

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.

VOLUME 1.

SNEADS, FLA., JANUARY, 1928.

NUMBER 1.

CHRIST COMES (By A. J. Thompson)

Christ comes with his angels. Matt. 13:41. He comes with his saints. I Thes. 3:13. He comes in the clouds. Matt. 24:30. He comes pierced. Ps. 22:16; Zach. 12:10. The wise shall understand. Dan. 12:10. He comes as a thief. I Thes. 5:2. What can we know? Dan. 12: 1-4; Luke 21:28. Trumpet sounds. Matt. 24:31. Flesh and blood cannot inherit this kingdom. I Cor. 15:50. John the Baptist not in the kingdom. Lk. 7:28. But he will be. Matt. 13:43. The apostles had to overcome before they could sit with Christ in his throne. Rev. 3:21. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Matt. 25:31. They will also judge angels. I Cor. 6:3. What will Christ do when he comes? John 20:30-31. The heavens and the earth shall be destroyed. II Pet. 3:7,12. But we look for new heavens and earth. Isa. 65:17; II Pet. 3:13. He shall judge the world. I Peter 4:17. He shall reign with His saints. Rev. 20: 4-6. His saints shall reign on the earth (new earth, I suppose). Rev. 5:10. No sea. Rev. 21: 1. The beast and the false prophet will be in the lake of fire. Rev. 19:20. Wicked will be dead. Rev. 19: 21. Devil will be chained. Rev. 20: 1-3. Jews raised. Ezek. 37: 1-28. Then they will be converted. Rom. 11: 23-32. Return to their own land. Ezek. 11:17. David will be their king. Jer. 30:9. Christ is David's king, for he is Lord of Lords and king of kings. Rev. 17:14. He shall reign forever. Luke 1:32, 33. Every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of the Father. Phil. 2:10, 11. When the seventh angel begins to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished. Rev. 10:7. After he sounds, John will prophesy again. Rev. 10:11. The tares will be burned first. Mt. 13:30-42. Then shall the righteous shine forth. Mt. 13:43. The wicked are dead, in Rev. 20:5. But in Rev. 20:8, they are alive. Therefore they shall be raised between these verses. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." Christ would not pronounce a blessing on the wicked. Be-

side, the wicked will be in the second death. Rev. 2:11; 20:14; 21:8.

Adam and Eve lost their privilege of eating of the fruit of the tree of life by disobedience. Gen. 3:22-24. Christ will restore all things. Acts 3:21. His saints shall have the privilege of eating of the life-giving fruit. Rev. 22:2-14.

Note.—Brother Thompson is over seventy-eight years old, and is badly afflicted. He asks the prayers of all Christians. Study what he has said in the light of God's word, and accept no statement not unmistakably sustained by the truth.—Ed.

WORK TO BE DONE

Make it clear to all, brethren, that the subscription price for "The Truth" is one dollar a year.

I am running off a thousand extra copies of the first issue to use in case that those whose subscription comes in too late to mail out to them, may get the back numbers.

And those who desire bundles of copies to hand out, will please be careful to send me word immediately as to the number they wish and the correct address, so that the papers will be delivered where you can use them, and not go to the waste basket.

If you like the paper, tell your friends about it; if you know of anything that will improve the paper, please frankly tell us.

Remember "The Truth Fund," for maintaining and improving the paper, is open at all times to all for donations.

We also are carrying a "Subscription Fund" to pay for the paper when sent to those who do not themselves subscribe.

Those who write for the paper or send in reports, please observe these directions: Have the matter typewritten if possible; if not, write plainly, leaving double space between the lines having them about half an inch apart.

So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.—Rom. 10:17.

Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God.—I Pet. 1: 25.

CONDITIONS IN THE CHURCH TODAY

(By D. J. Whitten)

In Rev. 3: 15-16 we have a vivid picture of the church today. The church here mentioned was spiritually wretched, miserable—poor, blind, and naked. God said that this church was lukewarm, and for this reason he said he would spew it out of his mouth, that is, reject it. This is a sad picture, indeed.

But what of the church to-day? Some of the evils in the church now are the following: 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, and wear men's clothes, members who do not pray and offer thanks to God for his blessings, parents who do not teach and pray with their children in the home, those who use unbecoming language, those who do not meet regularly for worship, and many are friends of the world.

Some may say that I am too severe, that I have overdrawn the picture; but the truth is that these are only a few of the evils I know to be in many congregations. And these things are displeasing to God. Will he not spew such out of his mouth? Repentance should be effected in such evildoers before it is too late. Help them by admonition. Help them by exhortation, as one that loves their souls. Help them by reproof, as those for whom Christ died.

The lack of brotherly love has caused the church to fail to keep many of the commandments of Christ. In Gal. 6: 1, Paul says, "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." And James says, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he that converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sin."

Brethren, do you realize that those who are overtaken in a fault will be

lost if they are not restored or converted? And will God hold those who could help them but do not, blameless? Do not be deceived.

Very often the church does not withdraw from every one that walketh disorderly, as directed. (2 Thes. 3:6; 1 Cor. 5:4-13). It says "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven that ye may be a new lump (unleavened), as ye are unleavened." Thus bringing the offender to repentance, you save both him and the church.

How can a church claim to be loyal when it has those in it who practice such evils? And how can we expect the world to believe in Christ when Christians so live as to mock him? I want to do all I can in my humble way to get the churches to wake up, for it is high time, as the apostle saw, and if we all do even a little in this direction, there will soon be seen a marked improvement. Who will help?

WHO DIVIDES THE CHURCH

When instrumental music was put into a church and those who could not conscientiously worship with it were driven out, who caused the division? They admitted that a church could be scriptural in its practice without it, still they loved it more than the unity of the body of Christ. The loyal ones were advised to come out from the corrupt body, and establish a pure worship, based upon the precepts and examples of the Bible.

When the Sunday School was taken into a church and the conscientious objecter was forced out, it was freely admitted that a church can be apostolic without a Sunday School, still they said, "If you don't like it, get out, we are going to have it." And the faithful were advised to come out of a church so corrupt, and institute a faithful church.

Who opposed a discussion of the music question? Those who wanted it. Who opposed a discussion of the Sunday School question? Those who wanted it and those who had it.

If these brethren had really wanted the Unity that the Son of God prayed these offending things would have been laid aside if they did not consider them commanded. And if they had thought them commanded, they would gladly have accepted the opportunity to have discussed them. But since "Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil," and "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh into the light, lest his deeds should be reproved" (John 3:20), we chased them from Dan to Beersheba without getting a

discussion. They were unwilling to try out their practice by a "Thus saith the Lord."

Those with no conscience on the matter or with a double conscience, said they could worship with it or without it; and one brother, as a compromise, advocated a little organ to start the tune, I believe. But nothing would do; and a once happy and united brotherhood, pledged to "speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent," divided swiftly and permanently, those who went off from the old motto declaring "We can't have the Bible for every thing we do."

Could the leaders of the organ advocates, the Society advocates, the Sunday School advocates have been brought face to face with a proposition to show that the Bible authorizes such things, very few, if any, would have followed them, for their weakness and folly, in the Bible light, would have been evident to all. But they won out by keeping away from the light with the Tempter's snare, Peace, peace, you will divide the church. Let us discuss such matters privately. The "sects" will see we are divided if we bring these matters to the open. And so they got in their work in private,—and divided the church over instrumental music and the Sunday School, for the use of which in or with a church of Christ there is no Bible proof.

But now a brother scents more trouble. He says, "The church has already been divided over the 'Sunday School' and its associate evils. Its advocates have forced brethren to bow to their judgement 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."

Again he says: "I still believe in the one cup. It meets a demand for a common ground but I have never refused to commune where two or more cups are in use."

This then, is the crux to untangle. Just what he means by "two or more common cups," is not clear to me. Does he mean that each participant uses two or more cups? If not, I fail to see where the "common" comes in. I can clearly see how the "one cup" he believes in "meets a demand for a common ground," for I am persuaded that no one can truthfully say its use is unscriptural. Then should not this "common ground" be brought to the attention of the brotherhood by every means possible so as to prevent another division—publicly, privately, in the pulpit, in the press, in the home, from our past experience here recounted, the sooner this is done the better for the cause of our Redeemer, and of our salvation, which hinges upon

our "endeavoring to keep the Unity of the Spirit." (Eph. 4:1-4).

But we notice that the brother I have quoted says that he has never refused to commune where two or more cups are in use. Perhaps so; but what are we to do with the brother whose conscience is not so elastic? Shall we in this, as the Sunday School brethren have done, "force the brother to bow to their judgement, or get out?" Well, if I mistake not, this has already been done. Shall this brother stultify his conscience and commune? If so, why did we not stay with the Sunday School brethren?—Yes and with the organ brethren? Here is a place for thought.

And as I see it, for "congregations that have more than one container for the wine, not to get a preacher who contends for one," as has been suggested, is to invite open division and drive the wedge already placed at the log. This very thing, in principle, was done by the organ brethren, and has been repeated by the Sunday School brethren. And not a few faithful preachers have felt the sting. However, it is a game two can work a very well. I have in my hand now a letter which says that such and such a church opposes such and such a paper on account of its position on "the cup question."

This is no game for Christians who have nothing to hide. Had the organ people allowed the opposition to land on it with the Bible, where would the organ have landed? Had the Sunday School churches allowed a free and open discussion with an open Bible to support or to condemn their practice, where would the Sunday School have landed? As it is, we are compelled to go at it as the boy did in killing his crippled dog—an inch at a time.

I am for unity—first, last and all the time. And I propose to teach the Bible without fear or favor. If you preach against the sin of division caused by the organ, the digressive will howl you're dividing the church. And if you preach on the blighting sin over dividing a church for a Sunday School, the "loyal" brethren will scream you are going to divide the church. If you kindly call the attention of churches to the sin of division over the "cups" and show the "common ground" for all on the one cup, these are now those who will say you will divide the church. So I guess we better all turn our ears from the truth, as Paul said it would happen with some.

No; here is Bob; I will preach against all ungodliness, whether the sin of causing division by the use of cups, or that Christian women cutting off their hair, when God says not to do it (Cor.

chapter 11), or that of women teaching the Bible in public, or that of drunkenness or adultery, or of fraternal organizations for Christians to enter and rob God of glory in the church. Yes, and I shall not slight the sin of Christians taking part in carnal wars, when they are the subjects of the King of peace, whose scepter is a scepter of righteousness. You can get plenty of preachers who will give you a milk-and-water gospel for your money, so if you want that thing, call them. They will need the job. I have only one authority and that is the Bible, and don't call me unless you want it—the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Bob Musgrove, Elk City, Okla.

REPORT

I have spent the summer in tent meetings about Columbus, Ohio, and find it one of the hardest fields I have ever worked. I am now ready to ship the tent back to Florida to the first place that calls for that work. All I ask is a place to pitch the tent where I can expect a hearing and have a place to eat and to sleep. Address me here at 2816 Osceola Ave., Columbus, Ohio, and if I am not at home the family will forward my mail. I want to say that "Scriptural Songs," said by many to be the best song book now extant, may be secured yet from my home by addressing Mrs. Lovina Wright, as above. Who will be the first to give me a tent meeting?—J. Madison Wright.

THE BOLL—BOLES DEBATE

I have been very much interested, somewhat amused, and considerably saddened in the reading the above discussion in the columns of the Gospel Advocate. Bro. Boles has been logical, clear, and concise in his arguments and presentation of the Scriptures supporting them; I wish I could say as much for Bro. Boll.

The vagaries of the human mind form a constant source of study for those who are inclined to sift the chaff from the wheat and note how far some apparently conscientious men—men of undoubted mental acumen—have diverged from the plain teaching of God's word.

This is not due to any lack of clarity in that word, but to the curious quirks and misinterpretations of men obsessed with some theory to which they persist in clinging in spite of its plainest utterances.

For instance, the argument that Christ did not possess all power and authority in heaven and earth at the time he commissioned his apostles, but had it conferred on him at Pentecost, makes the Lord a false witness against himself. The merest child can

see that the command "Go ye therefore" bases his command upon the actual possession of all power and authority at the very time it was given. Even a casual reading of the Scriptures will readily show that the Lord had already gone into his Father's presence, received the power that had been promised him and returned to begin its exercise by commissioning his apostles. The building of his church, it is true, began on Pentecost, but the power with which the apostles were imbued on that day had already been bestowed upon the Saviour as he emphatically declared when he gave the commission. The territory of his kingdom included both heaven and earth, and the establishment of the earthly part of that territory was given into the hands of his apostles.

The idea that Christ will not occupy the throne of David until the Jews have been converted to him and been converted to him and been restored to their ancient home in Palestine and their high estate there as a righteous nation that he will then rule over literal Israel as did David of old, is either to make the Apostle Paul a false witness when he said, "For he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall or partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace" (Eph. 2:14,15), or to accuse the Lord of breaking down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile only to undo his own word and rebuild it at his second coming. I would hate to have to take either horn of this dilemma, yet there is no escaping it by the man who argues that Christ is not now occupying the throne of his father, David.

