper than has the table on which it is spread. I presume that the bread and wine placed on the ground or floor would be as much the Supper as if placed on a table. Reason teaches that the table is just as important as is the cup or plate. This is simply a restatement of my position.

Jesus BROKE the bread—into how many pieces, no one can tell, but certainly into two pieces. Each disciple present ate a portion of one piece, unless he broke a portion from each piece. None broke a portion from the loaf entire, for Jesus had already broken it. Hence, the notion that a disciple must take a portion of the undivided emblem is absurd, as it affects the bread. Why should not the same rule apply to both emblems?

I now take the position that Jesus commanded the disciples to divide the cup among themselves, leaving the manner of division to them. In Luke 22:17, we read: "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said: Take this, and divide it among yourselves." This is the cup of the Lord's Supper for these reasons: 1. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all introduce the cup with the same words: He took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them (Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lu. 22:17). 2. All three witnesses follow Jesus' statement about the cup with His language about His own drinking of the fruit of the vine. 3. If Lu. 22:17 refers to another cup, then Luke mentions no commandment about the cup. The arguments against this are: 1. This makes Luke mention the cup before the bread. 2. It makes Luke appear to divide his statements about the cup. I answer: Paul twice mentions the cup before the bread (1 Cor. 10:16, 21). Luke 22:17 and 22:20 added together make complete sense and harmonize with the other writers. It follows that Jesus gave the Apostles at the institution of the Supper, not only the privilege, but a plain commandment to divide the cup among themselves. Brother Harper, please show where He told them how to divide it.

"Drink the cup," "Drink of the cup," "Drink out of the cup," "Drink the fruit of the vine"—all mean the same thing. Drink is defined: "To swallow a liquid." Hence the content of the cup, the wine, is the thing drunk. Brother Harper's entire case rests upon his interpretation of one passage: "Drink ye all (out of) it." I challenge him to attempt to harmonize the quotations just made containing the word "drink."

Question: 1. Is the use of more than one cup sinful? 2. Which would be the greater sin, to use fish on the Lord's table or to use two cups? 3. Is a church that uses two cups a Degrading church? 4. Shall we make the number of cups used a test of fellowship, and divide the church over it?

N. L. CLARK

FOURTH NEGATIVE

It is Brother Clark's "mistake," his ignorance, or his duplicity. A cup is a vessel, but a vessel is not a cup; it may be a bottle or a jug. A boy is an animal, but an animal is not a boy; it may be a dog or a cat. "Cup" is not defined as "a small vessel." A vial is a small vessel, but a vial is not a cup. A cup is "a small vessel used chiefly to drink from."—Webster. People do not use bottles, or jugs, or barrels "chiefly to drink from." Dare Brother Clark, in this connection, tell us the essentials of a definition? If so, he can refute his nonsense here. Now talk about "language, reason and consistency" will you? I challenge Brother Clark, as a scholar, to translate poterion either "vessel" or "container," his two chief words or jugglery in this discussion. He dare not do so any more than a Methodist scholar dare translate baptizo either "sprinkle" or "pour"—and why? Simply because the word does not mean that.

He says "The container has no more to do with the Supper than has the table on which it is placed." But the Son of God says: "This cup (not bottle, or jug, or barrel, or table) is the New Testament in my blood." And I say with Paul: "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Neither Christ nor Webster calls "the wine of the Communion the cup, no matter what contains it." This involves a metonymy, and hence Thayer says: "By metonymy, of the container for the contained." This is general. If the content is in a bottle, for example, he drinks a bottle; if in a cup, he drinks a cup. Hence Thayer says of those passages relating to the Lord's Supper where metonymy is used: "The contents of the cup." Yes, "cup," not bottle or jug; for if the content is in anything else than a cup, it cannot be called "the cup," by any law of language, reason or consistency.

No, Harper does not say, "the drink of which as a supply one drinks," but Thayer says this when he cites those "six Scriptures" where "cup" is used by metonymy, and he just as plainly says that "cup" in the "five other passages" refers to "a cup, a drinking vessel." (This should read: No, Harper does not say, "the drink of which as a supply one drinks," but Thayer says this. When he cites those "six Scriptures" where "cup" is used by metonymy, "the contents of the cup." Not "vessel," but a cup that is a drinking vessel. And he so says, because "cup" may mean, for example, "an instrument used in cupping." And Harper is backed not only by Thayer, but by Goodspeed, of Chicago University, and Ropes, of Harvard, two of the ripest scholars of New Testament Greek now living.

In trying to knock me out, he asserted that "the number of containers is an incidental to the worship," but in so saying he met himself coming the other way in "Harper and I agree that only one container should be used till after thanks are given." Maybe this is the reason he did not tell us when we have those "extraordinary occasions" for the "individual cups." If the number is an incidental, why not have the "individual cups" all the time, if we want them? Is Brother Clark our lord to hinder?

He asserts that "Every Scripture that connects the act of drinking with the institution refers to the wine." But Thayer says: "Πino ek (drink out of) with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks," and he cites Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28. Again he says: "After pinein (drink) of the thing out of which one drinks," and he cites "ek tou poterion" (out of the cup.) And he says, "differently in II.9, below," where he says, "Of the supply," etc., citing Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25.

For the sake of argument, suppose Lk. 22:17 to refer to the Lord's Supper—"Take this and share it among you" (Goodspeed's Tr.)—the how is shown in the command, "Drink ye all out of it" (Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23), for poterion here means, as Thayer shows, "a cup, a drinking vessel," and as Brother Clark admits, saying that "The Apostles, on that occasion, all drank from the same cup."

His questions: 1. Yes. 2. I see no difference. 3. In this matter, yes. 4. If "we" introduce a humanism and the church divides over it, "we" make the matter a test of fellowship and divide the church. Just what "we" will do remains to be seen.

Questions: - . Would you fellowship a church that uses an organ? 2. Would you fellowship a church that regularly uses "individual cups," and has the wine in them when thanks are offered? 3. Where is the ground of unity since you admit my practice to be acceptable to the Lord and I cannot conscientiously accept yours?

H. C. HARPER.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: The Scriptures authorize the use of more than one vessel in the distribution of the wine of the Lord's Supper.

In his third reply Brother Harper said: "No word in the Bible connected with the Lord's Supper means vessel or container." This must mean that a cup is not a vessel. Now he says: "A cup is a vessel." Clear cut contradiction. (Clark's "ignorance or duplicity"). Again: "A cup is a vessel, but a vessel is not a cup" (Harper). He should say: "A cup is a vessel, and some vessels are cups." A boy is an animal, and some animals are boys, Brother Harper. (Clark's "nonsense.")

Jesus used a drinking-vessel (Greek poterion), translated "cup" Nobody knows its shape, size, or material. If Brother Harper could see it, I seriously doubt he would call it a cup. Still he stoutly contends that it was not a bottle or a jug. How does he know? Bottles and jugs are often used as drinking vessels.

Brother Harper quotes Thayer's opinion as if Thayer were inspired. Thayer was a Greek scholar, and we all accept his definitions of Greek words. But when Thayer says the word "cup" is figurative in one passage and literal in another, he speaks as a theologian, not as a lexicographer. Brother Harper's principal authority is Thayer's opinion, not his definitions, for we all agree on them.

Harper, Thayer and I agree that the word "cup" or its equivalent in Matt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lu. 22:20; 1 Cor. 10:21; 1 Cor. 11:25, 27, "refers to the drink of which as a supply one drinks" (Harper's Third Reply). We also agree that the word in these passages is used figuratively, the container being mentioned for the content (wine). Hence I conclude that Jesus and Paul called the wine the cup. Only one question remains, viz: Did Jesus and Paul use the same word six times in connection with the Lord's Supper figuratively and then to confuse us use it in the same connection literally? I cannot believe it. Where the word is apparently used literally (as in Matt. 26:27), the context shows that the author had in mind the wine, not the vessel. This is the exact point at issue.

If I should concede every point in Brother Harper's contention, his conclusion would not necessarily follow. Suppose Jesus meant to tell the Apostles all to drink out of the same vessel, it would not follow that every group of disciples should do so. To draw this conclusion, Brother Harper must show that something in this particular manner of drinking was necessary to the proper observance of the Supper. This no one can show. Brother Harper has not once attempted it. Eleven men seated around a table, partaking of a common meal, would naturally drink the memorial wine from the same vessel. No reason appears for their doing otherwise. But when hundreds or thousands assembled, as in Jerusalem, for this service, circumstances were quite different. For these to attempt to repeat every detail of the first Lord's Supper would have been the very travesty of all reason.

I have argued that the notion of unity in the emblem is shown in the bread and wine placed on the table. I have called attention to the difficulty of observing the Supper by large assemblies with only one vessel for each emblem. Every lesson of memory, devotion and communion taught by the Supper is preserved where a sufficient number of cups is used to provide for the worshippers in decency and in order. In the individual cup, other notions enter. Pride, style, vain show, extreme notions of hygiene, etc., play their part. The mental attitude of the worshippers is changed by these things. How far God accepts such worship, I cannot tell. I am sure that any service rendered from wrong motives has always been rejected by Him.

Brother Harper says he occupies the only common ground on this question. Maybe so, but that does not prove he is right. A brother said to me: "One cup is safe." Yes, to sit on the floor, as Christ and the Apostles doubtless did, is safe, but is it required? For men only to commune is safe, but is it right? To follow Acts 2:42 as an order of worship is safe, but is it obligatory? I do not object to the use of one cup only, in small assemblies. Brother Harper teaches that the use of two cups is as bad as the use of fish on the Lord's table. Every church that uses two or more cups is a Digressive body. I suppose he believes all such will go to perdition unless they repent.

He asks me three questions, which I shall answer by number: 1. No; 2. I would not indorse, but would try to correct the practice. 3. Already answered.

I shall now briefly summarize my arguments. The one and only issue relates to the distribution of the wine AFTER thanks are offered. We are not debating about individual cups. Brother Harper insists that every worshiper in any assembly must drink from a common cup or be guilty of sin against Christ. I contend that by the words: "Take this, and divide it among yourselves" (Lu. 22:17), Jesus left the manner of division to the worshippers. Brother Harper says Jesus showed the manner by the language: "Drink ye all of it." I deny this because the context shows the pronoun "it" refers to the wine, not to the vessel. Next, I argued that we can drink a liquid only. This admitted, every passage that connects drinking with the cup refers to the wine. Brother Harper admits this in six passages out of eleven. If "cup" in the New Testament refers to the wine, whoever drinks any portion of it drinks of the cup. From this there is no escape.

Brother Harper has never denied we may use two cups if the word cup in the New Testament refers to the wine. In the next place, I have repeatedly shown that the bread is divided (broken) before it is eaten. Why should not the wine

be also? Brother Harper has never attempted to answer this. He has talked about a good many other subjects, but he has signally failed to show in a clear cut way how a thousand worshippers can commune in decency and order with one cup. He has utterly failed to show a reason for his contention except his interpretation of Matt. 26:27. He has not pointed out a principle of devotion, humility, or communion that is violated by the practice I advocate.

I leave the decision of the issue to the thoughtful and reverent-minded who may read what we have written.

N. L. CLARK.

FIFTH NEGATIVE

He omits "container" from the proposition and inserts "vessel," but this does not help him out of his dilemma, for, as I said, "No word in the Bible connected with the Lord's Supper means vessel or container. And this does not mean that 'A cup is not a vessel,' as he says; but it means that potation, the word used in the Bible, does not mean vessel or container. He says, 'translated 'cup.' True; hence 'bottles and jugs' are excluded, even if they are 'sometimes used to drink from.' And I said it right and in a way to expose his jugglery; and the fact that only 'some vessels are cups,' as he admits, is proof that vessel does not mean cup.

I know it was a cup, for that is what potation means. (Thayer.)

"Thayer's opinions," he says, as though Thayer's opinions do not obtain in his "definitions" as well as elsewhere! And what is Brother Clark's ipse dixit worth in comparison with the scholarship of Thayer, Goodspeed and Ropes?

Neither Jesus, nor Paul, nor Webster "calls the wine of the Communion the cup, no matter what contains it." And Brother Clark was not fool enough to defend his statement here; neither did he dare to deny Webster's statement that "cup" may refer to "A drinking vessel and its contents."

He says, "The Apostles, on that occasion, all drank from the same cup." Here he used the word cup literally; but again he uses "cup" in referring to the contents—"drink the cup." Has he done so to confuse us? I can not believe it. Then why should such use by Jesus and Paul confuse us?

Can he dispense with the cup and handle the wine? No. And since Jesus says, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," he can no more dispense with the cup in this institution than could that fellow Jesus called a fool separate the gift from the altar or the Temple from the gold. (Mt. 23 16).

He admitted that "it" (Mt. 26 27) "may refer to the cup," but now he tries to make us believe that he knows it refers to the wine; but I have pitted Thayer, and Goodspeed, and Paul against him.

"We can drink a liquid only." Yes; but we can "drink from the cup." With the Supper we find both "the vessel out of which one drinks" and "the supply of which." (Thayer.) Hence Goodspeed translates "eat of (not out of, as an ignoramus might say) the bread" and "drink from the cup."

He says, "Jacob drank 'out of it' (the well)." But he knows this is incorrect, for he again says, "If they used one bucket, they did not drink out of the well, at all, but out of the bucket."

He says, "I am unable to believe that three thousand disciples drank from the same cup." And this shows that he knows when he said, "When one vessel is emptied into other vessels, every person who drinks from one of these actually drinks from (ek) the original vessel, it is not so. If he knew it were true, such a difficulty never could have entered his head.

Yes, the Bible says the bread was broken; but when he came to the same thing of "the cup," he failed. I granted him Lk. 22:17 for the sake of the argument; but when "Take this and share it among you," was lined up with Mt. 26:27 and Mk. 14:23—"He took the wine-cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, 'You must all drink from it' and 'They all drank from it,'" he fled to "It does not follow that every group of disciples should do so," and lined up with the Pope, who drinks all the wine, and with other digressives who use "individual cups." When he thought he had the passage in his favor it was binding, you see; but if it points the other way, it is not for us to-day.

He admits that "In the individual cups, other notions—pride, style, vain show, extreme notions of hygiene, etc.—enter." Yet he will fellowship a church that "regularly uses the individual cups and has the wine in them when thanks are given." But he says, "I would not indorse, but try to correct such a practice." And he tells us, "How far God ac-

cepts such worship. I cannot tell." Yet he engages in it, and does indorse it on "extraordinary occasions," as I have pointed out, well knowing that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Ro. 14:23), and that "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God" (Ro. 10:17), and that Jesus says, "In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines, the commandments of men." (Mk. 7:7).

We have the same authority for "that particular manner of drinking"—all drinking from one cup—that we have for breaking the bread, or giving thanks; and I take the Book at just what it says and what he "concedes," namely: "Jesus used only one cup" and "The Apostles all drank from the same cup."

Had he not failed to show that all the disciples in Jerusalem took the Supper in one congregation and how nicely he could serve twenty-five thousand with "one loaf" and "one cup only till after thanks are given," there might be something for me to do here. Maybe he sees a limit.

His subterfuge of "sit on the floor," etc.; has been the siren song of all digressives. But "For men only to commune," like his practice, is neither safe nor right. Both are anti-scriptural. Women are "disciples." (Mat. 28 20; Ac. 8:12). The "disciples" came together to break bread. (Ac. 20:7). And "Every lesson of memory, devotions," etc., is not "presented" in his practice any more than it is in the practice of the Pope in drinking all the wine.

He contends for "one cup only till after thanks are given" (and this is in the worship), and then to down me he says, "The number of containers is an incidental to the worship," and ruins his contention and falls in line with "the individual cups," asserting that "The container has no more to do with the Supper than has the table on which it is placed."

He says, "If 'cup' in the New Testament refers to the wine, whoever drinks any portion of it, drinks the cup."

But if the wine is not in the cup, brother, he no more "drinks the cup." He may drink the bottle, or the jug, or whatever the wine is in. From this there is no escape.

He says, "If the word 'cup' in the New Testament refers to the wine." But there it never refers to the wine unless the wine is in the cup. Can Brother Clark drink a cup and a bottle at the same time? Can he drink a barrel when he drinks a cup if the cup was filled from the barrel? If he drinks cup number one when he drinks cup number two which was filled from cup number one, he drinks a barrel when he drinks a cup that was filled from the barrel.

Harper has denied the use of "two or more cups" all of the time.

To question 3 he says, "Already answered." But I fail to find his answer. Here is my question: "Where is the ground of unity since you admit my practice to be acceptable to the Lord and I can not conscientiously accept yours?" And he can not answer it and defend his practice. The man who admits he can worship "either way," and yet will not give up his way to save the conscience of a brother, would stick to his "meat" (Ro. 14:23) even if it sends a brother to perdition.

At no time in this discussion has he held his practice above privilege or liberty. And why he rejects "pride, style, vain show, extreme notions of hygiene, etc.," as motivating impulses which vitiate the worship, but calmly advocates "convenience" as an all-sufficient excuse for departing from divine precept and example, puzzles me. I simply can not understand how he expects to "keep the unity of the Spirit" (Eph. 4:1-4) by such a course.

With a prayer that the truth may prevail, I close,

H. C. HARPER.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

Three years ago we published the preceding part of this discussion. Bro. Harper now decides to republish it; and, upon his invitation, I am writing this article on the same proposition, with the understanding that he will write a closing article of about the same length.

I shall reply briefly to a few things in Bro. Harper's articles that I think deserve further notice; and shall also try to make clearer and more convincing my arguments. Let the reader keep in mind what the exact issue is. I believe that Jesus meant to appoint two things only as the elements of the Lord's Supper. These are the bread, memorial of his body, and the "fruit of the vine," memorial of his blood. These alone are sufficient to complete a supper, and they represent in separation his death. The suggestion of unity in his spiritual body, the church, is typified in the fact that he had one body and one volume of blood, which is shown in the

Supper by one loaf and one volume of wine. To my mind, this is the end of the law in so far as the Supper itself is concerned.

From the foregoing point of view, I consider the following Scriptures to refer exclusively to the liquid to be drunk: 1. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. 26:27, 28); 2. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come.—Likewise the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." (Luke 22:17 and 20); 3. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10:16); 4. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils" (1 Cor. 10:21); 5. "After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:25-27).

These Scriptures contain the testimony on which the issue between us depends. Of course, Jesus handled a literal cup, FOR NO MAN CAN HANDLE A LIQUID except in some kind of container; and Paul's use of the word "cup" is evidently borrowed from Jesus. My position is that in all these passages, Jesus and Paul had in mind the contents of the "cup," not the literal cup itself. My reasons are: 1. The content (wine) represents blood; the cup (container) represents nothing; 2. Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood;" and again, "This is my blood of the New Testament;" 3. of the cup, he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves." He surely did not mean: "Break a solid cup into pieces;" 4. The Corinthians were said to "drink the cup."

These Scriptures and arguments lead me to the conclusion that the "cup" of the Lord's Supper is "the fruit of the vine." If this is correct, the one thing of importance is to drink with proper spiritual preparation the appointed emblem of the Savior's blood. Whether this wine be in a cup, a glass, a bottle, or a jug has nothing to do with its value. If the bread has been broken into two, four, or a dozen pieces, I am supposed to eat from one piece only. In doing so, I eat the bread. Likewise, if the wine has been divided into two, four, or a dozen portions; when I have partaken of one portion, I have drunk the blood of the Lord. To me this reasoning is logical, Scriptural, and safe. If not, Bro. Harper should show wherein it is defective.

Bro. Harper has devoted much space to quibbling over such terms as "cup," "container," "vessel," etc. I take it that my readers understand the issue before us. Therefore, I do not waste space on such matters. He also tried to make an issue in this debate of the difference between two kinds of Greek genitives. I could not blame him for this. He was trying to escape the force of my argument on drinking out of Jacob's well. The reader can see my point, and he can also see that Bro. Harper failed to meet it.

The practical test of Bro. Harper's theory in the case of large bodies of worshippers is still unsettled. I have never been able to get him to tell us plainly how three thousand worshippers in Jerusalem drank out of one cup. He dodged around the question several times, but it is still unanswered. A loaf large enough could be provided and a container sufficient for several gallons of wine. The bread would be broken into pieces of convenient size for distribution, and Bro. Harper would never object. But he would have divided the church if Peter had proposed to distribute the wine among the people in a convenient and decent way.

Among the brethren I have met who agree with Bro. Harper there are three popular arguments. These have been discussed in this debate, but I consider them sufficiently important to be mentioned again. 1. "The Savior used only one cup, hence we should use but one." This has just been answered in my proof that Jesus appointed the wine, not the container, to represent his blood. There is no proof that Jesus made the container an essential part of the Supper. If the container is an essential part of what Jesus and Paul called "The cup of the Lord," then every worshipper would have to drink part of the container, which is absurd; 2. "It is safe." I deny this assertion. It may be safe in individual cases to use but one container, but it is not safe to teach error for the Lord's truth. This is my worst objection to Bro. Harper's teaching. I can worship with a congregation

of ordinary size in the use of one cup and say nothing about it. But when I am asked to indorse such practice as part of the law of Christ, I object. Bro. Harper is binding a law upon his brethren that I cannot accept; not through any lack of regard for Christ, but because I cannot believe that Christ made such law; 3. "More than one cup opens the way for 'individual cups' and all other innovations." Bro. Harper has made much of this contention. It simply means that in trying to avoid one extreme, we run to another. This is poor logic and dangerous practice. There are objections to individual cups and other innovations; and Bro. Harper proposes to oppose one innovation by introducing another.

I have no more to say. I ask the thoughtful reader to consider carefully all I have said. Think prayerfully what it means to divide the churches of the country over this issue, and this must be the result if Bro. Harper's notions are carried out. May the Lord help us to see and follow the truth, avoiding all errors; for only the truth can bless and save.

—N. L. Clark.

SIXTH NEGATIVE

Yes, "These Scriptures" forever settle the issue by not authorizing "more than one container" in the Communion.

He admits (1) that "Jesus handled a literal cup," (2) that "Jesus used only one cup in instituting the Supper," (3) that "The Apostles all drank from the same cup," (4) that Paul got his use of the word "cup" from Christ, (5) that "The Corinthians were said to 'drink the cup,'" (6) that one can "drink the cup" "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way" (3d Aff.), and (7) that Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood."

Hence the use of one cup is not an innovation. And if "It is not safe" to follow "Where the Bible speaks" at all times and under all circumstances, it is not safe to follow the Bible at all.

He said (3d Aff.), "If we substitute the word wine for the word cup in any passage that refers directly to the Lord's Supper, it makes complete sense and gives the exact thought." If this is true, let him tell us how he knows that "Jesus handled a literal cup." Where did he get "the exact thought" if not in the text? He can come as near getting "the exact thought" of the text by substituting beefsteak for "bread." And since Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," the "cup" does stand for something in the Communion. You can not have "the cup" in any sense here without "the cup (container)" you mention. And we know what Christ and Paul "had in mind" by what they said. They said baptism, immersion—Thayer. And they said *poterion*, a cup, a drinking vessel—Thayer. And since one can "drink the cup" only "By drinking what it contains," as he says, and since the worshipers must "drink the cup," the "cup" is as necessary to complete the Supper as are its "contents." And since the worshipers must drink "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:27), and since one can "drink the cup" only "By drinking what it contains," "it" is an essential part of "the cup of the Lord." And since one can "drink the cup" only "By drinking what it contains," "Every worshiper would" not "have to drink part of the container," much less "drink the container," as some have ignorantly said, in "drinking the cup of the Lord." And the kind ("there are many kinds of this figure") of *metonymy* used with the Communion, is not the kind we find in his example; "She sets a good table." The "cup" always "accompanies" "contents" here in the Communion, as the container.

And when they obeyed the command, "Take this, and divide (share, L. O. tr.) it among yourselves," they "All drank from the same cup," as he admits, and had no occasion to "Break a solid cup into pieces." And since they could "drink the cup" only "By drinking what it (the cup) contains," "it," "the cup of the Lord's supper," is not "the fruit of the vine" that "it" contains. And since the worshipers could "drink the cup" only "By drinking what it (the cup) contains," they could not "drink the cup" by drinking "a bottle or a jug," or what "two, four, or a dozen" contain.

He said (4th Aff.), "Even Brother Harper refers to six Scriptures in which he says that 'cup' means 'the DRINK of which as a supply one drinks.'" But Harper never said such a thing. The Greek is *poterion*, and it "means" "a cup, a drinking vessel." And even Brother Clark had to come across, saying, "translated 'cup.'" He then went to camouflaging under "its shape, size, or material." And he now takes occas-

ion to say, "a cup, a glass," etc., as if "a glass" were not a cup. Why not look at a dictionary, and quit such nonsense?