It would be a great help to students of God if they would be more careful about rightly dividing the word of truth. With the exception of a few casual references to the second coming of Christ, the prophecies of the Old Testament teach us nothing beyond the destruction of Jerusalem.

Jesus said "For I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them" (Luke 10:24). Philip said "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write (John 1:45) showing that the mission of the Old Testament prophets was to reveal Christ and his dispensation, leaving it to the prophets of the New Testament to reveal what was to occur afterward, which they did. It would be well to bear in mind the

declaration of our Lord that "The law and the prophets were until John: since then the kingdom of God is preached." (Luke 16:16).

The second coming of Christ belongs to the New Testament prophets and not to those of the Old Testament. It is proper to go to the olden prophets for any information up to and including the first coming of Christ and the setting up of his kingdom and the final destruction of Jerusalem, but improper and misleading to search there for what should occur in the New dispensation. This was emphatically out of the jurisdiction of the prophets of the Old dispensation.

G. A. TROTT.

Infant daughter of Sister John Murphy was taken suddenly and unexpectedly from us on the 19th of December.

Brother H. C. Harper conducted both services.

A Friend.

RESTORING CHRISTIANITY

What must be done to restore the church of Christ to its former power and usefulness? There must be a returning to the simple life and faith that led Paul to turn his back on the world's glory and pride to die for his Lord; that led Peter to feel unworthy to be crucified upright as was his Master; that filled all the Christian martyrs with divine fire as they went to their death for Christ's sake.

G. W. T.

Jesus

Jesus—"Thou shalt call His name Jesus (saviour), for He shall save his people from their sins." (Mt. 1:21) "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under Heaven, given among men, wherein we must be saved." (Ac. 4:12).

FREE TRACTS AND BOOKLETS

These are free for the asking while they last. There is a very limited number of some of them. Please send postage.

God's wisdom vs. Man's Scriptural baptism, The Cups—Are they Authorized in the Communion? Adventism Exposed—H. C. Harper replies to Bixler, Isbell, Mattox.

DEPARTED

Sneads, Florida
Sister Lucinda Reams, wife of Bro. S. B. Reams after a brief illness was called to leave us on Dec. 13, 1927. She leaves us, but we sorrow not as others that have no hope, for she lived a consistent Christian life, and her memory is cherished by all who knew her. She leaves many friends and relatives at Alexander City, Alabama, and other places where she has lived.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

Application for entry as second class matter pending.

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR	- - - - -	\$1.00
SIX MONTHS	- - - - -	.50
THREE MONTHS	- - - - -	.25

JANUARY, 1928.

OUR PURPOSE

It is due to the reading public that we declare our purpose in the publication of The Truth.

As Brother Trott will be connected with us prominently as a writer, according to promise, it is befitting at this time that he be heard. He says: "I stand where I have always stood, for strict adherence to the precepts and examples of the New Testament and shall advocate that principle until I die. I love you for your work's sake and your love for the gospel."

As for myself, I want to see a clean church and a clean ministry, and the word of God unsullied by the precepts and commandments of men. It has been stated that I accept the following as truisms: "Man can worship and serve God only in doing that which God commands him to do. The basic principle of all acceptable worship and service, as laid down in the Bible, is that man recognize Christ as the only rightful Lawgiver of this dispensation of God. The apostles selected by Christ, in establishing churches and setting them in order, taught them to recognize the word of God as the only authority and as the all-sufficient guide. Nothing was to be taught or predicted except what the Holy Spirit authorized through the apostles chosen by Christ. The command plainly and repeatedly given, was: "Not to go beyond the things which are written." The following Scriptures bear this out: II Cor. 4:6; I Pet. 4:11; II Thes. 3:16; Phil. 4:9; II Tim. 1:13; II Thes. 2:15; Matt. 28:20; Acts 2:42; Matt. 7:24; II John, 9; Col. 2:21, 22; Col. 4:16; and I Thes. 5:27.

H. C. HARPER.

OUR PLAN

The brethren have urged the work upon me. I did not begin preaching as a matter of choice; but circumstances seemed to make the imperative demand, and I undertook the ministry, not as a matter of preference, but as a matter of duty. Neither have I undertaken the publication of a paper as a matter of choice. Had I been so inclined, I could, long since, have done

so; but circumstances now make the unqualified demand upon me, and I undertake the work wholly as a matter of duty. When a child, I learned the motto: "When duty calls, obey." And I have made this the guiding star of my life. It was adherence to this that made me a Christian—yes, all I am that is of any worth.

I wish to thank the brethren for their kind words of cheer, and I shall try to repay the confidence they repose in me by ever standing firmly for the faith of the gospel. I know I shall need your constant prayers and encouragement. I feel as I imagine one risen from the dead: a new world has dawned upon me. Truly, one knows not what friends one has until adversity crosses the pathway. So I thank God, and take courage.

SABBATH KEEPING A SIN

The Sabbath fell upon the seventh day of the week. (Ex. 20: 10). It was an institution of Judaism, being given to Israel at Mount Sinai when "the law was given to Moses." (Ex. chapters 19 and 30). (also see John 1: 17).

On the other hand, the first day of the week is an institution of Christianity. It is the resurrection-day of Christ. (Mark 16: 9). Of the first fruits, the type, it is said, "On the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it." (Lev. 3: 11). And Christ, in his resurrection on the first day of the week, was the antetype, being "the first fruits of them that slept." (I Cor. 15: 20). And since Christ is "Lord" (Phil. 2: 11 and Rom. 10: 9), having all authority in heaven and on earth (Matt. 28: 18), it is evident that the first day of the week is the "Lord's Day." (Rev. 1: 10). The "Lord's day" and "Lord's Supper" are peculiar to New Testament Greek. They are New Testament institutions.

It was on the Lord's day, the resurrection day, that Jesus met in the assembly with his disciples after his resurrection (John 20: 19-26), and it was there that he poured forth his blessing upon them. And it was on the "Lord's day," the resurrection-day, that the disciples ever afterwards met to worship their Lord. (Acts 20: 7 and I Cor. 16: 1-2.) Hence any Bible reader should see how sinful it is to set aside the first day of the week, the "Lord's Day," for the seventh, the "Sabbath" of the law of Moses (John 1:17) or any other day.

It is Paul, who said in protecting the brethren against Judaizing perverters of the gospel, let no man judge you in respect of "the Sabbath" (Col. 2: 16). To submit to such false teachings is to reject Christ as Lord.

H. C. HARPER

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

(H. C. Harper)

"A purely Chinese administered non-sectarian church, to be known as "the Church of Christ in China," has been organized."

So says the Associated Press. And thus it is seen that sectarianism is a stench not only in the face of God (John 17), but also in the face of the "heathen." Jesus prayed: "That they may all be one . . . that the world may believe that Thou didst send me." Hence those who have upheld sectarianism, have simply gloried in their own shame.

The church of Christ is non-sectarian in its very nature. And the "gospel of Christ" (Rom. 1:16) cannot be separated from the church of Christ. There is "one Lord, one faith." (Eph. 4:4). And "factions, divisions, parties" are classed in the church of Christ, with the sins of drunkenness, fornication, idolatry; and "they who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5:20).

What is the basis of unity? Since Jesus is Lord, it is evident that all must confine themselves in their faith and practice to his word. Yes, speak where the Scriptures speak, and be silent where the Scriptures are silent. And for this we shall ever plead, as God gives us favor and strength.

Had not digression entered a once united, happy brotherhood, we could point the "heathen Chinese and the "denominations" to the realm of unity. A faction, moved by worldly pride, went out from us (to hasten the conversion of the heathen, they said) but they made in the end but a "denomination" among "the sister denominations." And today the heathen has arisen to shame them. And still there are others now headed in the direction of Babylon, led captive by Satan at his will.

Who will stand with us with means and influence for unity on the word of God?

"And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men." Luke 2:13. "And man, at war with man, hears not

The love-song which they bring; O, hush the noise, ye men of strife, And hear the angels sing!"—Sears. Then said Jesus unto him, "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."—Mt. 26:52.

I cannot believe man now has immortality because I read that the Lord only possess it. "The King of kings and Lord of lords: who only hath im-

mortality" (I Tim. 6:16)—P. T. M.

Well, then, I suppose you can believe with us that man now has mortality, can you not? And can't you tell us what it is that "man now has" that is mortal? If not, the Book of God can tell us. Here it is: "your mortal body." (Rom. 6:12), "your mortal bodies" (Rom. 8:11), "our mortal flesh" (2 Cor. 4:11).

Did the Son of God have mortality before he became incarnate? "Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."—John 17:5. Did the Son of God have mortality "before the world was?" Did the Son of God have mortality before "a body" was prepared him? (Heb. 10:5).

ENCOURAGEMENT

Relative to the new paper, "The Truth," I am introducing it both publicly and privately.—Homer L. King, Mo.

I intend to subscribe for it as soon as it is certain of being born.—J. N. Cowan, Texas.

Send me "The Truth," I do not want to miss a copy.—Carman Watson, Mich.

Send me "The Truth."—James T. Miller, Kansas.

Please send me your paper, "The Truth."—E. G. Creacy, Ky.

Send me your paper, "The Truth," I know lots of people that I'm sure will read your paper. I have heard Bro. Harper preach. He's a good preacher, and I learned to love him.—L. H. Barron, Ala.

Please send some of The Truth papers to me; I stand for the truth, and I know Brother Harper does, for I have read after him lots.—M. Edwards, Ill.

Success to you, Brother Harper, in publishing The Truth.—W. R. Crowson, Fla.

Enclosed find two dollars for "The Truth." J. B. Watson, Mich.

Send me a bundle of samples of "The Truth" and I will hand them out. The name is all right and I want to send in a few subs soon.—E. F. Morgan, Texas.

Brother Harper, I believe your writings are second to none in the brotherhood. Send me "The Truth."—Otis J. Haynes, Ark.

I am with you in the fight. The brethren everywhere, so far as I know, regard you, as I do, as the strongest writer we have. We seem to be standing alone in defense of the truth and

dare not lay down on the job. I will be glad to write for the paper. I wish you success and shall subscribe myself and send any subscriptions I can.—G. A. Trott.

My prayers are for the success of "The Truth." You may depend on me to do all that I can for the paper. Please send it to the following names. W. H. Reynolds, Ala.

I am glad to know of your zeal and untiring efforts for the purifying of family has been picking cotton for a 'he church. I am very poor, and my family has been picking cotton for a living. I shall be driving a wedge at Gilbert, Ariz., and if anyone knows a place that needs such work, please write me at Mesa, Ariz. I shall do all that I can for the Truth. Here is my subscription, and some names for sample copies.—J. M. Anderson, Mesa, Arizona.

Enclosed find a short poem for the paper. I shall try to send you an article occasionally. I trust that your efforts may be crowned with success in the publication of the "Truth."—J. P. Watson, Tenn.

NOXIOUS PLANTS

Sectarian "Plants" Shall be "Rooted Up" Because They Were Not Planted By The Heavenly Father (Matt. 15:13)

Jesus said (Matt. 15:13) "Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."

The Church of Christ was established in Jerusalem, Palestine, on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, which was in the year, A. D. 33 (Zech. 1:16; Isa. 2:2, 3; Dan. 2:44, 45; Matt. 16: 16-20; Mark 9:1; Acts 2nd Chapter; Acts 11:15). It was planted by the Heavenly Father. Dan. 2:44) and shall not be "rooted up" (Matt. 15:13), but shall "stand forever" (Dan. 2:44, 45; Matt. 16:18).

But all sectarian organizations, calling themselves "churches" shall be "rooted up" because they are "plants which my Heavenly Father hath not planted" (Matt. 15:13). Observe, then, that—

1. The Roman Catholic Church was "planted" or founded, about the year, A. D. 533, 500 years too late to be the "plant which my Heavenly Father hath planted," hence it "shall be rooted up."

2. The Mohammedan, or Mohometan Church was founded by Mohammed or Mohomet, a false prophet, of Mecca, Arabia, about the year, A. D., 622, 589 years too late to be the one planted by the dear Heavenly Father, hence it, too, "shall be rooted up."

3. The Church of England (Episcopal Church) was founded in the days of King Henry VIII, several hun-

dred years too late to be the "plant which my Heavenly Father hath" planted, hence it "shall be rooted up."

4. The Lutheran Church was founded by Martin Luther, the Great Reformer of Germany, in the year, A. D. 1517, 1487 years too late to be called the church of Christ, or the plant "which my Heavenly Father hath" planted, hence it "shall be rooted up."