The Scriptures say baptism, "an immersion"—Thayer. And they say *poterion*, "a cup, a drinking vessel"—Thayer. And if we dare not set aside this testimony and put in "two or more" immersions, or trine-immersion, we dare not set this testimony aside and put in "two or more cups," or individual cups.

He said (3d Neg.), "I do not believe in the use of individual cups unless extraordinary circumstances warrant it." Then he does believe in an "innovation" when "circumstances warrant it," for he now says, "There are objections to individual cups and other innovations." He should know that there can be no communion, joint-participation, of the whole assembly when either individual cups are used or "two or more cups."

He said, "I am unable to believe that three thousand disciples drank from the same cup." Then he does not believe he told the truth in saying, "When one vessel is emptied into other vessels, every person who drinks from one of these actually drinks from (ek) the original vessel," nor do I believe he did.

I gave the Bible, chapter and verses, and history (Ncander) in proof that they met for their worship in private houses. And Jamiesson, Faucet, and Brown say, "In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many (Clark says "containers," but they say) places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5,15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:5; Phile. ver. 2." And in confirmation of this, they cite the epistle of Isidore. And there is as much proof (and that is none) that they used "individual cups" as there is that they used "more than one container."

He said, "You translate ek 'out of.'" I did not translate. I quoted Bible translations that render ek "out of" in Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28—"drink out of the cup." And this is sustained by the scholarship of the world—"ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks"—Thayer. They were to "drink the cup," and since one can "drink the cup" "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way," as he admits, they drank the cup by drinking out of the cup. In John 4:12, did they drink the well? Was the well "ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks?" He knows it was not, for he says of ek: "Its primary meaning is 'out of,' but it is far more often rendered to indicate source, origin, beginning, etc." He then gives examples of this use of ek with a genitive, and it is not "ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks," either. And I said, "Hence the rendering 'thereof.'" And he stultifies himself in his 3d Aff. by rendering ek "out of" in John 4:12. It is ek autou in Mt. 26:27 and John 4:12, but he has sense enough to know that ek does not always have its primary meaning "out of." In Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23, and 1 Cor. 11:28, we have "ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks." But not so of John 4:12, and he gets nowhere with this except with simpletons. It is his smoke-screen to befuddle the unwary. All the "meet" his "point" needs is to expose his twaddle, and I have done that. If he wants more, let him say so. "Bro. Harper" does not propose to oppose one innovation by introducing another. He has offered to affirm and Clark has refused to deny that—A church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the communion service. And Clark has refused to add "s" to cup, and affirm it. He now admits the "individual cups" to be an "innovation," and I have shown his reasoning for "more than one" to be il-"logical," un-"Scriptural," and un-"safe." The "law of Christ," the N.T., provided for one cup to contain the drink element, and if Clark's innovation of cups prevails, division will result from his contention, for there are Christians who will not leave "Where the Bible speaks" and speak where it is silent. And furthermore, another division will follow over the "individual cups," for there are those who use "two or more" but will not tolerate the individual cups. And all this comes from leaving "Where the Bible speaks." And many will be condemned, for no Christian walks "worthy of the vocation (Eph. 4:1-4) unless he will "endeavor" to keep the "unity" Christ prayed for. And Clark has utterly failed to show any other ground of unity—unity on the one cup of which the Bible speaks, "a cup, a drinking vessel."—Thayer. Study this question in the fear of God, and act in view of the judgment, I pray you. "The will of the Lord be done."

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, DECEMBER 1, 1929

No. 23

TURNING ON THE LIGHT

"As to me (you mean my brother) trying to get the brethren at Abilene to quit the 'one cup,' I made no suggestion about it to the church, but I did talk with some of the brethren privately about the matter."—J. N. Cowan, 6-13, '25.

Well, brother, it is as bad to "sow the seeds of discord"—to teach heresy, if you please—"privately" as publicly. But Satan has always used cunning devices to seduce the unwary to sin, and he certainly used a cunning device, through you, his servant in this case, to get the brethren at Abilene to go digressive—to disgress from "the cup" (Matt. 26:27) to the CUPS of "Mystery Babylon" (Rev. 17:1-7).

Bro. Cowan made this statement in 1925, a few years before he learned that he could deceive the brethren easier by saying "container" instead of "cup." But the Abilene brethren were easily deceived, it seems, for they now have the cups—yes, two of them, I hear.

But when Bro. Cowan tried his "cunning device" of Satan at Deming, N. Mex.,—trying to get the church to use more than one cup, the brethren did just what they should have done—sent him away without paying him his carfare. They believe the Scripture—"Mark them who make separations and occasions of falling contrary to the doctrine which you have learned; and avoid them." Rom. 16:17. But Abilene went with "some who have already turned aside after Satan." Now watch Sidney W. Smith, of Abilene, who claimed, while in Calif., to stand for what the Book says—"a cup"—and see how much he is doing to get the digressive advocates of the cups at Abilene to give up their digressive practices.—Jas. D. Phillips.

WANTED

I want a location somewhere in the West with a loyal congregation, a church where the leaders are capable men, men that are willing to be governed absolutely by a "Thus saith the Lord"—men that "Speak where the Bible speaks" and are willing to be silent where the Bible does not speak. In fact, I want to live with, and work and worship with, a New Testament church. If there is such a church that will appreciate the help of an old preacher of the gospel, they may write me.—W. T. Taylor, De Leon, Texas, Route 1.

PRESENT CONDITION OF THE CHURCH

In revelation 3:15-16, we have a vivid picture of the Church today. This congregation was spiritually wretched, miserable, and poor, and

blind, and naked. God said that this Church was luke warm, and for this reason He said He would spew it out of His mouth.

Some of the evils that exist in the Church today are as follows: an unqualified eldership, unqualified preachers and teachers, many divisions, strife, envy, railers, revengers, lodge members show and game lovers, tobacco slaves, fashion lovers, women who cut off their hair, wear knee dresses, paint their face and wear men's clothing, members who do not pray and offer thanks to God for blessings, those who do not teach and pray with their children at home, those who use unbecoming language, those who do not meet for worship regularly, and many who are friends of the world. You may say that this picture is overdrawn but it is not. I have not mentioned near all of the evils that I know to be in many congregations. One of the worst evils I know of in the Church is the lack of brotherly love. The lack of brotherly love has caused the Church to fail to keep many of the commandments. In Galations 6:1 Paul says, "Brethren if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thy self, lest thou also be tempted." James also says, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." James 5:10:20. Brethren, do you realize that those who are overtaken in a fault will be lost if they are not restored or converted! The Church does not, very often, obey the command to withdraw from every one that walketh disorderly. 2 Thess. 3:6; 1 Cor. 5:4:5-13. He says, "Know you not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump! Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump (Church) as ye are unleavened."

Brethren, how can a congregation claim to be loyal when it has members in it who practice such things! How do we expect to get the world to believe in Christ if we so live as to mock Him? I am doing my best to get the brethren to wake up.

Brotherly, D. L. Whitten.

WEST VIRGINIA NOTES

Brother Fred Dennis will hold a meeting for the Pursley congregation, beginning October 20th. It has been a long time since these brethren have had a protracted meeting, and we hope for good results.

I know Bro Fred, for he used to preach quite a bit at old Sugar Grove. It was during his last meeting at this place that my daughters were

buried with Christ in baptism, by Bro. Fred, Aug. 15, 1924. In less than a year from that time the congregation was broken up. "Evil workers" conspired with the world to have the house closed against us, we were forced to meet in a private house, and the rest cast in their lot with the Pursley congregation.

Those who were responsible for the disturbance (uproar) have steadfastly refused to adjust the trouble according to the teaching of the Book. All who were once members of the Sugar Grove congregation are still living, except one.

After an interval of five years, preaching was once more to be heard within the walls of old Sugar Grove school house. Brother H. C. Harper, a sound, loyal humble servant of God held a short meeting here last Winter, Jan. 10th to 16th. Then in July following Brother W. H. Purlee, another faithful preacher, held a weeks meeting, but for some ungodly (it could not be a godly one) reason but few came to hear him.

Many are deceiving themselves by thinking that they can "cover up" their wrongs by saying, "let by-gones, be by-gones." The following excerpts from an article written by Bro. Dennis in the Leader of Sept. 3, 1929, are right to the point. "Yes, we know whether we have wronged our brother. If I lie about my brother, don't you suppose I know it? Yes, and God knows and knows my worship is not acceptable until I repent. Brethren, what did Jesus say to do when we remember that our brother has ought against us? Did he say to go on and worship, and make a nice talk on loving our brethren doing good to all men, etc? Let us get his admonition: First be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and "offer thy gift." Please note that he said "first." I wouldn't be surprised that if in many congregations if the brethren who "remember" would go and be reconciled to their brother that there would hardly be enough left to have "meetin'" while the reconciling was going on. Brethren what Jesus said is still in the Book! It will still be in it when you and I are cold in death, but it will be too late then for us to practice what he said. It will still be there when the books are opened "over there."

This is true: there is an "appointed day" when God will "judge all in righteousness". It will not be a case then of who gets there first to tell their side, nothing will be left out, and no one will be brow-beaten, no untrue words will have any weight with the all-knowing Judge. No case will be left out. All adjustments that are made here, in which there is often plain disagreement and continued hard feeling are to be faced again at the final court. All things will be settled at the judgment in the very presence of the Almighty God—Beware! It is therefore useless to resort to any method not known to be entirely pleasing to the great Judge. As Brother Fred has said, "It will still be there when the books are opened." Every deed will be brought to light. "We will all meet again on the great judgment morning.

The Books will be opened the roll will be called. Oh! how sad it will be if forever we're parted! And shut out of Heaven, for not serving God."

—Ira B. Kile.

OPEN LETTER

To the Signs of the Times, Mountain View, Calif.

Dear Friends: I like some of your writings. But I can not agree with you on keeping the Sabbath day holy. God said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." Matt. 17:50; Acts 3:22. Then we are not to hear Moses and Elias; but we must hear Christ. Did Christ ever command Christians to keep any day holy? We are not to keep any day holy, but we are to keep ourselves holy every day. 1 Pet. 1:15, 16; 1 Thes. 4:7; Heb. 12:14.

Christ broke the Sabbath. John 5:18; 9:16; Lk. 13:10-17; Matt. 12:10-14; Mk. 3:2-6; Lk. 6:7-11; 14:1-6. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." John 1:17. The law said, "An eye for an eye," etc. Matt. 5:38. But Christ says, "Resist not evil," etc. Matt. 5:39-44. The law said stone her. John 8:5. But Christ said, "Go, and sin no more." John 8:11. Christ has done away with the old law. Col. 2:9-22; Eph. 2:14-22; John 10:16. What law? See 2 Cor. 3:3-17. Peter said, "To whom we gave no such commandment." Acts 15:10, 11, 24, 28, 29. Hence our commandments must come from Christ's apostles. The commandments through Moses were written on tables of stone. 2 Cor. 3:17; Ex. 34:28. But look up James 2:10, and see what he says, and see what Paul says in Gal. 3:10-14. Do you now keep the whole law (See Lev. 23:39)? Do you keep Jubilee (Lev. 25:2-55)? The law was changed. Heb. 7:12-28. We have a better one. Heb. 8:6-13; 7:19, 22-29; 9:23; 11:16-35. What if they did keep the Sabbath and eat manna (John 6:49)? They died. But Christians who eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, live forever. John 6:48-58. When we are baptized, then we are added to the church. Rom. 6:1-3; Gal. 3:27; Acts 2:38-47, that is, added to the Lord. Acts 5:14; 11:24. Then we become new creatures. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:15; 4:24; Col. 3; 10, 11. Then we stand in the LIBERTY of Christ as a Son. Heb. 3:1-8; 2 Cor. 3:17; Gal. 5:1-6; 2:4; Jas. 1:25; 2:12; 1 Pet. 2:16. And so said Paul in Gal. 2:16; 4:4-11; Col. 2:6-22.

"The Sabbath was made for man." Mk. 2:27, 28. Grace appears, Acts 15:11; Rom. 3:24; 4:16; 6:14; Gal. 5:4; Eph. 1:7; 2:5-9; Tit. 3:7; Heb. 4:16. Rest: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matt. 11:28-30. And, "There remains, therefore, a rest to the people of God." Heb. 4:9. When will we get that rest? See Rev. 14:13. Yes, it will be after death; and we must labor now to enter into that rest, lest we fall after the same unbelief that prevented the disobedient among Israel from attaining rest. Heb. ch. 4. —J. A. Thompson.

"The amount of wine taken from its natural use and placed into the sacred use of the Lord's supper is the cup, and you cannot make it mean more without the absurd position that the container is called the blood of the New Testament. All who drink this wine partake of the Lord's cup."—J. N. Cowan, 3-29-'29. And you cannot

make the "wine" mean the "cup" until you change the meaning of English. And "All who drink this wine" do not "partake of the Lord's cup" unless they drink what the "cup" contains, for as N. L. Clark truly says (See Clark-Harper debat, 3d Aff.), "How can one 'drink the cup'? By drinking what it contains, and no other way." And if you would learn a little English, you would not get into so many "absurb" positions. The Greek **poterion** does not "mean" wine, but it means "a cup, a drinking vessel; and any preacher should have sense enough to know that "a cup, a drinking vessel,' is not wine.

"We should break bread in love, who of? The cup or the Lord? Christ said, 'do this in memory of me.' I fear we sometimes pay more tribute to the cup than we do to the Lord. The Corinthians paid more tribute to eating and drinking than they did to the Lord, hence ate and drank to their own damnation."—O.C. Ribble, in *Apostolic Way*, Oct. 1, 1929.

And we have heard sectarians say, "I fear these immersionists pay more tribute to the water than they do to the Savior," when they were put to rout by these "pesky water-salvationists," as they were wont to call those whom they could not face in an honest debate. And since all digression travels the same road, it may be safely conjectured that Brother Ribble has been up against some one on the "cupq uestion" that he could not meet, and so flies off at a tangeant after the manner of some sectarian. They say, "A drop is as good as an ocean," and maybe he thinks as Freeny Saunders talked in his debate at Elk City, Okla., when he said, "A skillet is as good as a cup." And so we have: "This skillet is the New Testament in my blood."

This silly stuff did not originate with Brother Ribble; it began with those who substituted sprinkling for baptism, immersion, soon after the Reformation was launched; and it began with those who had substituted cups in the communion for "a cup," poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel, about five years ago. And since (if there is anything to what they say) we may have cups for "fear" (And oh, what a fear.) we may make a god of the cup, so we may sprinkle for fear we may make a god of the water. Yes, all digression travels the same road.

"And as it (the church) claims perfection for itself as to all the purposes to be accomplished by revelation and by a church organization; and as it forbids additions or subtractions; and as we can see, that none are needed in order to the gracious purposes contemplated: we must regard all outside of it—all additions, all subtractions, and all alterations: all things not plainly included in it, as opposed to it, and justly styles innovations, corrupting its pure worship and hindering its progress."—Kendrick.

Then let us be satisfied with what is revealed as to the Communion, and let the addition of the cups, whether individual or two or more, go with the other "innovations," and have the "pure" worship, with unity.

"THE TRUTH"

Bro. Harper knows where the restorers stood on every doctrine and practice of Christianity. I am now twenty-five years old. My father had a lot of the works of the Campbells and others among the restorers. Since his death, I have bought everything I could find that was written by these men—Campbell, Milligan, Stone, Scott, Franklin, et al. I now have a copy of every issue of Campbell's papers—the *Christian Baptist* and *The Millennial Harbinger*,—that came from the press. I know of no writings of any of the pioneers that I have not read. I know just what these men taught and practiced. It is all summed up in the declaration of Thomas Campbell, which was endorsed by all who stood with him, viz., "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent." These men did not claim to have learned everything that the Bible teaches. They urged the generations following them to continue the plea to restore the ancient order of things, and to work it to perfection. Alexander Campbell said plainly that truths of great importance would be learned from the Bible after his decease—that "they shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased" (Daniel). And now "The Truth" is published for the purpose of upholding the restoration started by these great men. It, in a sense, takes the place of the *Millennial Harbinger*,—that fearless journal published by Campbell and known far and wide as standing four-square for "the ancient order of things." Its watch-word is "Back to the Bible." We are simply doing all we can to get back to the Bible. So, brethren, will you stand by us, with your money and influence, for a restoration—a complete restoration of the Apostolic Church? Will you? If you are interested in a return to "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6), get in line now, and do all you can toward preaching "the everlasting gospel to every nation, and tribe, and people and tongue." Rev. 14:6.

"The Truth" needs and deserves 1000 new subscribers, and we should raise them at once! This would enable it to be issued semi-monthly at \$1.00 the year. So work with us, brethren, to the end that it may have this number of new subscribers, by the first of the year!

Submitted in love for the truth,

—Jas. D. Phillips,
Montebello, Calif.

There is too much of the world in the churches.—Jas. A. Allen. Yes, the pastor is leading the church of Christ to destruction with his pastorate, the S. S., the cups, the C. E., the L. A. and various other societies too numerous to mention.

With the exception of the faithful few, the great majority of the church are so much like the world that outsiders cannot tell the difference.—Jas. A. Allen.

Yes, the bobbed hair fad, and card game fad, the picture show fad, the bathing beach fad, etc., are leading Christians to destruction.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida
H. C. HARPER - - - - - Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

IS BAPTISM ESSENTIAL?

The question, Is baptism essential to salvation? is an important one. We are always glad to give all the information (on this or any other subject) that we are able to give. A poor, misguided, though conscientious, girl in Okla., who has been preaching the "Holiness" doctrine, writes, under date of Oct. 1:

"Brother Phillips: When you were in a meeting here last summer, you made the statement that no one could be saved, under the gospel dispensation, unless he had been baptized 'for the remission of sins.' You think this baptism is water baptism. This doctrine is not in the Bible. Alexander Campbell is the first one who ever taught that doctrine."

Bro. Walter Scott discovered that Acts 2:38 taught baptism for the remission of sins, and taught it before Alexander Campbell ever thought of such a thing. Campbell himself said so. And "The Life of Elder Walter Scott" and Scott's own work, "The Messiahship, or Great Demonstration," shows the same.

And the history of the early church shows that they taught baptism for the remission of sins in the 4th Century of Christianity. The Nicene Creed says, "We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins." This creed was adopted, without a dissenting voice, in the 4th Century.

The Apostle Peter, the man to whom Jesus gave "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 16:19), preached a powerful discourse on the day of Pentecost, the birth-day of the Christian dispensation, and it resulted in about 3,000 Jews crying out, "What shall we do?" To this, Peter answered, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."—Acts 2:36-38.

The only question to be determined here is, Does the preposition for in Acts 2:38 ("for the remission of sins") mean because of, or in order to? No translation of any note (I doubt if there is any) translates the Greek preposition eis from which we have the English for in Acts 2:38, because of: they translate it so as to leave the impression that it is in order to. Hence, the American Standard Version reads, "unto the remission of sins." The Living Oracle reads, "in order to." The Common Speech N. T. reads, "with a view to."

But what do the scholars say on the meaning of eis? Young's Analytical Concordance says, "With a view to, eis."—Page 362. Thayer says (Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, page 94),

"eis acherin amartion; to obtain the forgiveness of sins, Acts 2:38." And these scholars are backed by the Greek scholarship of the world—Yale, Chicago, Princeton and Harvard Universities.

That baptism is essential to salvation is further shown by some direct, plain, simple statements of our Lord. Here are some examples: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."—Mark 16:16. "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God".—John 3:5.

That the birth "of water and of the Spirit" has reference to baptism, there can be no reasonable doubt; for, as Dr. Wall truly says, "There is not one Christian writer of any antiquity, in any language, but who understands the new birth of water as referring to baptism; and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give any account how a person is born of water, more than born of wood."—Infant Baptism, Vol. 1.110.

God has spoken on the subject of baptism. Let man hear and obey. "Kiss the Son lest he be angry and you perish in the way."—Psa. 2:11, 12.—J. D. Phillips, 136 S. 4th St., Montebello, Calif.

STAY WITH THE BIBLE

"My platform is that in the matter of worship to God and service to the Lord we will accept nothing unless the Scriptures authorize it."—Ulrich Zwingli, the Reformer of Switzerland.

"Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the Church, or be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament."—Thomas Campbell, the "Morning Star" of the Restoration Movement, in his famous "Declaration and Address," published in 1809.

"Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent."—Thomas Campbell, Ibid.

"Nor ought anything to be admitted, as of Divine obligation, in their Church constitution and managements, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles upon the New Testament Church; either in express terms or by approved precedent."—Thomas Campbell, Ibid.

"An innovation is something that has been introduced into the Church since the New Testament was written. I oppose all innovations."—Alexander Campbell, in Campbell-Rice Debate.

"Whatever you do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." Paul, in Col. 3:17.

If these principles had been taught and practiced by the Church since the days of the Campbells, the Christian Standard would never have advocated the Organ in the worship; the Christian Evangelist would never have advocated receiving "the pious unimmerged" into the fellowship of disciples of Christ; the Apostolic Review would never have advocated the classes and women teachers; and the Apostolic Way would never have advocated the use of cups in the Communion.

But these principles were not taught and practiced by the greater part of the Church, and hence

digression has torn us asunder, and numerous factions now exist among us. And factions in the Church are classed with "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies (factions), envyings, murders, drunkenness," etc.; and "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."—Gal. 5:19-21.

ITEMS OF INTEREST

On taking a general survey of the church today, it seems to me that a thorough study of the Eldership and its work is the most important work before us. "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by SOUND DOCTRINE both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers." Titus 1:9.

A man that fills this qualification must possess a first-class education. He must know language and the meaning of words. Moreover, he must know personal traits and matters in general,—must know how to make an argument according to the rules of logic.

This one passage from Titus will forever bar most of the men now occupying the office of Elder. They should not have been thrust into that work.

Some of the divisions in the congregations are the direct result of unqualified men as Elders. I can cite several instances of such troubles. And I have longed for an opportunity to hold a meeting in a town where the church is torn to pieces over personal matters. I have thought that if a preacher would go there and "preach the word" faithfully, good results would immediately follow.

The word is the power by which the lives of men are to be moulded or shaped. Most of our brethren are honest-hearted and will yield to the teaching of the word when such teaching is pointed out to them. Then it is our duty as teachers to preach the word and leave results with God. God's word is supreme, and will accomplish what God pleases. Then let us preach the word in love, and let us not be too ready to criticize or censure our brethren, for we, too, have short-comings that someone must overlook. May God have mercy on us and continue to bless us, is my earnest prayer. I am yours in Christ,

W. T. Taylor, De Leon, Texas, Rt. 1.

KNOWING THE TRUTH

Jesus says, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32. And Paul tells Timothy: "I am ordained a preacher and an apostle. I speak the truth in Christ and lie not." 1 Tim. 2:7. And in Rom. 9:1 he says, "I say the truth in Christ and lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit." Again Jesus says, "For he whom God hath sent speaketh God's word." John 8:34.

Therefore to know the truth is to know what Christ and the apostles have said. Now if we want to know the truth about any question, all we have to do is to inquire and find out what they

said. And if we want the truth, this will settle the question for us. But if we won't hear what they say, we will very likely take what someone else says.

Now did they speak of "a cup" or cups in the communion? Whatever they said is the truth, is God's word. And no man can be made free unless he takes this—no more and no less. How simple—just what Christ and the apostles said. Now, will we take it and be satisfied? Or will we do something else and provoke the Lord, as did Israel in the wilderness?

If we will take it, then as Isa. 8:20 says, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." And now what does the word say? "And he took a cup," Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23. "And he received a cup," Lk. 22:17. And Paul says "this cup," "that cup," "the cup." 1 Cor. ch. 10, ch. 11.

They say nothing about cups. And if we have the "fruit of the vine" in more than one at any time, we have cups, just as many as we have holding the separate parts of the "fruit of the vine" whether "two or more" or "individual cups." And when any man says he believes we should have just one cup, we know that he knows what the word of God says; but when he puts the "fruit of the vine" into cups, whether "two or more" or "individual cups," and still says he has but one cup, we know he does not speak the truth. And to use cups in the communion can not be the truth, and will not make free, but will be bondage in sin. It is to follow the voice of a "stranger." And Jesus said his "sheep" would not do that, but flee from strangers. Jno. 10: 4, 5. Then I insist that the brethren everywhere follow the Savior by following his word. Take the truth, be free, be safe, follow faithfully. Let Jesus lead. And always be ready to give a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear, as Peter tells us. If we do this, when the gathering time comes, and come it will, all will be well. Yours for unity and peace, Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

THE TRUTH

The friends of The Truth know that it is the only journal in the United States, by which the church of Christ can be fully and fairly represented to the community, and by which the false charges and misrepresentations of its opponents can be exposed—therefore,

We know it deserves far more support than the brethren have ever given it. Brethren, what could we do in our fight against all innovations if we did not have The Truth to help keep our forces informed about the "things concerning the Kingdom of God?"