5. The Presbyterian Church was founded by John Knox in the sixteenth century, about 1500 years too late to be the "plant" or church "which my Heavenly Father hath" planted, hence it "shall be rooted up."

6. The Congregational Church was founded by John Robinson, in the seventeenth Century, at least 1600 years too late to be the "plant" planted by our dear Heavenly Father, hence it "shall be rooted up."

7. The Jesuit (Society of Jesus Church) was founded by Ignatius Loyola in the year, A. D. 1540, 1507 years too late to be the "plant" planted by the Heavenly Father, hence it "shall be rooted up."

8. The Methodist Church was founded by John Wesley in the Seventeenth century, more than 1600 years too late to be the one planted by the Heavenly Father, hence it "shall be rooted up."

9. The Methodist Episcopal Church was founded by Philip Embury, about the year, A. D. 1776, 1743 years too late to be the one planted by the Heavenly Father, hence it "shall be rooted up."

10. The Mormon Church was founded by Joseph Smith, a false prophet in the year 1832, 1799 years too late to be the "Church of Jesus Christ," as it claims to be, hence it "shall be rooted up."

11. The Christian Church, or Church of the Disciples, or Disciples' Denomination had its beginning at St. Louis, Mo., about the year, A. D. 1849 (when it pulled off from the church of Christ), 1816 years too late to be the church of Christ, hence it, like the other denominations "shall be rooted up."

My readers will please pardon me for not giving exact dates and the name of the founder of some of the churches mentioned above. I am, at this writing, widely separated from my library, and am writing mostly from memory, hence can't give exact dates, etc., about some of them. And, there are other institutions, called churches, that I would like to mention here, but can't for lack of space. I will say, however, that any church that was founded this side of Pentecost, A. D. 33, and at any place other than Jerusalem, Palestine, and that was founded by a man originated too late, at the wrong place, and by the wrong man, to be the one planted by my dear Heavenly Father; is a "plant which

my Heavenly Father hath not planted" hence it "shall be rooted up." (Matt. 15:13). The same thing can, with truthfulness, be said of all humanly devised societies—Christian Endeavor, Sunday School, Missionary Society, etc.—organized to do the work of the church.

THE GREAT APOSTACY HAS COME 2nd Thess. 2nd Chap.

When Paul wrote his first letter to the Church at Thessalonica, he made mention of the fact that the Lord Jesus was coming back; that he would make another advent. The brethren drew an erroneous conclusion from his writings that the Lord was coming soon—in their own generation—that they began to walk disorderly and to neglect their own temporal affairs. This called for another letter from Paul, in which he corrected them, showing that His coming was yet a long time distant. He said:

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day (the day of Christ's second advent) shall not come unless there come a falling away (apostacy, Emphatic Diaglott) first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple (Church, 1 Cor. 3: 16, 17) of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2: 2-4.

The most eminent commentators are, I think, generally agreed that the "falling away," the revealing of the "man of sin" and "son of perdition," etc., has reference to the coming of Roman Catholicism. The "man of sin"—the Pope of Rome—sits in the "Temple of God"—the Church—claiming to be the "Vicar of Christ," "Prince of the Fathers," "Infallible One," "Supreme Head of the Church on Earth," "His Holiness, Lord God the Pope," "Another God Upon Earth," "King of Kings and Lord of Lords." Isn't this enough to prove him to be the "Man of Sin" and Son of Perdition? Certainly.

Daniel saw the same power—Roman Catholicism—the Apostate Church—under the symbol of the "Little Horn" of his fourth Beast, as recorded in Daniel 7. Turn to that Chapter and read Daniel's vision of the four beasts and you will be convinced that,—

1. The Beast that was like a lion is the Babylonian Empire. This kingdom fell about the year, B. C. 538.

2. The Beast that was like a bear is a symbol of Medo-Persia. This Empire fell about the year, B. C. 331.

3. The Beast that was like a leopard is a symbol of the Greek or Macedonian Empire. This kingdom fell about the year, B. C. 31.

4. The fourth Beast, with its "nails

of brass," "teeth of iron," "ten horns," etc., is a symbol of Rome, "the fourth kingdom which shall be upon Earth." This fourth Beast, which had the "ten horns," had also, a "little horn" which came up from among the "ten horns" and is described thus:

"I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them (or "behind them, unobserved, or unnoticed) another horn, a little one, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like that of a man, and a mouth speaking great things." Dan. 7: 8.

Daniel then asked a special question concerning this "little horn." "And concerning the ten horns that were on its head, and the other horn which came up, and before which three fell, even that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout (daring) than its fellows (the other "ten horns") I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them."—Dan. 7: 20-21.

In answer to this question, "one of them that stood by" (Dan. 7: 16), gave the following interpretation: "And as for the ten horns out of this (Roman) kingdom shall ten kings (or kingdoms—the ten subdivision of Rome) arise: and another (King) shall arise after them (the eleventh and last kingdom—Roman Catholicism—was to arise after Rome was divided into ten kingdoms); and he shall be diverse from the former and shall put down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High; and shall think to change times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and a half a time."—Dan. 7: 23-25.

The "Little Horn"—the Papal Power
It is evident to "the mind that hath wisdom" (Rev. 17: 9), that the "Little Horn" of Daniel's fourth Beast represents the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. For,—

1. It was to have its rise among the "ten horns" of the Roman Beast; it "came up among them;" that is, it was to have its rise some where in the Western Roman Empire. Roman Catholicism originated here.

2. It could not have its rise—could not "come up among them"—until after Rome was divided into ten subdivisions. "And as for the ten horns out of this (Roman) kingdom shall ten kings arise and another (the Little Horn) shall arise after them". Roman Catholicism did not rise until after Rome was divided, and the "ten horns" or kingdoms, were fully developed.

3. It was to subdue three of the kingdoms represented by the "ten horns." Daniel speaks of the "little horn, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots."

"And he shall be diverse from the former, and shall put down their kings." It is a well known fact, that no one, I presume, will deny, that thru the influence of the Catholic party, the Ostrogoths, the Lombards and the Vandals—three of the kingdoms represented by the "ten horns"—were plucked up, subdued, and removed out of the way.

4. Its character was to be, in some way, "diverse" from that of the other "ten horns" or kingdoms. The kingdoms represented by the "ten horns" were purely secular or political in their characteristics; but the kingdoms represented by the "Little Horn" is a politico-ecclesiastical despotism; that is, it is a despotic power, mixed with politics and Christianity.

5. It had "eyes like that of a man," indicating that it was to be noted for its intelligence. This is true of Roman Catholicism.

6. It was to "speak words against the Most High;" "there was given him a mouth speaking great things." The Pope, head of the Catholic Church, makes the following blasphemous claims: "There is one God, as revealed in Christ Jesus, His Son, and I am his vicar, or substitute." "My decrees are the very voice of God, and are a little superior to every other oracle." "The voice of final authority comes down from St. Peter through us, the popes, his successors."

7. It was to "think to change times and the law"—the law of God. The Pope has thought to do this very thing. He changed baptism from immersion to sprinkling. He has "changed" the law on so many things that it is hardly recognized by them as being any part of the Divine administration.

8. It was to "make war on the saints, wear out the saints and prevail against them." This they have done by inflicting the penalty of death upon all that they consider heretics.

9. It was to last for "a time, times, and a half a time" (Dan. 7: 25). According to Rev. 12: 6, 14 a "time, times and a half" equals 1,260 days (See, also, Rev. 11: 2, 3; 13: 5). And according to Ezek. 4: 6; Num. 14: 34 each prophetic day counts for a year. Hence the Empire of the "Little Horn"—the Roman Catholic Hierarchy—was to lord it over the saints for 1,260 years. This period, covers, I think, the "Dark Ages" of history, when Satanic wrath reigned the zenith of its power.

The Protestant Reformation
In the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, Wickliff, Huss, Luther and others saw the danger of acknowledging the authority of "His Holiness, Lord God the Pope". They dared to question the authority of him who blasphemously claimed to be the "Supreme Head of the Church on Earth," etc. They tried

to reform this great "Man of Sin," the "Son of Perdition." But they failed. They who dared to question the authority of the Pope soon began the destructive work of forming creeds, confessions of faith, etc., almost as corrupt as the one to which they were bound while subjects of the Pope. They did not truly acknowledge the Living Creed, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. They are following too closely the traditions of their apostate mother, "the Mother of Harlots"—the Roman Catholic Hierarchy (Rev. 17). The Protestants do not claim authority to "change . . . the law," as did the Pope, but they teach something else about as bad, viz., that we can teach and practice everything not expressly condemned in the Bible.

The Restoration Movement

Thomas and Alexander Campbell, B. W. Stone, Walter Scott, and others, seeing that the Reformation had failed to accomplish the purpose of God in restoring the ancient order of things (Isa. 60; Jer. 30: 10-17), started another movement in the beginning of the 19th Century. Their plan was to plead for a restoration of the ancient order of things and the union of all believers in Christ on the basis of the Bible alone. This movement was started with the plea, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent."

A Departure

The Restoration Movement gained rapidly until in the late forties—about 1849—when the disciples began the introduction of musical instruments, humanly arranged societies, etc., into the worship and work of the church, causing diversion. The body was divided into two different bodies, one—the liberals,—adopting a party name—Disciples' Church, or the Christian Church. This denomination has become about as corrupt as any now in existence. They have no regard for the old motto. "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent."

Another Departure

We are now going through another shameful division. It started a few years ago with the "Bible College" idea, the "Sunday School" idea, the "Hired Pastor" idea, the "Young Peoples' Meeting" idea, etc. Just a few more steps from "that which is written" (Cor. 4: 6) and the ones advocating these things will be identical with the Christian Church, the Disciples' Denomination, will be to install the musical instruments and begin to receive the sects on their sprinkling and pouring. They are headed for Babylon.

What We Need Now

What we need now is more people, preachers, individuals, and congrega-

tions, that will continue to plead for a restoration of the ancient order of things. I am glad to say that there are many yet who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. We still have a goodly number who are trying to worship and work "as it is written" (1 Cor. 4: 6). But we need more. Preachers, elders, individual members, work together with us for a restoration of the Apostolic order of things. Tell your friends, erring brethren and all, that the Lord says, "Come out of her (Babylon) My people, that you have no fellowship with her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues" (Rev. 18: 4). Are you doing your part? JAMES DOUGLASS PHILLIPS
Everton, Arkansas.

THEIR OVERTHROW DESCRIBED

I think most, if not all, my readers, will agree with me that the term "Babylon," used in the Book of Revelation always represents Roman Catholicism and her household of Protestant daughters and grand-daughters—Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, etc.—which constitute spiritual Babylon, or religious confusion (the original meaning of "Babylon" is "confusion," hence the Tower of Babel was so-called because it was at the building of this tower that God caused the confusion of speech, of tongues, from which confusion the Tower (Babel) and the City (Babylon) were named), and, hence, the overthrow of Babylon, described by John, literally means the overthrow of false religious organizations. Read John's description of her overthrow:

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of her fornication." Rev. 14: 8. And again:

"And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying: Thus with violence shall that great city, Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all." (Rev. 18: 21).

There are people in Babylon who are, or who would be, children of God; and to all such the voice of warning has already gone forth, "Come out of her (Babylon), My people, that ye have no fellowship with her sins" (Rev. 18: 4). "Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean; and I will receive you." (2 Cor. 6: 17).

Now, gentle reader, if you are in Babylon, if you have on any of Babel's garments, I beg you, I plead with you in the Name of God, Christ, and all that is sacred and lovely, to lay them aside, "Come out of her," lay aside the unscripural and antiscripural doctrines and practices, return to Jerusalem (the Church of Christ), and follow the teachings of the Bible in

all things. The cry, "Come out of Babylon," must be heard a while longer, and then shall her end come. For, "Every plant, which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up" (Matt. 15: 13). "Come out of her, my people, that you have no fellowship with her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues."—Rev. 18: 4.

JAMES DOUGLASS PHILLIPS
Everton, Ark

BAPTIZED INTO HIS DEATH

I bury (baptize) people who are "dead in sins," (Col. 2: 13) and not "dead to sin" (Rom. 6: 2 and 11). And in this burial they are "made free from sin" (Rom. 6: 18) and "dead to sin." Otherwise, I would bury a person who is alive to God; and if there was any change in baptism as indicated in a burial and a resurrection, the person would most conclusively be raised in a lost state.

G. A. CRUTCHFIELD

I now will direct attention to some of the very palpable errors to which I have referred, the first in mind being that preposterous one, that the sinner's heart is "purified" by faith alone or faith only. Those who teach this perfidious error predicate such teachings on Peter's statement found in Acts 15: 9. They deny the charge that teaching of the passage implies that the "purification" is effected by faith alone or faith-only—that is, those I have criticized on the question do. But their way of putting the question, in their sermons and writings inevitably implies purification by faith alone, for their way of putting it is as follows: "Faith purifies the heart, and repentance purifies or changes the life, and baptism changes the state—if this should be submitted to the consideration of even a kindergarten tot that tot would visualize at a glance that it implies "purification" by faith alone, will some of them please tell us what was with faith at the time the purifying took place, to keep it from being "alone?" I think, if they would do a little connected thinking right here, that a blush of shame would mount their cheeks.

In discussing this egregious fallacy with one of its advocates, in private, he said: "Well, Bro. McGary, you know Peter said their hearts were purified by faith, and knowing this as you do, I would thank you to tell me how you teach it." I replied: "You tell me how you teach justification by faith in replying to a sectarian when he quotes Rom. 5: 1 to sustain his theory of "justification by faith only," and I will let the way you teach in such case stand for the way I teach concerning your theory of purification by faith only." Then he began trying to quibble up

a difference between purification and justification, which he failed to do, even to his own satisfaction. I told him that if he would show me the difference between purification and justification, in the scriptural sense of the term, I would show the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee—I didn't have to show the difference between the two latter terms.

The same Peter who taught that the heart is "purified by faith" also taught that the soul is purified by obedience of the truth (see 1 Pet. 1:22). And if any one will tell the difference between purification of the heart and purification of the soul, I'll not only tell him the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee, but will, for good measure, tell him the difference between nihilism and nothingness.

Purification is by faith and justification is by faith, and both take place at the same time and in the same way, because they are the same.

The pertinent question then is when does "faith purify"—instantaneously or at some times subsequent to its first existence? I need not wait for an answer from those brethren who teach the absurd fallacy concerning purification, for I know their answer would be that faith purifies when it leads to obedience.

Hence I ask them this question: Is not one justified when his heart is purified? If they say no, then I would remind them that Christ said: "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."

Therefore, if purification takes place before justification, according to this saying of our Lord, one may be prepared to see God before he is justified! Furthermore, if "faith purifies the heart" before repentance takes place, as the theory under discussion implies, then one may be prepared to see God before he repents.

This would render, not only baptism a non-essential, but also repentance and justification! Pshaw, brethren, stop teaching such rank foolishness and base perversion.

I must close this without paying any attention to other fallacies that those same brethren propagate, which are as unsound, untenable, unbalanced, unreasonable and unscriptural as the one I've been considering. But I'm purposing to pay my respects to some of those others ere long.

A. MCGARY, G. G.

I am here requesting you to send me sample copies of "The Truth," and oblige.—Grover White, Ohio.

Please send to my address a copy of "The Truth."—Lila Phillips, Texas.

I am glad to know you are yet standing for the truth. I will work to get all I can to take the paper. I do not

want to miss a copy.—G. A. Comfield, La.

I see that you are publishing a paper "The Truth." Please send a sample copy to me.—W. M. Hunter, Texas.

I am sending you two dollars for "The Truth." Good success to you, Bro. Harper.—Mrs. W. T. Hansard, Ala.

Brother Harper, you are doing a good work. Get the people to read for themselves. I have no use for a dictator.—John Carmichael, W. Va.

Brother Harper, I see that you are publishing "The Truth." May it ever be an expression of the truth of God.—J. Madison Wright, Ohio.

I am at your service to do anything I can to advance "The Truth." A brother that can preach as you do should be able to give us a good paper.—Joe E. Wallace, Ala.

I stand with you for "The Truth." Give us the word of God, brother.—T. McNeely, Okla.

Mark me up for "The Truth." It sounds good to me.—J. S. Bedingfield, Texas.

Please enter my name for "The Truth." The name sounds good, and I hope we can all live up to it.—Ollie Thomas, Ohio.

I shall help you all I can. Will send in my subscription and others.—H. C. Welch, Texas.

Announcement of "The Truth" received. Glad to know that I may be favored continually with your knowledge of God's word.—J. C. Falkner, Ark.

Send me copies of the new paper "The Truth," I will do what I can for it.—Oscar Walters, N. Mex.

I hope you are getting lots of subscribers for "The Truth," and that it may increase in circulation all the time; for it is hard to over-estimate the value of Bible knowledge. I shall write articles all along and send to you.—Jas. Douglas Phillips.

I will boost for "The Truth." Send me samples.—W. T. Taylor.

Enroll my name for "The Truth." May God richly bless you, brother.—A. J. Thompson, Texas.

You have my sympathy and support. And I hope "The Truth" will cut its way through every innovation that blocks the progress of New Testament Christianity. Look for my subscription in time to get the first issue.—J. H. Wilson, Texas.

I heartily endorse your undertaking in getting out "The Truth," and shall anxiously await the first issue, and will help you in every way I can.—H. R. Stringer, Miss.

I am much interested in the new paper, "The Truth," you are publishing. Please send me samples at once.—Ernest Kuykendall, Okla.

Send me copies of your paper, "The Truth."—E. E. Roberts, M. D., Ark.

Send me a few sample copies of the new paper, "The Truth."—A. M. Pettigrew, Texas.

Please send "The Truth" to the enclosed addresses.—I. G. Hayes.

Everybody here wants the paper. "The Truth" is a good name for it. You may send to the following addresses. I shall begin a meeting at Delena, California, in January. Send me samples there.—Bob Musgrove, Okla.

I want the paper, the rest want it, and I will do all I can for its circulation.—E. B. Webb, Tenn.

I notice you are beginning the publication of "The Truth." I wish you much success in your undertaking.—Coleman Overby, Tenn.

We were sorry, indeed, when you were shut out. May the Lord bless you in your undertaking in publishing "The Truth." The truth I am sure it will be, coming from that source.—J. F. Pursely, Texas.

You may put me down on your list of subscribers. I want every copy of "The Truth."—Ira L. Sanders.

I want "The Truth" and I will try to be on time with my subscription.—M. H. Northcross, Fla.

I want to write and work for "The Truth." The brethren here are with you.—W. T. Taylor, Okla.

I have been waiting for the brethren to all get ready and all send for "The Truth" together.—A. H. Pinegar, Tenn.

I shall send in subs. for "The Truth" soon. May God bless you for your stand for fair investigation.—Jas. T. White, Texas.

Hope you will be successful with the paper. Here is my subscription.—

THE TRUTH FUND

A brother in Texas ----- \$10.00
A brother in Texas ----- 7.00

This fund is for maintaining and improving the paper, and we hope to be favored with frequent donations by those who wish to help spread the truth in this way.

SUBSCRIPTION FUND

We have, as yet, received no funds for this purpose. But some brethren have promised to donate to it.

There are some who are too poor to pay a subscription, some who are old and have no means, and some who have had sickness or other misfortunes and these would be glad to read the paper. And some would like to help send the paper to those not members of any church, or those in darkness of humanisms among the churches. With your donation, we shall be glad to have any names you may suggest to whom the paper may be sent.

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.

VOLUME 1.

SNEADS, FLA., FEBRUARY, 1928.

NUMBER 2.

FOOLOLOGY

"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."

The heart of a fool is a trash heap that accumulates a great store of mental rubbish, and the atheistic, deistic, agnostic fools seem to have acquired a choice lot of the most rank scented garbage of them all. To go into all the ramifications of infidelity would take more space than could be devoted profitably to this subject, so I will merely point out a few of the foolish breaks made by would-be scientists, falsely so-called. I would not consume time with them at all if it were not that our public school text books are being made the sewers for a lot of this slush and the minds of the growing generation are being thereby poisoned in a way that calls for earnest protest.

I have just recently been looking through a copy of the text book on ancient history adopted for the use of the public schools in Texas. It boldly teaches that the Old Testament scriptures are on a par with pagan mythology and not to be taken as reliable history and that the religious beliefs and practices of the Jews are borrowed from Egypt, Babylon and other pagan sources. Evolution's deadly miasma is becoming the normal atmosphere of the school room and contempt for the word of God is rapidly being instilled into the hearts of our children.

In other words, the fools seem to have obtained the right of way in our institutions of learning and are training the rising generation up to be fools and heading them toward the destination of all fools' destruction. The tomfoolery of evolution has been so often and so ably exposed that I am not going to attempt to tear off all the filthy rags of sophistry with which evolution has been clothed by its votaries, but I wish to show, by just one instance, its fatuous delusion. We find that some of the very lowest forms of life are perpetrated by a division of the parent organism into two parts, each part becoming a separate and complete organism, growing to full size and then reproducing in the same manner. Again we find another class in the animal kingdom in which reproduction is brought about by the process of egg-laying and hatching. Some others perpetuate their kind by birth of their young direct from the parent animal. Now let evolution give us any sane explanation of how one of those subdividing organisms could, by any possible process of evolution,

chance to the egg laying group, or how the egg layers could, by infinitesimal changes, through aeons of time, ever develop into animals giving birth to fully formed progeny and then we will be ready to investigate their absurd claims more fully. Just a glance at this aspect of the matter shows how utterly foolish is the whole fabric of evolution. If some of their mush-brained apostles will kindly attempt to bridge this bottomless gulf, we will cheerfully give them space in The Apostolic Way.

In the meantime, I wish to urge a persistent and concerted warfare made to poison the minds of our children in our public schools.

G. A. TROTT.

BAPTISM

The Gospel Advocate has at last "hit the nail square on the head" and clinched the argument against "sect baptism."

Among other things, the Gospel Advocate says: "We are also commanded to repent and to be baptized in order that our sins may be forgiven."

That puts the purpose of the act of baptism into the command as a limiting element thereof; and no one can obey that command without being baptized "in order that" his "sins may be forgiven." Again, no one can be baptized "in order that" his "sins may be forgiven" who believes his sins already forgiven before baptism. Therefore, such a one cannot obey that command.

The Gospel Advocate further says: "But the popular system of conversion among the denominations puts getting religion before baptism, thus upsetting God's divine arrangement."

Hear the Gospel Advocate again in the same article: "To place the remission of sins before baptism upsets the word of the Lord, puts the cart before the horse, and thus makes a human arrangement of the whole matter of conversion." (Gospel Advocate, Dec. 19, 1918, pp. 1212-12-13).

Now if these statements from the Gospel Advocate be true (and I believe they are), then all the converts among the denominations who believed their sins forgiven before they were baptized have missed the whole of "God's divine arrangement." It matters not how honest they were, nor how much they intended to obey God, those converts have done by practice just what their teachers did in theory,

namely: by placing "the remission of sins before baptism" they "upset the word of the Lord, put the cart before the horse, and thus make a human arrangement of the whole matter of (their) conversion."

According to the Advocate the "whole matter of" their "conversion" is therefore nothing more than a "human arrangement." Their baptism is "upset" baptism and their remission is "upset" remission; for the whole of God's "divine arrangement" is upset by placing "the remission of sins before baptism."

Just here I would ask the Advocate to please explain, in the light of God's word: How is such "upset" baptism *valid baptism*? How is such "upset" remission *real remission*? And how can such "human" conversion be *genuine conversion*? Since that journal has pronounced the whole matter of such conversion to be nothing more than "a human arrangement?"

Will the Advocate please answer the following question? (I have put this question to many, but have had no answer?)

If God overlooks the mistakes of aliens and saves them by baptism "despite" their error of "upsetting God's divine arrangement," of "upsetting the word of the Lord," and making "a human arrangement of the whole matter of (their) conversion" by placing "the remission of sins before baptism," then I ask, would God not be as good to his children and overlook their mistakes and save them at the last day "despite" their error of "upsetting God's divine arrangement," of "upsetting the word of the Lord," and making "a human arrangement of the whole matter of" their worship by practicing "instrumental music" in their worship and working through missionary societies? If not, why not? The principle is exactly the same, and the cases are parallel, and God is no respecter of persons.

From the Gospel Advocate it now appears as clear as the noon-day sun that it is *essential to valid baptism, to true conversion, and to real remission of sins* that the subject understand "God's divine arrangement" that baptism comes before the remission of sins and is a *condition* of that blessing.

J. P. WATSON.

Cookesville, Tenn.

Truth unsullied is our goal and our purpose: "Hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may."

THE GOOD CONFESSION

"And Phillip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (Acts 8:37.)

Now this verse is said to be an interpolation but I think it contains the "good confession." What other could a disciple of Christ want made? Was not this the disputed fact, at that time that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God?

Christ says "If you believe not that I am he (the Son of God), you shall die in your sins." "Whosoever confesseth me before men, him will I confess before my Father." These are declarations that tend to show that we must believe and confess the Christ; not only in words, but in our acts as well.

"Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on the life eternal whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess THE GOOD CONFESSION in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the "GOOD CONFESSION." (Tim. 6:12, 13. R. V.)

Now, what was the confession that Christ witnessed before Pilate? That he was the Son of God—Christ, King of the Jews, etc.

The confession that Timothy made was evidently the same that Christ witnessed, as they are described in the same definite terms. See Deut. 32:29; I Sam. 2:6; Luke 22nd and 23rd chapters.