It is highly important that every member of any congregation of saints should read every issue of The Truth—Therefore,

Let every Elder, or leader, insist that every family represented in your congregation subscribe for and read The Truth.

The Truth will do a lot of good among the people who are not Christians, and it can be circulated

among them if we will work together to that end—Therefore,

Let every member of the Body of Christ insist that every friend and neighbor subscribe for and read The Truth. And let all who are able, donate The Truth at least one year to some one not now reading the paper.

Some things may have been said in the paper that should not have been said, but remember that "It is human to err; but divine to forgive." So when you see something in the paper that is calculated to harm the Body of Christ, write the author of it and insist that he use more care in writing his articles. The truth will not hurt the church. So let every writer write the truth, and let us not criticise any one for contending earnestly for the faith. Jude 3. Brethren, let us get to work!
—J. D. Phillips.

Jas. D. Phillips, 136 So. 4th Street, Montebello, Calif., Oct. 25: I recently closed a meeting for the few brethren at Long Beach, Calif., without visible results. They now meet in the auditorium of the Frances E. Willard School, Tenth Street and Freeman Ave. They contemplate moving to the Seventh Day Adventist meeting house soon. This will be a great advantage to them. I will be with the brethren at Montebello Lord's day and night. I shall, the Lord willing, begin a mission meeting at Bakersfield, Calif., Nov. 2. We hope to establish a congregation there. I have been out of the field for some time on account of having my tonsils removed, and an operation on my head. I have improved very rapidly, for which I am thankful to God whose "loving-kindness endures forever."

Those who may think of coming to Southern Calif., will be welcomed to attend meeting at either or all the following places: 138 S. 4th St., Montebello; 3535 Siskiyou St., Los Angeles; Tenth and Freeman Sts., Long Beach; Ford City Addition, Taft; Delano, Dos Palos and Bard. There are churches at El Centro and Temple City, but I do not have their addresses at present. If you know of brethren in Calif., who may not know where the one-cup, non Sunday school churches meet, write and tell them, please. Loyal churches are hard to find in this country. Brethren moving to Oregon, should write Bro. E. V. Holifield, Center Point, Ore.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE

Church discipline (church government) is so much neglected to-day that it is just about a thing of the past, but if there is not an awakening and a return to it, it appears to me, that the church is doomed to failure and the displeasure of God. And if by these feeble efforts of mine, some are aroused to their sense of duty in the matter of discipline in the church, I shall have accomplished my purpose.

Hear Elihu, "He openeth also their ear to discipline, and commandeth that they return from iniquity." (Job 36:10) The Lord has ever required strict obedience to His mandates, and in propor-

tion, as His ancient people obeyed Him, he blessed them; but when they failed in obedience, He invariably showed His displeasure by inflicting punishment upon the guilty. As Paul says, "Every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." God, in dealing with His ancient people, allowed them to suffer shameful defeat at the hands of their enemies, when sin and defilement was present in their midst. He refused to bless them and to give the victory until they had found and punished the guilty. See the case of Achan in Joshua 7. Now, how can we conclude that God will be more lenient with us, and will bless us with sin and defilement in the "camp"? My Bible does not lead me to believe that He will. The law of Moses was dedicated with the blood of animals, but the New Covenant with the precious blood of Jesus Christ. Hear Paul, "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" (Heb. 10: 28, 29). With these and such like scriptures before our minds we ought to be able to appreciate the force of the word of the Lord in the New Covenant.

By a careful study of Heb. 12:9-15, the reader will readily see that the object of discipline is to restore the disobedient, and not for the purpose of getting rid of him or kicking him out. See also Gal. 6:1., and Jas. 5:19,20. Another object of discipline is to cause others to "fear". See 1 Tim. 5:20. Truly has Solomon said, "Open rebuke is better than secret love." (Prov. 27:5.)

What will be the effect and result if the disobedient are allowed to go on in the fault, as is usually the case? "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" (1 Cor. 5:6.) Again, "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled." (Heb. 12:15.) Ah, yes, when the disobedient are allowed to go on in their sins, others are influenced to practice such things, hence, "thereby many be defiled." Certainly we know that a home without discipline is not a fit place for children; a school without discipline is unfit for children; a commonwealth without government is not a safe or fit place for one to live; and we should know that a congregation without discipline is not suitable to that degree of spirituality that God requires of His children.

Now, after all that can be done to restore and win the fallen brother has been accomplished—every scriptural and reasonable effort exhausted, and still he refuses to make matters right, what should be done? Let the Bible answer, "Now we command you, brethren in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." (2 Thes. 3:6.) Note that Paul said "we command" to do this. Have we done it, brethren? For other references, see 1 Tim. 1:19, 20; 1 Cor. 5.; Tit. 3:10.

Brethren, have we any authority to just ignore this positive command of the Lord? See Jas. 2:10.

Yes, Bro. D. J. Whitten, I am with you in your plea for a clean church and the practice of discipline.

Yours for the "whole counsel of God," Homer L. King.

WHAT JOHNSON SAID

"We must fight everything God has forbidden, and contend for everything he has commanded. But things I might consider lawful for me (neither commanded nor forbidden) may be inexpedient; might injure my influence for good. I can, and often sacrifice my opinion or judgment on matters that must be governed by the law of expedience; for example: in my debate with Lee Sanders, he tried to make the 'class system', 'women teachers' etc.: on a par with the communion service. So I drew up this statement, 'For the sake of peace and harmony in the church, we do hereby agree that wherever the class method of teaching with its women teachers, the use of grape juice for wine, the use of two or more containers on the Lord's table, are causing trouble or disturbing the church, never to advocate the use of them there.'"—Alva Johnson, A.W., Dec. 15, 1927.

And on this, Duckworth makes this "comment:" "I heard Brother Johnson submit the proposition referred to in the above, and Brother Cowan said to me, 'I submitted the same proposition at Petersburg.' It would be impossible to have a division on any question where such a feeling is manifested on both sides. 'Where two or more containers are causing trouble or disturbing the church never advocate them,' and the same attitude towards the classes by brethren believing in them would never have brought division."

And he closes this "Comment" in the following words: "The church has already been divided over the 'Sunday School' and its associate evils. Its advocates have forced brethren to bow to their judgment or get out. Let us finish this fight and discuss among ourselves other questions with the hope that we may come to a common agreement."

Remarks

We suppose that Johnson and Cowan felt safe on that proposition, for all digression is bent on going the same way. They were well aware that Sanders would not sign, and they wanted to bring out boldly the spirit of digression by this ruse; but they seemed oblivious to the fact that the cups digressives manifest the same spirit and are in the same predicament, being under the condemnation of the Savior, who prayed that his disciples "all may be one." (John Ch. 17) And had Clark and Johnson and Cowan, with others, acted upon this statement and not tried, as did the Sunday School digressives, to "force brethren to bow to their judgment or get out," we might now have "peace and harmony" instead of division with its condemnation of those who did not "endeavor" to keep the unity of the Spirit. (Eph. Ch. 4). See

the spirit shown by the cups advocates at Temple, Texas; at Gunter, Texas; at Abilene, Texas; at Roswell, N. Mex.; at Graham, Texas, where Sister Keel says, "Bro. Hall (J. S.) did tell me he told the Bro. that carries the basket to go ahead and use 2 cups and he did," and this is the Hall that claims to be "a strong one cup man." And if he is not facing two ways, which way shall we expect to find him after this? May the Lord deliver the church from such "one cup" men. And now those who had to "bow to" this high-handed action or "get out," are going to New Castle, miles away, to worship. My what a sweet, Christ-like spirit these cups digressives do show. Yes, this is how they "endeavor" to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. And there is the town church in Littlefield, Texas, whence word came several months ago that "The next Sunday, September 1, Duckworth being present, they flopped over, used two plates and two cups," as reported by one who was an eye-witness. And there is not much "hope that we may come to a common agreement" by such action. But all digression is alike.—Ed.

IS IT PERFORMED IN FAITH?

Many preachers, yes, even preachers claiming to be Christians only, go right on preaching things for which we have no Bible authority just as if we had a plain "Thus saith the Lord" for such things or a plain Bible example. Yes, I have observed many gospel preachers doing such things.

Nothing, however, can be practiced by faith that is not set forth in the word of God by precept or example for us to do. We are divinely taught that faith comes by hearing the word of God. Rom. 10:17. And Heb. 4:6 tells us that "Without faith it is impossible to please" God. And this is quite evident, for we are assured that "Whatsoever (and this takes in everything) is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. So the one that presumes to do things in the worship of God is guilty of presumptuous sin—a sin that King David prayed to be delivered from. Ps. 19:13. We have a plain example of such a sin in the case of Nadab and Abihu. Lev. 10:1. This sin consisted in presuming to worship God in their own way—a way that God had not commanded.

Can you call to mind anything now being done as worship to God that God has not commanded? It is a presumptuous sin for man to attempt to serve God in a thing God has not commanded. How about sprinkling for baptism? And how about instrumental music in the worship? "Such a little thing," do you say? And so was the offering of strange fire a little thing in the eyes of man. And this should teach us a lesson, for just as sure as God punished in the one case, we must expect a much sorer punishment than death, as we read in Hebrews. And their sin was no more than that of some followers of Christ now in profaning the worship at the Lord's table by using several loaves and cups instead one loaf and one cup to hold the "fruit of the vine" as the Lord gave us the example and set it forth by Paul. And punishment will not miscarry for the guilty ones who

wilfully pervert this worship of our God. And the preachers who shut their eyes at such presumption are most guilty before God. They take the lead of the people and should set the example and call the churches to repentance before it is too late. They stand at the head of those who have always called for a "Thus saith the Lord" for our teaching and practice. But they stand in the way of sinners. Stand with a padlock on their mouths when they well know that a plurality of cups and loaves has neither precept nor example in the word of God. Therefore they are more guilty than were Nadab and Abihu in that they practice a wilful and presumptuous sin. They countenance an act of worship without a minutia of faith. And those brethren who are engaging in such worship with doubts, should take heed. Paul said, "He that doubteth is condemned." Rom. 14:23. Why? Because he eats not of faith. And how can he have faith where there is no word of God? If you don't want to be condemned, repent and quit it. Better far not to partake. Why take such a risk when we know what God says?

It seemed necessary to Uzza to stay the ark of God, but oh, the terrible cost. And plainly those who engage in the holy service where man puts in a multiple of cups, is guilty of presumption, and how can he escape the punishment unless he repents and quits?

Why are so many preachers shutting their eyes to this sin. Has Satan blinded their eyes? Is it the love of money? or popularity? of ease? Are they afraid to face "the people," and "fight the good fight of Faith"? How can they expect eternal life? How many preachers to-day are coming down in thunder tones, as did former preachers, on "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent?" Verily, "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." 2 Tim. 3:13. They don't dare to do this in the face of what they teach and practice. If they did such a thing, there would soon be some debating or some backing out. But they can not escape the judgment—Dr. W. W. Stone, Palacios, Texas.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Nov. 7, 1929.—I closed a series of meetings with the faithful brethren at the L. F. D. Tabernacle, near Roswell, New Mex., Oct. 16th., which resulted in three being baptized into Christ, and some expressed themselves as being convinced that the class system of teaching and individual communion cups were out of harmony with the Bible.

At this place, I met some very fine people, and they seemed to know how to make one feel at home. I enjoyed my stay with them very much. It seems that I failed to give satisfaction, for they have asked me to return next year for another effort.

From L. F. D., I went to Deming, New Mex., where I had once lived some three years ago, and with which church I had spent nearly two years, engaging in mission work in that field. Words fail me as I try to express the joy and pleasure of meeting the familiar faces of dear brethren and sisters, who had proven such staunch friends to

me and my family during our sojourn with them. I feel certain that some of my very best friends on earth abide in Deming. We shall never forget them and their many kind deeds toward us. It was gratifying to learn that the church in Deming had not departed from the simple and scriptural manner of worship, used while I was with them. They have not found it necessary, nor scriptural, to install the class system of teaching the Bible, neither have they thought it necessary, or "convenient," to use a plurality of drinking vessels in the communion.

I am, at this writing, in what promises to be a good meeting, near Montreal, Mo.

TURNING ON THE LIGHT

A man who will not "fight" in defense of, and for the advancement of, what he believes is right, is not worth his salt.—James A. Allen, in G. A.

For four long years I have evaded a discussion of the "cup" question, though I have been pressed often to debate it.—J. N. Cowan.

I think it is wrong to debate the cup question. It is the silliest thing to fuss about I ever saw.—Alva Johnson.

Now, Brother Harper, since this matter is up, I want you to clearly understand me. So long as I publish the paper, I shall reserve the right to refuse to publish anything, in part or in whole, that is sent to me for publication.—R. F. Duckworth. (What he "refused" in this case was an exposure of the sophistry of the cups digressives).

So there are some among the non Sunday school preachers who are not worth their salt.

J. Madison Wright, 2816 Osceola Ave., Columbus, Ohio.—Dear Brethren: I have been so engaged this year that I have not taken time before now to report my meetings, and now in the Starling-Loving University Hospital on my back with orders not to move, I do not feel like writing much. Suffice it to say that I did the most perfect preaching this year I have yet done, and still I am not yet "out of the banks and toward the high-water mark. In my third meeting in Greenbrier Co., W. Va., I stumbled over a tub at night, injured my left shin. Infection set in, and the three best doctors I could get joined in sending me to the hospital. Doctor Dodd, the head of the hospital and surgery in the College of medicine here, said to-day (Sept. 26), the fourth Thursday since I was hurt, "It is going to be there a long time." So "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth." Brethren, pray for my rapid and complete recovery. (And let those among whom Brother Wright has gone preaching the Gospel of the blessed Son of God, who gave his life for us, not neglect him). "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even the least, ye have done it unto me."—Christ (Mt. 25:40). —Ed.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

VOL. II.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, DECEMBER 15, 1929

No. 24

THE APOSTOLIC WAY IN THE MIDDLE OF A BAD FIX

By James Douglas Phillips

For the past ten years the Apostolic Way, Dallas, Texas, has been challenging the Firm Foundation, the Christian Leader, the Gospel Advocate, and the Apostolic Review for a written discussion on the class and woman teacher questions, the discussion to be published in the aforementioned papers and the Apostolic Way; and its present publisher, R. F. Duckworth, has been having "con-
nption fits" because these papers have not agreed to such a discussion.

But now the table has turned, it seems, for Brother H. C. Harper, publisher of The Truth, Sneads, Florida, has been challenging the Apostolic Way to put up a man and debate the question of whether two or more cups or individual cups may be used on the Lord's table, and the Apostolic Way has ignored his challenges, which have been kept before them for the past two years. And why do they ignore his challenges? Simply because they know that the same arguments Cowan, Johnson, et al., among their foremost debaters make in favor of more than one cup in the communion, can be made by the Firm Foundation, Christian Leader, Gospel Advocate and Apostolic Review in favor of classes on the Lord's day,—that's why. And no one realizes this more keenly than does R. F. Duckworth.

I understand that Brother Ira L. Sanders debated the class questions with Brother Alva Johnson and Sanders turned Johnson's arguments against the classes against the cups and hence Johnson could do nothing with him. The same arguments that justify the one will justify the other, and Cowan knows it, and Duckworth knows it, and Johnson knows it—they do. And they know that if they debate the cup question on a fair proposition their inconsistency will be known by all who read it. So debate there is none. Truly "the legs of the lame are unequal."

The above appeared in Firm Foundation, August 27, 1929. I have noticed all my life when the Sects were at outs in a town all you need to get them together is to let a true Gospel preacher come in with the truth, and they will all get together and double up on him. Brothers Phillips and Harper have been bitter enemies to the Firm Foundation for years, but it looks now like they might be fixing to join hands and efforts in trying to put down their common enemy, the Apostolic Way. I do not believe it has been ten years ago or near that since H. C. Harper was with the

Apostolic Way, and James Douglas Phillips also was a prominent writer for it, yet he says, "For the past ten years it has done so and so." Well, was it a crime ten years ago or eight years ago, or was it all right until you and Brother Harper pulled off and started the little sheet you call The Truth (falsely so-called)? But you say, H. C. Harper has challenged the Apostolic Way to put up a man to debate: whether two or more cups may be used on the Lord's table, and complain because Brother Duckworth don't put up "Cowan and Johnson," etc., to debate it. Now, Brother Phillips, you should not blame Brother Duckworth, for he doesn't believe in more than one cup on the Lord's table neither does Cowan or Johnson. If Duckworth should have a man with him who did believe it was right to have more cups on the Lord's table, no doubt he would help you whip him. Surely you and Brother Harper are not going to say that wooden table the carpenters made from the scraps when they had finished the church house in which we worship is the Lord's table, are you? Or that the Lord's cup is a literal cup, on a literal table in a literal kingdom and that Peter used literal keys to unlock and open it.

No, Brothers Duckworth, Cowan, and myself believe the Lord has but one kingdom (body) and wherever established is the same; but one table and wherever you see it, looks just like, but one cup on that table, and wherever the Kingdom is established and his table spread the same cup is always used. Hence, about the only way for you and Harper to get a debate on the subject is to affirm in the use of two or more cups on the Lord's table, and surely Brother Duckworth can get a man to put up, who will deny. But you say, "I understand Ira L. Sanders turned Johnson's arguments against the classes against the cups." Well, how come you to so understand? If you had tried to inform yourself, you would have known better. Sanders did try to place the cup question on a par with the teaching question. So I wrote out and signed a statement like this: Wherever the use of two or more containers at the Lord's supper, the use of uninspired literature, the division into classes and women teachers were causing trouble or division, never to teach or advocate the use of them, begged Sanders to sign it, but he would not. This was published in the Apostolic Way and no doubt you read it, Brother Phillips, then say, "I understand he turned Johnson's arguments against the cups," well, and just understood a falsehood, that's all. I also begged Sanders to debate the questions from the Bible, just as I begged you to do at Sentinel, and he, like you, refused to do it. Yet he says, like you, "We speak where the Bible speaks, and are silent where it is

silent; "you remember I wrote this out, "Should it ever become necessary for us to discuss the subject again, we agree to use nothing but the 'Holy Bible, as proof or evidence in such debate." Signed it and begged you to sign with me, but no, no. You don't want a Bible debate, utterly refused and so did Brother Harper. Well, when you stand on the Bible and the Bible only, you won't have access to the Firm Foundation. They won't publish mine.

—Alva Johnson (In Apostolic Way).

Remarks

1. The foregoing is Bro. Johnson's attempted reply to my article showing that the Way is slipping gradually over the ground occupied by the Firm Foundation in its attitude towards innovations.

Be it known that I begged Johnson to affirm that a church can use more than one cup by divine authority, and he would not do it. And I begged him to deny that a church can use one cup by divine authority, and he would not. There is no issue over what we practice: the issue is over his practice of using cups, even individual cups, as at Roswell, N. Mex., where he held a meeting. And this practice puts them in the same fix as we find the S. S. brethren—afraid to debate.

2. And if I wish to expose them thru the F. F., it is my own business, not his; and his ranting about "joining hands with them" to get me to ease up on him and his digression will do him no good. I know his tactics of "Stop thief."

He used to report weekly through the F. F. But he tries to make out that it is an awful thing for me to write in the F. F., and all for the simple reason that I am exposing his false teaching which lines him up with the F. F. which the A. W. has been opposing, but now finds itself in the same fix. One thinks the organ is the only digression possible for a church of Christ; the other thinks the Sunday School is the only possible digression. The one takes anything but the organ; the other takes anything but the S. S. Not long since the editor of "The Truth" challenged the A. W. to affirm that a church of Christ that uses cups in the Communion earnestly contends for the Faith once for all delivered to the saints, and they were as silent as any organ or S. S. advocate ever was. They dare not do it, and that is where my exposure pinches their toes, and Johnson has begun to squeal.

3. No, indeed, it was not wrong for the Way to challenge the F. F. for debate on the Sunday School when "H. C. Harper was with the Apostolic Way" as owner and editor "and James Douglas Phillips also was a prominent writer for it." But it is inconsistent for the Way now to challenge for debate on the S. S. and then refuse to debate an issue that is dividing the churches, an issue of their own making by the policy they have invoked to keep on good terms with the big churches, especially so since we offer to meet them on the same terms that they proposed to debate the Firm Foundation. They know that the practice of

using cups in the Communion has no more a foundation of Scripture for it than has the Sunday School.

4. "Pulling off and starting 'The Truth.' "You mean PUSHED off, brother. For when that digressive policy was run over Brother Harper, who owned two-thirds of the Way, to shut him out of his own paper and let the digressive cups advocates operate among the churches to their division as they have, Brother Harper started "The Truth" rather than to sue for his property. And as these digressive brethren realized that their unrighteous works would be met with an open Bible, they mourned its birth, as Herod did that of Jesus, and it is a constant thorn in their side, for they are going to be met with logic and the correct use of language, and their game of "bluffing, and pulling the wool over the eyes" of the brethren, is at an end wherever "The Truth" goes. And they hate the paper because their own works will not stand the light of God's truth.

5. Yes, Duckworth says, "I can partake of the loaf and the fruit of the vine where more than one cup is used, but I cannot defend the use of more than one. Harper and Trott insist that it is wrong to use more than one."

Duckworth knows that there are churches that "use more than one" cup, and so does Johnson, for he has twice debated in behalf of what he called "two or more coppers." He better try telling the truth about the matter. If there is but one cup in use where "two or more cups" are used, there is but one cup in use where individual cups are used, and per this logic (I should say nonsense), as Dr. Trott has shown, where the assembly is put into classes with a teacher over each, there is but the one assembly, and Johnson is with Cowan bound to go to the S. S. to be consistent. And Duckworth to be consistent could practice the Sunday School, but he could not defend it. And ditto with the organ. Verily what was the Way, now has some strange ways when compared with the Bible way. Surely Duckworth, Cowan and Johnson are "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity."

6. Yes, good brethren who stood with Johnson in the fight against the classes, told me how Johnson was made to squirm when Lee Sanders turned J's arguments against the classes against Johnson's use of cups. And they did not fail to tell me what a failure Johnson made in meeting Sanders. Sanders finds his classes in the same chapter and verse that Johnson finds his cups,—in the broad, digressive road of "EXPEDIENT," and "LOVE" that "covers a multitude of sins," "PEACE" that protects all digression from exposure in debate.

7. Yes, you said you wanted a "Bible debate," but when I offered to read a whole chapter of Greek if you would give us one single verse from the Bible that speaks of your cups or containers with the Communion, all could see that I did not have to read the Greek: You are simply in the hard row with the organ and the sprinkler. Can you correct Thayer, and Robinson, et al. in giving us the meaning of New Testament Greek? If you

expect to debate again, you better get Pres. Duckworth to start up that Greek Class and run it long enough for you to learn to use a Greek lexicon. Here is your fallacy in a nut-shell:

We drink the cup in the Communion;
Only a liquid can be drunk;

Therefore the cup in the Communion is a liquid.
This is absolutely false. If you can not detect the fallacy, get some tyro in logic to unravel the syllogism for you.

Now you unravel this one if you can:

"The cup of the Lord," as used with the Communion, is a metonymy.

It takes the cup and its contents to constitute this kind of metonymy;

Therefore it takes the cup and its contents to constitute "the cup of the Lord," as used with the Communion.

8. You tell me, "When you stand on the Bible and the Bible only, you won't have access to the Firm Foundation." And this must be the reason why you had access to the Firm Foundation a few years ago, eh. And you hooked yourself in trying to hook the other fellow, didn't you? "The Truth" has now been published nearly two years, and the Way has never had the courtesy to give it a word of brotherly mention.

—J. D. Phillips, 136 4th St., Montebello, Calif.

CRITICISM

"To criticise, expose and condemn others, is not a pleasant task; but when religious teachers enthroned error, and mislead honest people, silence would be unkind and censurable."—Author Unknown.

There are many who think we should have no "wrangling" in the paper, "for," they say, "we should show the spirit of love." But it is because we love the souls of perishing men and women that we criticise and expose error both from the rostrum and through the press—we want them to learn the truth, for "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

It is by no means a pleasant task to expose and criticise the false assumptions and reasonings of those of our brethren who have made such a splendid fight against the Sunday School and other innovations; but when they go into the creed-making business as one of them did at Roswell, N. Mex., it is time for the "Watchman on the walls of Zion" to "Cry aloud and spare not;" for when one of our brethren goes into the creed-making business, he is surrendering the distinctive plea of the disciples of Christ for unity on the basis of "the Bible and the Bible alone"—the plea that made Catholicism tremble, when Alexander Campbell met the Arch-Bishop of Cincinnati; the plea that made Protestantism quake, when Alexander Campbell met the celebrated N. L. Rice; the plea that made Infidelity hunt its dark corner, when Alexander Campbell met the intellectual giant—Robert Owen, in debate on the Infidel System, at Cincinnati; the plea that made digression tremble, when the noted Benjamin Franklin made his uncompromising fight against it.