This is conclusive. To my mind, as to the confession that is required of all who desire to put on Christ, "confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus." "No," say some, "God for Christ's sake has pardoned my sins," is the proper confession. "Christ is come in the (my) flesh," says another. O! why wrest the Scriptures in this unholy way? Why not accept this blessed Truth just as we find it and confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus—let our lives be an open confession of him, epistles read of all men, so long as we be permitted to walk the walks of men?

I doubt not that angels rejoice when one confesses from the heart, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God."

W. L. SHELNUTT,
Wedowee, Ala.

THAT CHALLENGE

Brother Little, of Montgomery, who is a Sunday School advocate, for a while visited this section of Alabama; but it seems that he felt the pressure against the Sunday School so strongly that he decided to quit; at least he has not been here for more than two months. When here he advised the church at Samson, so he says, "to leave all matters of procedure to Bro. Samuel Jordan, of Highland Home, Alabama."

Now, Brother Jordan, it seems ordered the church at Highland Home to

send Bro. I. L. Boles down here to preach for the church at Samson and to pay him twenty dollars a month for his support, so Bro. Boles said; but the church at Highland Home objected to giving any more money for the Samson work. And up to this time, so Bro. Boles said, Brother Jordan had not received any "pay for his preaching at Highland Home." So he now ordered the church there to pay him twenty dollars a month for his preaching. Then he takes it and sends it to support Boles at Samson. When Boles begins his work in Samson, he comes out to Bethel church neighborhood, and tells us his object in visiting us is "to get the two churches to working together. We have no Sunday School at Bethel, and I related to him the attack the Sunday School brethren had made through their preacher, Houston Proffett. Bro Boles then made a defense of the Sunday School, but when I replied to him, he had no more to say, but on his way back he told a brother that "He wanted to meet me in debate on the Sunday School question." I then wrote him concerning his challenge for debate. He replied that he was busy, but hoped to see me in the fall.

Fall came, but he has not yet appeared. So I wrote him again, but since I have received no reply, I should like to know what is the matter. Has he recovered from his Sunday School fever which seemed to be consuming him when here?

If not, and, as the little girl once said, he has not another "want" that beats the one he had when here, just "rin up, and let us have "a whole day" as you told Brother Hopkins that you wanted with me on the question. In fact, I shall be glad to give you as much time as you wish. By the way, let us discuss the question through the Gospel Advocate, which puts out the "Sunday School literature," and The Truth. Now I have met your challenge, will you meet mine?

W. H. REYNOLDS,
Kingston, Ala.

KEEP THYSELF PURE

The following passages of Scripture clearly teach that preachers should live so as to be examples of purity. The apostle Paul, in instructing Timothy, his son, in the gospel, said: "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither partake of other men's sins: keep thyself pure" 1 Tim. 5:22. Again in 2 Tim. 2:22, he said: "Flee also youthful lusts but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." To the same young preacher the apostle said: "Let no man despise thy youth: but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation (or manner of life), in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity."—1 Tim. 4:12. If all who pose as teachers, or as leaders of the church in any way, would read and study these passages prayerfully, I believe much

good would come from it. If preachers would conform their lives to the instruction given to the young preacher, Timothy, it would not be long before a marked change would be seen over the entire brotherhood, for good. The change for good will never come until we have the right kind of men as leaders.

The power of example is great to advance good, or evil. It is natural for the average member of the church to think that their teachers are worthy of imitating, and they should be. One of the saddest things confronting the church today is that the elders, leaders and preachers are not conducting themselves nor their families so as to be worthy of imitating. We can never hope for the church to glorify God as long as its leaders do not live pure lives. Oh, how sad it is to think how few leaders we have that have the cause of our Master at heart sufficiently to stand for purity of life as they should. We have many leaders that cannot be considered as worthy of imitating. Some chew and smoke tobacco, and that before our children, whom we warn daily against all enslaving habits. It is hard to get children to let a thing alone while some prominent person practices it before them. The big preacher has a great influence over the young. If he is pure in his habits, and opposes all lustful habits, he will influence the young as well as the old to want to live better lives. But, if he does not live a pure life himself, he is a curse to society and to the church. Parents often punish their little children for doing things that they do themselves. They will sit around and suck an old stinking pipe before their little fellows, and then chastise them for taking up the habit. I believe that all such parents should repent in sack cloth and ashes. They are a curse to their own offspring as well as to society in general. Parents who do not have such habits don't want their children to take up such practices yet they see preachers and other prominent members of the church doing these things, and that makes it very hard for them to keep them from doing those things.

All preachers and leaders in the church should endeavor to try to so live as to elevate all who associate with them. I know of many prominent men who are members of the church, who are held up as an example in things that are very wrong. The people will say, when rebuked for doing a certain thing, "why does a certain preacher do that, if it is wrong? Why does he allow his girls to wear knee dresses, if that is wrong? why does he allow them to paint their faces, if it is wrong? Preachers ought to live so that they will be the right kind of examples. Their children should be faithful, as well as their wives. I do not consider a preacher a good example who smokes and chews tobacco. I do not believe that his family is a good

example is he allows them to go to shows, to dances, bob their hair, wear knee dresses, go car riding alone with boys, and go in bathing in the common bathing suits, with both boys and girls together. I believe that all such practices are unbecoming to any one who professes to be a Christian. Such practices will bring any people down to a very low standard of morals, not to mention its effect upon the church. I stand ready to defend what I have written. If any brother feels that I have been too sharp, let him prayerfully consider what I have said before he has much to say. If I am wrong, I know that I have been led wrong trying to learn the truth. May God help us to so live as to be examples of purity, is my earnest desire and prayer to God. Brethren don't just throw this aside and forget it, and go on in your careless way, but stop and consider before it is too late.

D. I. WHITTEN.

Bro. James B. Otts writes from Gainesville, Texas, saying: "I think 'The Truth' is a dandy little paper, and am sending my subscription and that of Bro. H. C. Pearson. I have some time for preaching not yet taken in July and August, and shall be glad to correspond with brethren desiring meetings then.

ARE YOU INTERESTED
IN GOOD SONG BOOKS

"Tidings of Joy," our 1928 song book, compiled by Will W. Slater, is now ready. We believe it to be the best all-round, all-purpose book we have ever published. It contains 192 pages, made up of the very best songs we could obtain. It contains a list of about twenty invitation songs, and then a list of the later popular songs, together with about sixty brand new songs never before published. These songs have been written by the South's best writers. Brother Slater publishes song books exclusively for the Church of Christ. All his representatives are members of the church. He has taught singing schools, singing normals and sang in meetings since 1906, and in connection therewith, has been preaching since 1915. He surely knows and understands the needs of the church in the song book line. He has endeavored to supply these needs in his recent publications. "Spiritual Melodies," his 1926 book, has been a phenomenal success. Twenty thousand sold, recommended by 42 gospel preachers, 25 singing teachers, besides elders and song leaders too numerous to mention. "Gems of Truth in Song," his 1927 song book, has gone into 31 states, and nearly two hundred letters of commendation have been received. These books have given universal satisfaction. We sell song books under a positive guarantee to please. You MUST be satisfied or money will be cheerfully refunded. Four thousand

copies of our new book "Tidings of Joy," were sold in advance of publication, and shipped direct to our customers from our printers. Our books are all uniform in size and price, 192 pages, 35c per copy, \$3.60 per dozen, \$14.00 per fifty, \$26.00 per hundred, prepaid. Send all orders to Mrs. Will W. Slater, Song Book Publisher, Fort Smith, Arkansas.

THE CHURCH OF THE BIBLE

Predictions

The man whose name is the Branch shall build the temple of the Lord.—Zach. 5:12,13.

The mountain of the Lord's House shall be established, and all nations shall flow unto it; and out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.—Isa. 2:2,3.

I shall send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me.—Mal. 3:1.

In those days John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. This is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord.—Matt. 3.

Then cometh Jesus unto John and was baptized of him in the Jordan, then he began preaching: The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.—Luke 6:13; Matt. 10:5; Mk. 3:14.

Jesus chose his apostles; he is crucified, a sacrifice for sin, the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God.—Isa. 53; Rom. 5.

After his resurrection for our justification, he is with his apostles forty days, speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, of which he had told them before his death, when he said that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem.—Acts 1; Luke 24. And then he tells them to tarry in Jerusalem until endued with power from on high; and that they would receive this power after the Holy Spirit came as another Comforter.—Acts 1; Lk. 24; John 16.

The Holy Spirit came on the day of Pentecost, the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection; and then the apostles spoke, preaching the gospel as the Spirit gave them utterance.—Acts 2; Mk. 16. The power is now received. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation.—Rom. 1.

The Church

What shall we do? Then Peter, who had the keys of the kingdom, said unto them, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, then they that gladly received his word were baptized. And the same day were added about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and

prayers.—Acts 2; Matt. 16:18; Matt. 28:20.

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, said Peter, when asked who Christ is; and Christ said "Upon this rock I will build my church. The word of the Lord has now gone forth from Jerusalem in the preaching of remission of sins (Lk. 24), and now here is the church. And here is the right word, the right foundation, and the right builder, and the right place—the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. Here they were delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dead Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.—Col. 1:12, 13.

In the figure of a building, Christ is now the Chief Corner Stone, which is become the Head of the corner in the building (Acts 4:11), and the building is fitly framed together.—Eph. 2:17-22. And the body is fitly joined together for its own edification.—4:16. And the Lord added to the church daily such as were being saved.—Acts 2:47.

Being saved is being added to the church by the Lord.

In my next I shall take up the name.
W. T. H.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

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.

It has come to pass among us that a full and free discussion of any difference between brethren is despised by Christians, but I believe it indicates a serious defect in the conceptions and convictions of Christians respecting the Christian religion when people are afraid of and opposed to full and even-handed discussion of questions that involve the truth. The readers of the papers don't want it. They don't want to read a paper that has "wrangling" in it. They are ashamed for their neighbors to see their paper and so forth. Brethren, it is a real defect among us.—J. N. Armstrong.

Yes, you are right brother. It truly is a defect, a serious defect. And this same defect had much to do with the rise and reign of the Papacy; and it is the chief corner stone of denominationalism. And it produced the digressive "Christian Church" denomination.

And as digression from God's word advances, discussion is frowned down. And there is no surer indicator of a leaning to digression than an opposition to open "free-handed" discussion. Error utterly despises public discussion. It cannot live long in such an atmosphere; and many are the excuses put forth to avoid such a thing.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

Application for entry as second class matter pending.

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR	- - - - -	\$1.00
SIX MONTHS	- - - - -	.50
THREE MONTHS	- - - - -	.25

FEBRUARY, 1928

OUR PLAN

We announced in our prospectus that *The Truth* would be published weekly at three dollars per year; but since I could not get off from my school work at the close of the year, as expected, it was decided to publish monthly until I could give my whole time and attention to the paper. And we have put the subscription at one dollar a year. Those who have paid more may have a refund or may have their subscription extended, as they prefer; or they may have the surplus above one dollar applied as a donation to "The Truth Fund," if they prefer. And we are asking now to write us which they wish.

The brethren have urged the work upon me. I did not begin preaching as a matter of choice; but circumstances seemed to make the imperative demand, and I undertook the ministry, not as a matter of preference, but as a matter of duty. Neither have I undertaken the publication of a paper as a matter of choice. Had I been so inclined, I could, long since, have done so; but circumstances now make the unqualified demand upon me, and I undertake the work wholly as a matter of duty. When a child, I learned the motto: "When duty calls obey." And I have made this the guiding star of my life. It was adherence to this that made me a Christian, yes, all I am that is of any worth.

I wish to thank the brethren for their kind words of cheer, and I shall try to repay the confidence they repose in me by ever standing firmly for the faith of the gospel. I know I shall need your constant prayers and encouragement. I feel as I imagine one risen from the dead: a new world has dawned upon me. Truly, one knows not what friends one has until adversity crosses the pathway. So I thank God and take courage.

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 organ-

ism 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 of Christ 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).

"THE VICAR OF CHRIST"

"On the Vatican hill rules and reigns this prince of peace, and vicar of Christ, and all the world does him homage . . . Upon his head is the triple crown for he is king of kings, man and men, and of his kingdom there shall be no end until the consummation of the world . . . He is invested with power from on high, with power supreme, territorial and celestial."—Catholic Citizen, Aug. 14, 1909.

The have also styled him "Lord God" "the Pope." Now read Revelation, chapter 17, and see how it tallies in description. And what a "jolt" this king (?) will get! Even so, come Lord Jesus. "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (II Thes. 2:8). Then they truly say of this "vicar of Christ," this "king of kings, man and men," that "of his kingdom there shall be no end until the consummation of the world." And all this comes because "They did not welcome into their hearts the love of the truth, so that they might be saved." (II Thes. 2:10) Read this again.

"THE TRUTH"

I now come forth a new born journal, Designed for age and youth: To bear the message of God's love— My name is called "The Truth."

I can but bear what's borne to me,

Hence I am not to blame Should you find error on my face, Contrary to my name.

If truth alone be given me, To herald here and there, There shall no error then be found Upon my pages fair.

All gospel truth I bear to you Retain it in your mind: Condemn me not unless you should Some error in me find.

Take me, read me, pass me to others, The many or the few: Bless them with the message that, "The Truth" has borne to you. —J. P. Watson.

THE ADVENT OF CHRIST

That Christ will come again the Scriptures plainly teach; and they just as plainly teach that the time of his coming is not revealed. John 14:3; Acts 1:11; Matt. 24:30-44. Yet almost from the beginning of the present era the "imminent coming" theory has found advocates. Paul had to combat the theory in his day and his reproof is clear and forceful.

Barnes tells us in his General History, page 391, that the Catholic Church advanced this ruse, and "Lands and money were freely bestowed upon the church." The Papacy had an eye for business, you see; and it became, through this false teaching, immensely rich.

The eighteenth century saw several such "imminent coming" movements. Irving, Wolfe, Bengal, Ezra and others stirred the people by preaching and predicting the imminent coming of Christ. But as soon as the people saw that they had believed a falsehood these movements died out, but not without leaving a black streak in the Christian fabric, as the preaching of falsehood always does.

In 1831 William Miller began his "Advent Movement" in America, preaching the imminent coming of Christ. At first he attracted almost no attention, and after nine years of such preaching he said "I stand quite alone."

He predicted that Christ would come "between March 21, 1843 and March 21, 1844. And he had the reckoning to prove it. And as the time which he had set drew nearer and nearer the people among whom he labored became frenzied and hundreds joined the movement. However, Christ did not come, and the flock scattered; and Miller himself went back to his farm and took no leading part in the later movements.

But new leaders were not lacking: Snow, Starrs, White, Southard, Howland, Crozier and Edson came forward with explanations as to why Miller had missed the date, and they advanced new theories to account for the "delay" of Christ in coming. The "cleansing of the Sanctuary," the "Midnight

Cry," the "Shut door," and other theories just as absurd were now worked to the limit to save the "imminent coming" theory.

Other dates were set for Christ to come, but all proved a failure as to his coming.

Finally, there came a split in the movement. Up to this time all were observing the Lord's day, the first day of the week. But in 1846 a Mr. Bates, who had joined in the movement in Massachusetts, visited some relatives in New Hampshire, who were Seventh Day Baptists, and he soon became a Sabbatarian. Returning to Massachusetts with his find, he tried to convert the Whites (Ellen G. and her husband, James) who had now become prominently connected with the "Advent Movement," to Sabbath keeping; but they would have none of it. But ere long Ellen G., who had by this time become the prophetess of the Advent Movement, and was having visions for divine guidance of the movement, had a vision which established the Sabbath as binding on all Christians.

And now to boost "Sabbath keeping," the observance of the Lord's day, the first day of the week, was stigmatized as "the mark of the beast." And forthwith a "Seventh Day Adventist Church" sprang into existence at New Bedford, Massachusetts, with just three members. Gathering members from different localities who were willing to follow the leadership of the Whites, this church numbered twenty-eight members by the year 1846.

In a few years the Whites moved to Battle Creek, Michigan, where they began the publication of a paper, "Present Truth." And soon Mrs. White's "testimonies" were given out as the revealed will of God. She said: "In ancient times God spoke to men by the mouth of Prophets and apostles. In these days he speaks by the testimonies." But after awhile she was constrained to say: "I have been shown that unbelief in the testimonies has been steadily increasing."

The truth is, that many were unwilling to take her "testimonies" as the revealed will of God. And this led to a split in the Seventh Day Adventist ranks which still exists.

Those Adventists who had never joined in with the Sabbath movement continued to observe the Lord's day as they had done in the time of Miller. And they took the name Second Advent Christian Church. These have now turned to what they call "conditionalism" as a leading tenant since the advent feature of the movement has turned out to be such a "joker." I quote from one of their papers of Sept. 8, 1927, the following:

"Elder Skipper, in a very convincing way showed how the Advent Christian Church differed from all other denominations. The two distinctive differences are: 1. The nature of man; 2. Man's Future Home."

Their Mr. C. L. Reaves, who had debated "The Soul Question" with W. A. Cameron, issued a challenge in the leading daily of Jacksonville, Florida, to the whole world. We accepted his challenge; but when it came to the real debate, they threw up the job. I say they, for we challenged any of them to step out and defend their teaching—Reaves, Bixler (the editor of their paper), Isbell and Mattox. —As to the Sabbath question, we shall have more to say soon.

COWAN-WHITE DISCUSSION

Dec. 15-18, Bro. J. N. Cowan and Bro. James T. White discussed the following propositions at Fort McKavett, Texas:

1. The Scriptures teach that the fountain mentioned in Zechariah 13:1 fulfilled on Pentecost after Christ's resurrection, was the blood of Christ. J. N. Cowan affirms; J. T. White denies.

2. The scriptures teach that the fountain mentioned in Zech. 13 1, fulfilled on Pentecost after Christ's resurrection, is the waters of baptism. J. T. White affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

3. The Scriptures teach that the alien sinner reaches the blood of Christ in baptism. J. N. Cowan affirms; J. T. White denies.

4. The Scriptures teach that the alien sinner reaches the blood of Christ after baptism. J. T. White affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

5. The Scriptures teach that the blood of Christ, shed on the cross, is the blood of the New Covenant. J. N. Cowan affirms; J. T. White denies.

6. The Scriptures teach that the cup mentioned in connection with the loaf used in the communion, is the blood of the New Covenant. J. T. White affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

Considering the bad weather, the attendance was good. A number of preachers were present. While the speakers were logically limited to the Scriptures for proof, yet Brother Cowan we are sorry to say, filled his time up with what he called his "gospel saw," his "squirt gun," his "hypo-needle," and other things which he sought to make fun of arguments he could not meet with the Scriptures. And after spending his time thus, he would set in with a harrangue on what he called a gospel sermon. When pressed, he would misconstrue the Scriptures to try to escape. For example, he said First John 1:7 was written to the alien sinner, and not to those in the light; but every subterfuge he put up was clearly met.

He would have no water in his fountain, and was constantly heading for remission of sins in the blood before baptism. He argued that the alien sinner has life through faith in the blood before baptism, the birth of water (John 3:5), and to prove it he said you could feel a child's heart beat while it was in his mother's womb before birth. He did this to escape the

truth that the sinner had to pass through the waters of baptism to come into the life of the New Covenant. He put up as good a fight for the sectarian dogma of conversion before baptism as any Baptist preacher could have done.

He quoted Heb. 13:20, but apparently could not see that "the cup" had anything to do with that covenant, when Jesus plainly says, "this is my blood of the new testament." "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.)

The covenant was then ratified (this is my blood which ratifies the agreement." Heb. 13:20; Matt. 26:28—Goodspeed tr. and Emphatic Diaglott) in Jerusalem before Christ died, as all testaments must be signed before one dies, to make them binding. But Cowan seems to care nothing for "the cup." He can have a dozen as well as "the cup." And when he denies that the cup mentioned in connection with the loaf in the communion is the blood of the new covenant, he denies a plain statement of the Scriptures.

White challenged Cowan to meet him on the same propositions at Robstown, Cowan's home town, and at Lometa, White's home town, or at any other place he would name; but Cowan answered not a word.

We endorse Jas. T. White as a capable teacher of the Word, standing for what is written in work and worship. Those who wish to have fellowship with him in the good work can send words of encouragement and donations to him at Lometa, Texas, Box 65.

Herman M. Stewart,
Albert C. Talyor,
J. M. Hook,
Menard, Texas.

THE PLAN OF SALVATION

This is the title of a tract recently sent me. It purports to be "A brief discussion, showing that water baptism is not essential to pardon." The author, J. C. Vanzandt, Portland, Oregon, says that he was reared under Methodist teaching and believed in the altar of prayer for penitents. He became deeply interested in his spiritual welfare, he says, but was much perplexed over the various theories concerning the plan of salvation. Finally he bought a Bible, saying, "I know the Bible teaches the correct plan of salvation, and I will read it for myself."

This makes one think of the Bereans "examining the Scriptures daily whether these things were so" (Acts 17:11) and if we are willing to let the Scriptures settle the matter, and let the "various theories" go, it will be settled correctly—and it is very important to us that it should be so settled. The man who loves the truth

is satisfied with the Bible way; the man who does not love the truth (II Thes. 2:10, 11, 12) is in a bad way.

Now hear the author of this tract: "Then this thought came to me: 'If we are begotten of God by believing, as John says, and if believing does away with the altar and prayer in order to get salvation, then, on the same basis of reasoning, it also does away with baptism in order to salvation, for the verse says whosoever believes.'"

"This settled my mind on the question. I saw clearly that the condition laid down in this verse is not baptism, but simply BELIEVING in Jesus. Soon after this, having fully repented, I believed on Jesus, and the Holy Spirit bore me witness that I was saved from sin, and that before I received water baptism. Having believed on Jesus, I fully realized the truth of I John 5:10 'He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness IN himself.' This witness came to me on August 17, 1886 and I have it now."

But do not the Methodists, who take "the altar and prayer in order to get salvation," get the witness IN themselves exactly the same as you do? They say they do. Whom shall I believe? I believe none without the "witness of God" (v. 9). "There are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood." (V. 7).

Our friend gets his witness without the "water," and it does not coincide with the "witness of God." And "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God it is greater" (v. 9). There must be agreement in these witnesses: "The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. 8:16). Now let the Holy Spirit have a chance to "testify" (Jno. 15:26) then when man's spirit can "testify" with God's Spirit, that he is a child of God, we are ready to receive the testimony, and not before that.

Then let us get the Holy Spirit on the stand and listen to the testimony. Jesus said to his apostles: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father (See John 15:26) upon you; but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high." (Lk. 24:46-49).

"Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you." (Acts 1:8). "Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." (Acts 1:5). "And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave to them to utter forth." (Acts 2:1-4).

The New Covenant (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:6-13), based on the blood of Christ (Heb. 9:11, 12), is now established. The fundamental law of this covenant, announced by Jesus to His

apostles, with all authority in heaven and on earth, is "Go ye therefore, and disciple all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Matt. 28:18-20). "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mk. 16:15-16).

Now for the first time sinners ask the inspired apostles, "What shall we do?" (Acts 2:37) Here we must expect to find the key note of the New Covenant on the plan of salvation. The Holy Spirit here announces his testimony on the question of salvation from sin. (And thou shalt call His name Jesus (Savior): for He shall save His people from their sins." (Matt. 1:21).

What a wonderful occasion to angels and men was this! How carefully should we listen! A matter of eternal weal or woe is here to be settled! "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. . . . Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts 2:38-42).

Now listen to the author of this tract. He says:

"Because Peter said to be baptized for the remission of sins it is claimed that 'for' means in order to their remission. Let us see.

"The preposition 'for' is used to mean in order to, or because of. Rom. 4:25 says that Jesus 'was delivered FOR our offences, and was raised again FOR our justification.' Yes, delivered FOR our offences, not in order that we might sin, but because we had sinned. He was delivered FOR our justification, not that man had been justified, but in order that he might be. From this we see that 'for' is used to denote either in order to, or because of, and the question now arises: In what sense is it used in Acts 2:38? I maintain that it is used to denote 'because of' Now for the proof.

"We are justified by faith, and the Bible nowhere makes baptism a condition of justifying faith, but invariably makes faith a condition of baptism. If we say that 'for' in Acts 2:38 means in order to, then we make baptism a condition of faith, and thus reverse the Bible order; but if we allow it to mean 'because of' it makes justifying faith a condition of baptism, and makes the verse perfectly harmonious with the rest of the Bible. We must remember that in every place where the Bible associates faith and baptism it makes faith precede, and thus become a condition of, baptism, and we dare not reverse this order for Acts

2:38. From this we learn that baptism FOR the remission of sins means because OF the remission of sins."

Now I take it that the author of this tract is an honest soul, and will appreciate the truth. He seems to reason very strangely for one who has studied solely to arrive at the truth.

Let us notice what he says. You see he admits that if "for" (eis) here means "in order to," he is wholly mistaken about this matter, and baptism is essential to pardon. But before we evamine this point, let us notice Peter's command in the light of other scriptures. Do you really think that Peter (Rather, the Holy Spirit) directed persons who had not repented to "repent and be baptized" because of remission of sins, that is, because they were already saved?—saved before repentance and baptism? Do you? Does Mr. Vanzandt? Let him tell us. He shall have the space in this paper to do so.