Jesus says, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous, therefore, and repent."—Rev. 3:19. So let us "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and teaching."

—Jas. D. Phillips.

HOPE IN DEATH

Paul says, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." He thus shows that we should have hope in death—hope that the blessed Savior will safely lead us "through the Valley of the Shadow of Death"—the Valley we all must walk, sooner or later.

Bro. Jacob Creath says in the *Millennial Harbinger* for Dec., 1844, that he was present at the death of our dearly beloved brother, Barton W. Stone, a great reformer and co-laborer of our beloved brother, Alexander Campbell. Bro. Creath says, "He was rational, though evidently dying, when I saw him. After prayer and singing a hymn, I asked him if he felt any fear at the approach of death, "O, no, brother Creath," said he, "I know in whom I have believed and in whom I have trusted, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him. I know that my Redeemer lives. All my dependence is in God and in his Son, Jesus Christ." He quoted sundry passages and commented on them. But, said he, "My strength fails, but God is my strength and my portion forever."

"He exhorted his friends and his family to live like Christians—to obey the Savior, and prepare to meet him in eternity. I observed that I almost envied his situation, and desired that my last end be like his. "Brother Creath," said he, "if so great and so holy a man as Paul was afraid that he might be a cast-away, may not so frail and poor a man as I fear, too? But my God is good and merciful, and my Savior is strong and mighty to save me." He continued in the same strain till his strength failed, and I had to leave. Bidding him farewell, he said, "God bless you, my brother. I hope to meet you in heaven."

"We all, like sheep," are prone to "go astray," as the book divine says. But when we err, we should get right with God, remembering that "It is human to err; but divine to forgive," if we come to His easy terms of pardon. Bro. Stone had hope in death because he followed the Lord to the best of his ability. Let us do likewise.—J. D. Phillips.

The year will soon close. Who and how many will say "Christmas gift" for "The Truth" with a substantial donation to cheer us on at the beginning of 1930? We are thankful for all the gifts to keep "The Truth" before the people that want the New Testament way. Let us not miss an issue next year. At one dollar a year, we shall still need donations to carry us through and pay the printing bills each month.

Those who want copies of the Clark-Harper discussion on the number of cups authorized by the Scriptures in the Communion, can get them from the office at Sneads, Florida, at five cents each.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida
H. C. HARPER Publisher

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LAYOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

HELP! HELP!

Brother Trott says: We need—badly need—to get out some tracts. I have one ready for the printer on "the cup" and my impression is that it should be published without delay . . . I prophesy that no one will undertake to answer the "cup" tract, though nothing would please me better.—A. W., Dec. 1, 1929.

If Brother Trott will send us his MS., we shall be glad to publish it for him in "The Truth", and it won't cost him one cent; and the brethren who have sent in donations to him to get out his tract can send to "The Truth," a paper that is not afraid to let its readers see "both sides of every question."

But if the Doctor is going to take a stand against the cups as his convictions dictate, he will not be wanted at Littlefield since Watkins advised them to put in the cups. He might preach there if he would agree not to say anything against the cups, no doubt. Hence the Doctor is not likely to realize the desire of his heart in his declining years.

There is room in the A. W. for Clark and Barker, for Clark and Bond, for "Education," but none for Brother Trott on the "cup." Not a little bit. It makes one think of Jesus in the "stable."

Bro. Hewitt Smith says in the same issue: "Sometime ago Brother Trott and I agreed to discuss the issue involving the number of cups to be used in the Communion with a view to publishing it in tract form. Neither of us are able, however, to finance its publication . . . I wish to say that Brother N. L. Clark, Brother J. N. Cowan and Brother Alva Johnson give their endorsement of the debate."

Now listen. If Clark, Cowan, and Johnson will give their written endorsement of Bro. Smith, we will publish the debate in "The Truth," and it won't cost these brethren one cent. Why not run it in the Way, too? Are they afraid for their readers to see where the truth lies on this question? Have they, as the Sunday School paper did, crawled into their hole when it comes to debating the issue? —Ed.

EDITORIAL

Brother Cowan has sent in two articles, which we publish in this issue. We are glad to get them, for it brings up a matter that should be better un-

derstood than it generally is. We have fifteen translations, so-called, of the New Testament on our desk; but there is not one of them that we think gives the best renderings throughout. And if Brother Cowan has one that is accepted by him in every particular, we should be pleased to have him name it.

He says, "I have examined the Greek text carefully," etc. Which Greek text has he examined? We need some information here. Is he able to take the variant readings of the Greek MSS. of the New Testament books and make a text? Goodspeed "is one of the greatest living authorities on ancient Greek manuscripts." He needs no vindication as a translator of N. T. Greek. Let Bro. Cowan name the translation that he will undertake to "vindicate" throughout, and he has a job right now.

In Acts 10:20, some of the MSS. read two (duo), and some read three (treis). And some texts read duo, and some read treis. Which text has Bro. Cowan examined? So also of Acts 20:28, some MSS., and two of the oldest among them, read Theo (nom. Theos, God); and some read Kuriou (nom. Kurion, Lord), and some Greek texts read Theo and some read Kuriou. None reads "Kurion," as Bro. Cowan has it. Some of the readings are idiomatic, and some are very elliptical. To render these without supplying words, would not make sense.

Bro. Cowan says, "I am not taking a position." It may look that way to a blind man. It is evident, though, that he is afraid to "close in," and is just putting out his "feelers". Well, we return the compliment. Did Christians, few or many, ever meet in the Temple in Jerusalem for their church worship? Did twenty-five thousand (Antioch had a population of about 500,000) ever meet in one assembly to "break bread?" Why make a sophistic play on the word "congregation?" In "He is the head of the body, the congregation" (Col. 1:18), which "congregation" is it? Which one is the "congregation?" Of which "congregation" is he head? In "Upon this rock I will build my congregation" (Matt. 16:18), which "congregation" did he build?

In "the congregation which is in their house" (Rom. 16:5), "the congregation which is in their house" (1 Cor. 16:19), "the congregation in your house" (Phile. v. 2): did each congregation so mentioned include all the Christians in the city, or place, mentioned?

Did they use "individual cups" or "two or more cups" in the Communion? If so, by whose authority? When was it that big church-houses for big congregations with one pastor, presbyter (priest), as "the pastor", came into existence? Is B. W. Johnson right in saying of Acts 2:46, "It may refer to observing the Lord's Supper in private residences?" Why not "close in" now and affirm the proposition you have signed, and give us those "arguments" you say you have for your position? Are you afraid of losing your "position" if you should take it with us? You may have ours, and you are welcome to it if you can get it; and we stand willing to take it with you at any

time on the proposition we agreed to affirm with you. Then we suggest that you meet Bro. Alva Johnson on the proposition you have signed, namely, "Resolved, That the individual cups are deceptive and divisive." He says this might not be true of some places. He may be able to show us how we may have them without division by proposing the remedy he gave for taking in the "two or more", namely, educate the objector's conscience. It should work as well in taking in the "individual cups." But at Littlefield, under the Watkins sway, they have a different way, and it seems now to be "the Apostolic Way,"—kick them out.

Come again, brother, we should like to have you set us right if we are wrong; and will thank you for it.

IS GOODSPEED RIGHT?

By J. N. Cowan, Robstown, Texas

I have observed within the past few years quite a deal said about Goodspeed's translation of the New Testament, in fact enough to cause me to secure a copy and examine it. Several brethren have used Goodspeed as a witness to settle religious controversy, and should he not be a good witness, the masses of brethren who have not examined him will be deceived. I am here giving a few of the passages which the reader should study and come to his or her own conclusions.

Act. 10:7. "Cornelius called two of his servants, and a devout soldier who was one of his personal attendants, and after telling them the whole story, sent them to Joppa."

Act. 10:20. "There are two men looking for you."

Act. 11:11. "Just at that moment three men, who had been sent from Caesarea to find me, reached the house where we were staying." From the above, how many men were sent after Peter?

Act. 20:28. "And be shepherds of the church of God, which he got at the cost of his own life." Did God die? Is there an excuse for translating "Kurion" God?

Act. 16:17. "These men are the slaves of the Most High God, and they are making known to you a way of salvation." Is there more than one way of salvation?

From the translation of 1 Cor. 11:4-10 we learn that man must pray an prophesy bare-headed; that women must pray and prophesy with a veil in addition to their hair; that if she does not wear a veil she might as well cut her hair also; that she cannot offer prayer nor explain the will of God bare-headed. The passage, according to the translation either permits the woman to teach in public with her veil on, or else it teaches she cannot teach her children privately without her head being covered with something besides her hair.

There is no command in the translation to lay by in store on the first day of the week. See 1 Cor. 16:2.

1 Cor. 15:23-24. "But each in his own turn; Christ first, and then at Christ's coming those who belong to him. After that will come the end,

when he will turn over the kingdom to God his Father, bringing to an end all other government, authority and power." Does the end come after that or does it come then, at the coming of Christ? Was Christ talking about putting down other powers and authorities, or was he talking about laying down his own power and authority?

1 Cor. 15:29. "Otherwise, what do people mean by having themselves baptized on behalf of their dead? If the dead do not rise at all, why do they have themselves baptized on their behalf?" This justifies the Mormon practice of being baptized for those who have died without baptism. Is he right?

Mat. 14:19. "And he took the five loaves and the two fish and looked up to heaven and blessed them, and he broke the loaves in pieces and gave them to the disciples and they gave them to the people." "And they all ate and had enough. And the pieces left over that they gathered up filled twelve baskets." What did Christ do when he broke the loaves in pieces? What condition were the loaves in after the breaking? The fragments of how many loaves were gathered up? Mar. 6:44, a record of the same event says, "There were five thousand men who ate the loaves." Did they eat the loaves, or the pieces?

Mat. 26:26. "As they were eating Jesus took a loaf and blessed it, and he broke it in pieces and gave it to his disciples, saying take this and eat it. It is my body." In what way did he brake it in pieces? Did he do this loaf as he did the five loaves above referred to?

Mar. 14:22. "He took a loaf and blessed it, and he broke it in pieces and gave it to them."

Luk. 22:19. "And he took a loaf of bread and thanked God, and broke it in pieces, and gave it to them."

1 Cor. 11:23. "For I myself received from the Lord the account that I passed on to you, that the Lord Jesus the night he was betrayed took some bread and gave thanks for it and then broke it in pieces, saying, 'This is my body which takes your place. Do this in memory of me.' He took the cup, too, after supper, in the same way, saying, etc." What condition was the bread in when it reached the disciples? Did he do the cup as he did the bread, break it in pieces?

1 Cor. 12:13. "For we have all—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free men—been baptized in one spirit to form one body, and we have all been saturated with one spirit." Do you believe this translation?

Let the reader remember that I am not taking any position but only asking if Goodspeed is right. I will follow this with one more article. Brotherly, (J. N. Cowan).

IS GOODSPEED RIGHT — NO. 2

(By J. N. Cowan)

Act. 2:46. "Day after day they all went regularly to the Temple, they broke their bread together in their homes, and they ate their food with glad and simple hearts." Is "their bread" the lord's supper? "They broke their bread together." What

is the antecedent of "They," and "their", in this sentence? Is it not "they all" who went to the Temple regularly? How did they break their bread together in separate houses?

Act. 5:11-14. "And the whole church and all who heard this were appalled. They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade. None of the others dared to associate with them, but the people made much of them, and men and women in increasing numbers believed in the Lord and joined them." Was the "whole church" of this passage all the disciples in Jerusalem? Did they actually meet together as one church, or congregation? Act. 6:1-7. "In those days as the number of the disciples was increasing, complaints were made by the Greek-speaking Jews against the native Jews that their widows were being neglected in the daily distribution of food. So the twelve called in the whole body of disciples and said to them—This plan met the approval of the whole body." Etc. How many congregations did the Apostles call in to decide this matter? Did they separate the whole body into groups in order to observe the Lord's supper?

Act. 11:26. "The result was that for a whole year they met with the church, and taught large numbers of people, and it was at Antioch that the disciples first came to be known as Christians." How many do you suppose were in this church? Did a 'large number' of people belong to the one congregation? Is Goodspeed right?

Act. 14:27, when Paul and Barnabas return from their journey, "They called the church together, and reported how God had worked with them." - - - "The church saw them off upon their journey - - - when they reached Jerusalem they were welcomed by the church." (Acts 15:1-3). Does Goodspeed leave the impression on your mind that there was only one congregation in Jerusalem, and only one in Antioch?