In giving the New Covenant commission to His apostles, did not Jesus, with all authority in heaven and on earth say: "Preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" Does not Jesus, in the plainest terms, here place salvation after belief of the gospel and baptism? Mr. Vanzandt says: "I admit it but ask: What kind of salvation? The Bible teaches both a present and a future salvation. This future salvation is not DUE until Jesus comes. The verse does not say: 'He that believeth and is baptized IS saved,' but 'shall be saved'."

But the only way Mr. Vanzandt can make the passage fit his "theory" (for it is now evident that he is only theorizing) is to change the passage to: He that believeth and is saved shall repent and be baptized; for he gets salvation before both repentance and baptism, is his manipulation of Acts 2:38. But if this is "future salvation," and not "saved from sin," he is committed to the doctrine of "once in grace, always in grace," with a vengeance! Ah, yes, the future salvation is conditioned upon many additions after baptism (II Pet. 1). He is fighting the light, I fear!

No, my friend, the language is correct. He that comes to this room and is disinfected shall be landed—not IS landed. Jesus promises salvation from sin on conditions here stipulated, and the language is neat and laconic. And thus the Holy Spirit "testifies" on the day of Pentecost, as we shall see.

(To be Continued)

NEWS NOTES

Bro. Geo. J. P. Masser, a gospel preacher of Abilene, Texas, writes that he will do what he can to advance the progress of The Truth and has some time not yet engaged for meetings in 1928.

Bro. Bob Musgrave of Elk City, Oklahoma, is now in California holding meetings. Brother Musgrave is always busy holding innovations. He has successfully met Lee P. Mansfield and

P. J. Taylor on the S. S. question recently.

Bro. W. T. Taylor writes to let us know that he wants to support "The Truth" and hold as many meetings in 1928 as he can. Address him at Burnet, Texas.

Bro. J. F. Pursley, of Graham, Tex., who has spent his life preaching the "unsearchable riches of Christ," writes the office saying, "Brother Harper, all seemed well pleased at my securing a promise from you to hold our meeting."

Bro. W. H. Reynolds of Kinston, Ala., who is a very successful preacher and debater, has been active in southern Alabama and northern Florida the past year in evangelistic work.

Bro. James Douglas Phillips, one of our most successful young evangelists, of Everton, Arkansas, made a very successful evangelistic tour through Indiana the latter part of the year just closed.

Bro. M. H. Northcross, Ocala, Fla., who has spent half a century in the ministry of the gospel in upholding New Testament teaching and practice on conversion and the work and worship of the church, writes the office saying, "We regard you as one of our most loyal and logical writers. We are hungering and thirsting for that rich, spiritual food and drink you once so freely and lovingly gave us, speaking with that intellectual love that once made us so happy to reach it, and drink a fresh draught from your fonsic pen of enlightenment."

Bro. W. R. Crowson, who is a preacher of ability, recently in his home town, Milton, Florida, met a Seventh Day Adventist in debate to the delight of those who love to see error put to rout. More than a quarter of a century ago he, with Brother Early Arceneaux, who had not yet taken up with transgressives in being "the pastor" of a church, and who was at that time opposing such human institutions as the Sunday School, established a prosperous church at Largo, Florida, from a zero beginning. But this church, like the vacillating Arceneaux, has taken up with idols—the S. S. and "the pastor" and the world go hungering and perishing for the bread of life.

Bro. O. A. Timmons, Ramsey, Illinois, writes: "I just closed a meeting at Herrick, Ill., and go to Knightsville, Ind., where you held a meeting, and I often hear them speak well of your work among them as a preacher. I then go to Calhoun county, Ill., for my third meeting within a radius of four miles, since August of this year, and will be there from the fifth of November. I want 'The Truth,' Brother Harper."

Bro. H. R. Stringer, who preaches as he has opportunity in connection with his work as rural carrier out from Dague Chitto, Miss., informs us that they now have a church house for his home congregation, which he has struggled so long and faithfully to

build up. Those passing through are invited to visit them.

Elder J. C. Wheeler, one of the efficient teachers of the church at Borden Springs, Ala., writes us an encouraging letter and sends in subscriptions to "The Truth."

Bro. Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., has closed a very successful year of evangelistic work, and is planning greater things, if possible, for 1928. He is highly commended as a preacher of the gospel.

Bro. Otis J. Haynes, Pine Bluff, Ark., writes to say: "I want every copy of 'The Truth.' I have always admired your writings as second to none in the Brotherhood."

Bro. H. C. Welch, who began preaching when a young man, is now located with his family at Gunter, Texas. He promises to assist "The Truth" in its stand for "the faith of the gospel."

The "Primitive Christian," one of the nicest papers that we have seen, writes to ask us for an exchange with "The Truth." It is ably edited by Brother Coleman Oberby, Union City, Tenn.

Bro. I. G. Hayes, Troy, Texas, who loves to preach the gospel as it is written, without addition or subtraction, sends us a good list of subscribers to "The Truth," with an encouraging letter.

Elder C. A. Stark, Dallas, Texas, writes an encouraging letter, and sends in his subscription to "The Truth."

Elder E. G. Creachy, Horse Cave, Kentucky, well known contender for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," (Jude), writes us to send him "The Truth."

Bro. James T. White, Lometa, Tex., who is in the field preaching while the harvest is ripe, sends in a good list of subscriptions and words of cheer. It all helps in withstanding error. The report of his debate at Fort McKavett Texas, reached us too late for our first issue.

JESUS IS KING

The above statement is about the easiest to prove that might be made in regard to Jesus. Notwithstanding this there are a few materialists that will dispute it.

It is my purpose to establish by the Scriptures the fact of the kingship of Jesus beyond dispute. And in proving it I shall establish the right of Jesus as our sovereign Lord and Master.

"Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion."—Psalm 2:6.

"God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is written in the second Psalm (2:6,7), thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."—Acts 13:33.

Here, according to Paul, yea, according to the Holy Spirit by whom he spoke, "God hath fulfilled" the above statement of David in the second Psalm. Then Jesus is now King. Peter also teaches that Christ is on

David's throne. He says: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath unto him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ. . . . This Jesus hath God raised up. . . . Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted."—Acts 2:29-33.

Jesus is exalted to the throne, and is therefore now King.

The apostles preached that Jesus is King, "Saying that there is another King, one Jesus."—Acts 17:7.

"We see Jesus . . . crowned."—Heb. 2:9.

Isaiah prophesied: "Behold a king shall reign in righteousness."—Isa. 32:1. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne . . . is a scepter of righteousness."—Heb. 1:8. In Isa. 33:22 we learn that "the Lord," that is Jesus (Acts 2:36), is our "judge, law-giver, and savior." And in Matt. 1:21 it was said, "He shall save his people from their sins." And all who have been thus saved, have been "delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son: in whom they have redemption, the forgiveness of sins."—Col. 1:13.

They are now "fellow citizens with the saints."—Eph. 2:19. And they are in the kingdom of God's dear Son.

Therefore we conclude that this establishment of Isaiah, 33:22 is fulfilled in Christ our Savior and King. And this being true, Jesus is an absolute ruler, and his word is our law, the "law of faith, since he now has given to him 'all authority.'"—Matt. 28:19.

Hence we have no right to legislate or enact laws to govern his body, the church. And we are warned not to add to or take from his word.—Rev. 22:18. We should obey him humbly and unquestionably.

W. G. Taylor,
Burnet, Texas.

THE TRUTH

I have read the first copy of the new paper. It has a bright, healthy, clean, intelligent face. Its name is "The Truth." This name sounds good to me. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth; Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away; For I am the Lord, I change not." Man is frail, his works imperfect, hence they can be improved and brought up to a higher standard. The fact that man can improve and that his works can be improved upon, are clear and unmistakable evidences of his frailty and imperfection. God's word and works cannot be improved upon. They are perfect, complete, from the beginning, hence there is no room for improvement. God never changes his course

of action, it is right and perfect, his patterns and models are perfect, hence in all his works in all ages of the world, God's laws, types, patterns and appointments are unchangeable. For man to change or substitute for God's word and works is to exchange the truth for a lie. The least violation, departure, or attempted modification of these laws brings its sure and unerring penalty.

"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The appointments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the church are unchangeable, perfectly adapted to the wants of a perfect church. They are all the works of God. He appointed them. To add to them, change or modify them in any of their parts is to pronounce them imperfect, hence is to impugn the wisdom of God. It is to be guilty of sacrilege and treason against God. To follow the flesh is to change the ordinances, modify the institutions, and think to change the laws to suit our ideas of propriety, our views of fitness, and our judgment of efficiency. "He that walks after the flesh is an enemy of God." I am yours Bro. Harper for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

James B. Otts

GEMS OF TRUTH
W. C.

Buy the truth, and sell it not.—Prov. 23:23.

Let Truth and Error grapple.—Bacon.

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,

The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies among his worshippers."

Speaking the truth in love.—Eph. 4:15.

Who concerning the truth, have erred?—2 Tim. 2:18.

Who hath bewitched you, not to obey the truth?—Gal. 3:1.

Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth.—I Pet. 1:28.

Turn away their ears from the truth.—2 Tim. 4:4.

Commandments of men, which turn from the truth.—Tit. 1:14.

So do these also resist the truth.—2 Tim. 3:8.

And many shall follow their pernicious ways by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.—2 Pet. 2:2.

I have chosen the way of truth.—Ps. 119:30.

They receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.—2 Thes. 2:10.

Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth.—Jno. 17:17.

Ye must be born anew.—Jno. 3:7.

The seed is the word of God.—Luke 8:11.

Having been begotten again, not for corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God.—1 Pet. 1:23. Preach the word.—2 Tim. 4:2.

So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.—Rom. 10:17.

For seeing that the world through its wisdom knew not God, in the wisdom of God it was the good pleasure of God through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.—1 Cor. 1:21.

And those by the wayside are they that have heard the word; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart, that they may not believe and be saved.—Luke 8:12.

And that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with patience.—Luke 8:15.

THE TRUTH FUND—TAG

G. A. Comfield\$1.00
I. G. Hayes1.00
Otis J. Haynes1.00
A. J. Thompson2.00

NOTICE

The free booklets on "The Cups—are they authorized in the Communion," are all sent out. But we are in hopes that we can soon announce a discussion of this subject between Bro. J. N. Cowan and Dr. G. A. Trott.

Brother Trott says: "In regard to the proposed discussion you may make any arrangements you desire. I have man in defense of what I believe to never had any reluctance to meet any be God's truth. I have no interest in life that compares with the propagation of the truth." And again, under date of Jan. 4, 1928, he says: "Bro. _____ and I corresponded briefly on the cup, but the subject was not gone into very deeply and consisted (on _____'s part) mostly of queries, and I would not wish it to be published as a discussion of the subject, though I am quite willing to engage in a written discussion with any one at any time."

REPORT

Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.

The year 1927 has been quite a busy one for me, but I am not satisfied with what I have done. I hope to do more and better work as an evangelist. May God give us strength and courage to press the battle with more zeal, ener-

gy, love for lost souls and a greater determination than ever before.

I had profitable meetings in both the North and South during 1927, especially in Indiana. I am to return to this field again next spring for a greater effort.

Success to The Truth. I hope it will prove true to its name.

HOMER L. KING.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

I may not understand the purpose of the new paper, "The Truth," and cannot pledge it my support until I know more about it. I do intend to subscribe for it as soon as it is certain of being born.

J. N. Cowan.

Well, here she is, with her second bow,
So give her your hand and subscription now;

And her purpose I trow you will find to be

To scatter The Truth from sea to sea.

Anything that cannot bear criticism, investigation, and examination, however rigid and severe, demonstrates its own unworthiness.—Gospel Advocate.

You are right. Truth seeks investigation; Error says "down with investigation." "Truth, like gold, shines brighter by collision." But error falls when shaken.

Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.—Jesus. Hence they fear criticism, investigation, and examination, and cry, "Peace, peace; you will break up the church."

But every one that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.—Jesus.

As the sunlight kills out noxious germs and promotes health, so gospel light kills out noxious teaching and practice, and promotes a healthful, spiritual body as a church. And those whose deeds are wrought in God have no fear of criticism, investigation, and examination, for truth shines brighter by collision. It is agitation that keeps the waters pure. It was a silencing of criticism, investigation and examination that produced the Papacy.

The word baptize came into the English language from the Old French baptizer, from the late Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptize, from bapto, dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkling is not to be associated with it.—The Lexicographer's Easy Chair is the Literary Digest, March, 7, 1925.

If this is not the truth, we will be glad to here insert a correction from any literary critic.

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.

VOLUME 1.

SNEADS, FLA., APRIL 1, 1928

NUMBER 4.