Act. 15:22. "Then the apostles and elders with the whole church resolved to select representatives and send them with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch. Did they have an association of congregations in Jerusalem, and did they select a representative from each of these congregations to Antioch? Or, did they select these representatives from the same congregation? Act. 15:30. "So the delegates went down to Antioch and gathered the congregation together and delivered the letter." How many congregations did they gather together? Were there a 'large number' in this congregation?

Act. 18:8. "But Crispus, the leader of the synagogue, believed in the Lord, and so did all his household, and many of the people of Corinth heard Paul and believed and were baptized." How many congregations did they make out of the many who were baptized? "Paul, by the will of God called as an apostle of Jesus Christ, and our brother Sosthenes, to the church of God at Corinth, to those who are consecrated by union with Christ Jesus, and called as God's people, like all those anywhere who call on the name of Jesus Christ, their Lord as well as ours." (1 Cor. 1:1-2.) According to the last quotation, did the apostle

address any one who did not live at Corinth? How many congregations did he address?

1 Pet. 3:19. "And was physically put to death, but he was made alive in the Spirit. In it Enoch went and preached even to those spirits that were in prison." I have examined the Greek text carefully, and fail to find any word which could be translated, "Enoch" Is Goodspeed right in adding a word to the Greek text? If some Greek scholar can find the word "Enox" translated Enoch in 1 Pet. 3:19, I will be very thankful to have him point it out to me. Has a translator the right to add a word to the text to suit his theory? Can such a translation be depended upon?

With this brief review, we bid the Chicago Professor good-bye, and will not use him as authority, until some one vindicates him. I could not use him on just one verse in the New Testament, and turn him down on the majority of others. I repeat the question, "Is Goodspeed Right?"

RESTORING THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

The Kingdom of Heaven, announced by John, the Kingdom Harbinger (Matt. 3:2) was fully established in the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ,—when Peter announced that Jesus had been made "both Lord and Christ."—Acts 2 c.; and was composed of those who publicly acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, and were immersed into His name and death, "for the remission of sins."—Acts 2:38. It took this baptism to prepare the King for the throne of the Kingdom, and it takes it to prepare the believing penitent for citizenship in the Kingdom of Heaven, ruled by Jesus, the "King upon the holy hill of Zion" (Psa. 2:7). This kingdom prospered greatly while it acknowledged Jesus as King, and the white horseman (Jesus) "went forth conquering and to conquer."—Rev. 6:1, 2.

The subjects of this Kingdom followed "the lamb"—Jesus, "the King of Kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15; Rev. 17:14).—"whithersoever he goeth" (Rev. 7.) The Evangelists of this Kingdom went everywhere "preaching the word," and saying to the people in sin and darkness, "Repent and be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."—Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15, 16; Acts 2:37, 38. And they preached the fundamental law of Zion's King, namely, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."—Matt. 7:12. And those who obeyed the gospel (Rom. 1:16) were "Blest inhabitants of Zion, Washed in the Redeemer's blood," and could "sing with the Spirit and the understanding,"

"I love thy Kingdom, Lord,
The house of thine abode,
The Church our blest Redeemer saved,
With his own precious blood."

But that such a condition would not always be in the church of God, or kingdom of Heaven, the prophets and apostles all are witnesses. Paul said an "apostacy" must come, a "man of sin, and son of perdition" must be developed in the Temple or

church of God—that he would be haughty, arrogant, a man without law, who would assume the titles of homage due only to God,—that he would sit in the church of God showing himself to be a God. This apostacy came with Roman Catholicism, and the “man of sin” and “son of perdition” was fully revealed in the one who loves to be called “His Holiness, Lord God the Pope.” (2 Thes. 2nd ch.)

Daniel said that this man would “think to change times and the law;” and that “he shall make war on the saints, wear out the saints,” and “prevail against them” for “a time, times and a half a time”—literally, 1260 years—at the end of which he was to be shorn of his temporal power, as the French Revolution did in 1793—exactly 1260 years after the Pope assumed a dictatorship over the church and the world in 533 A. D.

Since that ever memorable epoch in the history of religion the truth has triumphed gloriously over error. Alexander Campbell and his co-laborers shook the spiritual world to its very center, crying, with the Apostle John, “Come out of Babylon”—all you who love Zion and seek the peace and happiness of Jerusalem—“that you have no fellowship with her in her sins and that you receive not of her plagues.”—Rev. 18:4. Thus they began the restoration of “the faith once for all delivered to the saints.”—Jud. 3.

But a reaction set in when the disciples began the agitation over the installation (in our churches) of mechanical music, societies, the mite system, etc. Since then, we have become divided into the Christian Church with its divisions and subdivisions, and the church of Christ, with its division over the cups, the Sunday School, the practice of receiving into our fellowship those who have been baptized because of remission of sins without baptizing them “unto the remission of sins,” the Bible Colleges, the BOLL theory, and other things too numerous to mention.

In the absence of Zion’s King, he has left his kingdom in the hands of stewards, who have proven unfaithful. The fault is not to be found in the wisdom of God, nor in the Christian system—it is to be found in the weakness of weak and frail mortal man, who should be always crying, Reformation, reformation—a thing most of us are not doing.

Truly, then, we need a restoration of the Restoration—a restoration that will make us want to get back to the primitive faith, manners and customs taught and enjoined upon us by the Lord Jesus Christ, through his apostles who are even now sitting “on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of the children of Israel” (Matt. 19:28)—the church of Christ.

Let every preacher, and every elder, and every one who can speak publicly begin now to plead of a return to every teaching and practice of primitive Christianity from which we have departed.

“Come we that love the Lord,
And let our joys be known,
Join in a song of sweet accord,
And thus surround the throne.”
“We are marching to Zion,

Beautiful, beautiful Zion;
We’re marching upward to Zion,
The beautiful city of God.”

Let us pray for a restoration—a complete restoration—and let us give God no rest until he shall make Jerusalem a praise in the earth. And let us WORK as well as pray.—J. D. Phillips.

COMING OF THE SON OF MAN

On The Clouds of Heaven

By Alexander Campbell

Matt. 24:27, 37, 39, 40; 26:64; Mark 13:26; 14:62; Luke 21:27.

Whether this “Coming of the Son of Man” denotes a literal, or figurative coming, is a question which has, recently, been much agitated. Since the days of President Edward’s History of Redemption till now, it has been a commonly received opinion, that there are four comings of the Son of Man spoken of: Of these, two are literal, and two are figurative—his coming in the flesh; his coming to destroy Jerusalem; his coming to destroy the works of the Man of Sin, and to reign with his saints 1,000 years on earth; and his coming to judge the world at the last day. The first and last are said to be literal and personal comings; the others, figurative.

The question before us is purely a literary one; and for the following reasons it would seem to us that, however we may talk of a figurative coming, either at the destruction of Jerusalem, or of the apostasy, the phrase, as found in Matthew and Luke, must denote a personal and literal coming of the Son of Man:

1. On leaving the Temple for the last time, Matt. 23:39, he told the representatives of the Jewish nation that their house, or temple, was soon to be deserted, and that they should not again see him, till the day they would say, “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” After going out of the temple, this coming is made the subject of conversation between him and his disciples in private, chap. 24, and of course must be explained to them in the sense in which it was expressed in the temple; and there we learn it was such a coming, or return of the Saviour, as could be seen by the Jews—“You shall not see me” till a particular day.

2. The Apostles ask, “What shall be the sign of thy coming?” and as they must have understood him in the sense he delivered himself in the temple, he would answer them in the same sense; for had they misunderstood him, he would have corrected them, as his manner was. The conversation was then about a personal, and not a figurative, coming of the Son of Man.

3. As his going away, or his absence, was not figurative, but temporal and literal, so must his return, or coming, be literal and personal, else there is an application of words in a double sense in one and the same period; and if so, rules of interpretation are wholly unavailing.

4. But the coming of the Son of Man introduced Matt. 24 could not apply to Jerusalem’s

ruin; for the Jews did not then see him, nor say to him, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," as he declared would be the case when he would next come. As they have not yet thus addressed him, we are assured that he has not come in the sense of Matt. 23 and 24.

5. As the Lord addressed the Scribes and Pharisees as representing the nation, so he addresses his disciples as representing his body, the congregation of saints; and after telling them, in order, the things that must happen, to them, and the nations, before the coming of the Son of Man, he places that event (Matt. 24:27 and Luke 21:27) after the destruction of Jerusalem, the desolation of the nation, and the long persecutions and sufferings of the real followers of the Lord.

6. When they should see these signs they were taught to rejoice, inferring that their deliverance, or redemption, drew nigh. But this deliverance has not yet arrived; consequently, the Son of Man has not yet come on the clouds of heaven.

7. But this coming cannot be secret, or figurative, for it is to be as visible and striking as the lightning which, breaking forth from the east, shines even to the setting sun—"so shall the coming of the Son of Man be."

8. Neither is it spoken of as if there were a plurality of events called "comings of the Lord," but as one and singular—The coming of the Son of Man.

9. Again, as Daniel the prophet is quoted in reference to the desolations coming upon the city and sanctuary, it is natural to suppose that the disciples would also remember that Daniel had placed the coming of the Son of Man at the destruction of the little horn, when "the thrones were cast down," and "the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame," and therefore could not be led to think that "the coming of the Son of Man" was either figurative, or to be at the desolations coming upon Judea.

10. But as seven parables are introduced, in this discourse, to explain the coming of the Son of Man, or the Saviour's return; and as the last of them is on all hands agreed to denote a personal, and not a figurative coming, we are compelled to the conclusion, that the coming so often mentioned and so fully explained, must always be one and the same, which the last of the seven parables certainly make literal and personal. These seven parables, or comparisons, all found in one and the same discourse, relative to one and the same coming of the Lord, are, first, the parable of the fig-tree: from this he teaches them to know when his coming is near—second, the days of Noah and the deluge, sudden and unexpected by the world; "So shall the coming of the Son of Man be"—third, the parable of the thief; "Be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man comes"—fourth, the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servant; "The master of that servant shall come in a day when he looks not for him"—fifth, the parable of the marriage, or the wise and the foolish virgins; "Behold the Bridegroom comes; go ye out and meet him"—sixth, the par-

able of the talents; "After a long time the master of those servants comes, and reckons with them"—seventh, the parable of the sheep and the goats; "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory," or on the clouds, he will gather the Gentiles, all the nations, before him, and separate the good from the bad. The coming of the Son of Man is always kept in view, in these seven comparisons; and if we regard any one of them as literal, we must so regard them all.

These are a few, and but a few, of the reasons which incline us to regard this coming of the Son of Man as literal, and not figurative: and not at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, but at the close of the times of the Gentiles.—"Appendix" to the Living Oracles," pages 78, 79.

We fully agree with Brother Campbell on this matter, namely, that the second advent of the Lord is literal, and not figurative—it is visible and personal. Let the church prepare herself for the coming of her Lord and King, by obeying the call now going forth—"Come out of her"—Babylon, confusion,—false religion, politics, etc.—"my people, that you have no fellowship with her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues."—Rev. 18:4.

Christ is not coming to earth again to set up a temporal kingdom and reign on David's throne in Jerusalem, as our pseudo-Adventist brethren, under the leadership of R. H. Boll, teach; for the Bible does not teach it. And John the harbinger announced, nearly 1900 years ago, that "The Reign (or Kingdom) of the Heavens is at hand." Matt. 3:2. —J. D. Phillips.

They do not teach the word of God to their children nor bring their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.—Jas. A. Allen.

No, they don't do this: they leave it all for the Sunday School—a human institution, designed by Satan to lead them captive at his will—to do. And who is it that does not know that the S. S. has resulted in a general ignorance of the Bible, and almost a total disregard for the word of God?

NOTICE—We want the names of places or churches that are using the individual cups among the non-Sunday School churches. Please send in any and all names within the range of your knowledge. Get them in as soon as you can, please.

Ed Swindler, Bloomfield, Iowa.—We sure think you are publishing a wonderful paper. Wish we had it every week. We want you up here for some mission work next year.

D. D. Lunsford, Bloomfield, Iowa.—If the debate with Brother Purlee was referred to in the issue of Nov. 1, I am a member of the church of Christ. I never read Russell's work. (This report was confused with another. It is Bro. Reynolds who is to debate the Russellite.—Ed.)

THE TRUTH FUND.

L. C. England	\$3.50
Homer L. King	1.00
T. F. Thomasson	1.00