The Church

(A. J. THOMPSON)

The church now is a chaste virgin, espoused to one husband, I Cor. 11:2. A virgin is not a wife, Rev. 14:4. Espoused does not mean married. Mary was a chaste virgin, espoused to Joseph before they were married, Matt. 1:18; Luke 1:34, 35; 2:5. The church may have tares in it, Matt. 13:30, 38. All nations, Matt. 28:19. Every creature, Mark 16:15, is invited to come into the church. But only the blessed are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb, Rev. 19:9; and they must have on the wedding garment, Matt. 22:11-14; Rev. 6:11; 7:9-17. And must be ready, Matt. 24:44; 25:10; Luke 12:40.

Christ is called "the everlasting Father," Isa. 9:6. His wife is the New Jerusalem, Rev. 21:1. And she comes down from God out of Heaven, Rev. 3:12; 21:2-10. She is the Mother of us all, Gal. 4:26. Children, have ye any meat?—John 21:5. The A. V. here says, "married to another," but the R. V. says, "joined to another," and the Modern Speech says "That you might belong to another," in Romans 7:4. Added to the church, Acts 2:47. Added to the Lord, Acts 5:14. And Acts 11:24 means the same.

Christ is the foundation, I Cor. 3:11. And he is the chief cornerstone, Eph. 2:20. He says "Upon this rock I will build my church," Matt. 16:18. Christ is the rock, I Cor. 10:4. If we build on him, our house will never fall, Matt. 7:25, but if we build upon any other foundation, our house will fall, Matt. 7:27.

Note.—Different phases of a thing are presented under different figures, brother, that's all. In one phase the church is an espoused, chaste virgin.—I Cor. 11:2. And this figure is striking and beautiful. In another the church is married to Christ.—Rom. 7:4. "Ye should be" to another. There is no "joined" or "married" in the Greek; but marriage is the topic in the context, and logically "married" is the only word that makes the completion of thought. But use "joined," if you please, then if they are joined to Christ, as the text says, and are not married, and "bring forth fruit," as the text says, they do so in adultery. "Behold, I and the children whom God hath given me."—Heb. 2:6.

"But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."—Rom 5:8.

A Wonderful Character

In Phil. 3:12-14 we have these words: Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect; but I press on, if so be that I may lay hold on that for which I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus: Brethren, I count not myself yet to have laid hold; but one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forward to the things that are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Then in verse 15, he winds up by saying: Let us therefore, as many as are perfect (full grown), be thus minded.—R. V.

The question might arise as to when the apostle was apprehended, or laid hold on, by Christ, and for what purpose?

By reading Acts 26:12-19, we are informed how Christ appeared unto Paul, to appoint him a minister and witness, and the apostle informs us in verse 19 that he was "not disobedient unto the heavenly vision."

And that we may understand how seriously the apostle considered this charge of Christ to preach the gospel, he informs us in I Cor. 9:16 that woe would be unto him if he preached not the gospel, and that if he would preach it willingly, he would be rewarded; if not, he has a stewardship entrusted to him, etc.

Another question might be considered here, and that is this: Knowing that the Apostle Paul had received great revelations, what prevented him from thinking too highly of himself, or becoming boastful?

In II Cor. 12:7, we are informed that a thorn was sent to pierce his flesh, an instrument of Satan to discipline him. He prayed the Lord that it might leave him. But his reply has been: My help is enough for you, for my strength attains its perfection in the midst of weakness. Most gladly, then, will I boast all the more of my weakness, so that the strength of the Christ may overshadow me. (vs. 8 and 9 as in 20th century Tr.)

It might be suggested right here by someone who believes in that false theory, "Once in Grace always in Grace," that they could not see the necessity of God's sending Paul a thorn to make him weak and perhaps, to make him suffer: an inspired man like Paul, who had received such great revelations, and had been charged with

Question

What should be the last word in verse four of I Cor. 11?—A. J. Thompson.

The Greek ends the verse in the verb and the King James translators put *him* in italics in the text to show it is supplied and not in the Greek, while they put *me* in the margin. The verb seems to signify "to bear with" in the sense of listen to, when me completes the sense very well with this meaning. But the verb also signified to stand firm against, and in this sense of not to listen to *him* completes the sense very well. So it depends upon which shade of meaning of the verb that is taken as to what should be supplied. Moffatt supplies "me," and I think this less liable to mislead the English reader. Some supply "him," and seem to think that the apostle was speaking by sarcasm, the sense being:

If a false teacher come to you with little or no evidence of a divine mission, you hear with greatest admiration, just beautifully; but I who gave you the strongest proofs of a divine mission can hardly catch your ear at all, and you actually snub me.

the gospel, because they believed he would be saved any way.

I hope none of my readers come under this class.

In Phil. 3:12, 13, as quoted above, the apostle Paul did not consider that he had as yet laid hold on that for which he was striving. Then, too, in I Cor. 9:27, he informs us that he bruises his body and makes it his slave, lest after he had called others to the contest for the crown, he should himself be rejected. (See 20th Century Tr.)

Other Scriptures might be cited in confirmation of the same teaching, but I believe this will suffice.

The Apostle tells us that one thing he does, is to forget what lies behind, and strains every nerve for that which lies in front, and so he presses on to the goal to gain the prize of that heavenward call which God gave him through Christ Jesus.

Dear reader, if it was necessary for the Apostle Paul to strain every nerve that he might gain the prize—an inspired man, as he was!—and such a wonderful character!—do you not think it is high time for us to wake up from our slumber and get busy sowing seed of the kingdom?

If it is true, as some claim, six trumpets have already sounded, and

the seventh is to be sounded shortly thereafter, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness. (II Pet. 3:11)

L. I. GIBBS,

1108 So. Clela Ave, Los Angeles, Cal.
Note:—And you should live momentarily a life just as holy, and strain every nerve for the crown in the race just as hard daily, and sow the seed of the kingdom (Luke 8:11) just as faithfully whether the seventh trumpet sounds a thousand years from now, for you have no assurance of another day of your life. (Luke 12:16-21.)—Ed.

When Faith Saves

Salvation by faith is at once a truth of theology and of life. Faith enters into all relationships of men with each other as well as in every acceptable act of worship. Without faith, it is impossible to please either God or men. The civilized man walks more completely by faith than does his untutored brother. The whole fabric of our complex social and economic order rests on faith in men. Destroy faith and business anarchy would immediately reign. Primitive man lived with little dependence on his contemporaries, but the man of today must look to a multitude of his fellows for even his food and raiment. No function of civilization is exercised without faith. Instead of religion being exclusively the realm of faith, it is simply the domain of faith's highest exercise.

Close to the importance of the proposition—that faith saves—is the question of when it becomes operative. The whole mourner's bench system rests on a mistaken view of when faith saves; the doctrine of justification by faith only, assumes for faith the immediate remission of sins in the face of plain teaching of scripture to the contrary. That salvation is not instantaneous (that is, apart from any expression of faith) is evident from plain teaching of New Testament writers.

Dealing with the sentimentalist or mystic of his day, James says: "Faith apart from works is barren . . . Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith" (Jas. 2:20, 24). Faith must be fertilized by works (works of faith) before it will justify or save. If we are not justified by faith only, then we are justified by faith immediately, and the time element must be taken into account. It is sometimes urged that James is dealing with the heavenly salvation of the saints and not with the unconverted, to whom a different rule applies. A sufficient answer to this is that the apostle cites the justification of Rahab, the harlot, side by side with the justification of Abraham, the long-time believer.

To be saved is to become a son of God, and John clearly indicates that the privilege of sonship does not come

by faith only. Speaking of the advent of Christ, the apostle says: "He came to his own and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them he gave the right to become children of God, even to them that believed on his name." "Believing on his name" therefore does not immediately give sonship or salvation, but simply the right or power to become children of God. Confirming James and John, Paul says: "For with the heart man believes unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10). Faith exists before confession, but salvation follows confession, so men are not saved the moment they believe. The three apostles agree in teaching that salvation is not by faith only, but that some thing is to be added to faith before it becomes complete and secures for us salvation.

Having seen that salvation is not secured the very moment that faith is formed in the heart, that it follows confession, which follows faith, and that faith by itself is barren, but that its existence gives us the right to become children of God, we are prepared through faith. To reach our goal the most readily, we shall need a working definition of faith which is submitted as follows:

1. Conviction that the unseen is true.

2. Confidence or trust in the unseen expressed by appropriate action.

Conviction that the unseen is true is a universal element of faith. By faith Moses endured as seeing him who is invisible. We believe in God who is invisible. But the mere conviction that the unseen is true does not bring salvation. The demons believe there is one God and shudder (Jas. 2:19). Conviction by itself will not mold character and determine destiny. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." Matt. 7:21.

This brings us to the second element of faith which is: "Confidence or trust in the unseen expressed by appropriate action." On sufficient evidence, a rheumatic might believe that the waters of a distant hot spring would release him from his infirmity. Although he has the first element of faith, he is not cured. But his conviction is so strong and his suffering so intense, that he puts money in his purse for expense of travel, goes to the spring, takes the baths and returns home a whole man. He was cured by faith when faith was made complete in trust expressed by appropriate action.

The illustration is right in line with the law of faith in Holy Scripture. Speaking of certain Jews failing to accept Christ, John says: "Nevertheless even of the rulers many believe on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess it (Him), lest

they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the glory that is of men more than the glory that is of God." They believed on him, but were not saved. They had the first element of faith, but were unwilling to trust in Christ and exercise their right to become his disciples. Their faith was barren because it was not fertilized by confession and surrender to the Lord.

In the gospel, faith in Christ saves when it is confessed in baptism. With all authority, Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Baptism is the divinely appointed and fitting expression of faith in Christ. Hence, speaking of believers generally, Paul says: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. or as many of you as were baptized in Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. 3:26, 27). We are sons of God by faith because we were baptized, is Paul's argument. There must be no slurring over the great fact that salvation is by faith in Christ, but full-orbed faith is demanded. It is faith coming to fullness in repenting of sin—confessing Christ and being baptized—that secures the blessings of sins forgiven. Faith is never complete for salvation until spirit, mind and body pass under the dominion of Christ.

The modern doctrine of salvation by faith only is not far-reaching enough in dealing with the problem of sin and salvation. It unduly exalts the emotions and depends more on the state of the feelings than the surrender of the whole life, body, soul and spirit to the revealed will of God in Christ Jesus.—G. E. RUTLEDGE.

Baptized For The Dead

This language is found in I Cor. 15:29. "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?"

Is it a baptism of suffering? I say, No. Look at the phrase "for the dead." Does this mean in place of the dead, or because of the dead, or as the dead? The preposition *for* will take any of these meanings, according to the meaning of the context. And it is evident that Paul here stated what he calls "that form of doctrine" in Rom. 6:18. And in this chapter of Corinthians, he begins: "I delivered . . . how Christ died . . . was buried and rose again the third day." So in obeying the "Form of doctrine" (Rom. 6:18), one is dead, is buried and is risen in baptism." (Col. 2:12, 13; Rom. 6:1-12.) Hence this attests a faith in the resurrection of Christ and a general resurrection. Hence Paul goes on to say, "Now if the dead rise not (as some were contending at Corinth), why are they then baptized (buried and risen in baptism) as the dead, if there be no resurrection of the dead. This is beautiful in that it meets the objector to a nicety. Christ has risen and thus become the first-fruits from the dead." And we arise in baptism

to walk in newness of life.—W. L. SHELNUTT, Wedowee, Ala.

REMARKS

To prevent any misunderstanding, we wish to say a few words here. 1. Some might think that if *for* here means "because of," why may it not mean because of in Acts 2:38, and read "be baptized because of remission of sins." "For" in Acts is a translation of *eis*, which never means "because of," while "for" in I Cor. 15:29 is a translation of *uper*. I here give several translations of it. Am. S. V; Else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them.—I Cor. 15:29. King James: Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead.

Living Oracles: Otherwise, what shall they do, who are immersed for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why then are they baptized for them? Goodspeed: Otherwise, what do people mean by having themselves baptized on behalf of the dead? If the dead do not rise at all, why do they have themselves baptized on their behalf? Moffat: Otherwise, if there is no such thing as a resurrection, what is the meaning of people getting baptized on behalf of their dead? If dead men do not rise at all, why do people get baptized on their behalf? Berry: Since what shall they do who are baptized for the dead if the dead are not raised at all? Why also are they baptized for the dead. Concordant Tr: Else what shall they be doing who are being baptized for the sake of the dead? If the dead actually are not being aroused, why are they being baptized also for their sake?.

Thayer gives the meaning of *uper* in this verse to be "on behalf of."

What argument could the apostle derive from the baptism of these Corinthians (See Acts 18:8 and I Cor. 1:13-17) in proof of the resurrection? The very strongest, for in baptism there is both a "burial" and a "resurrection." (Col. 2:12-13. And everyone in conforming to the baptism commanded by Christ portrays the fact of a resurrection, hence his baptism is "on behalf of" the dead, for it shows that the dead are to have the benefit of a resurrection. Hence sprinkling is virtually denying the resurrection. It can not be performed "on behalf of" the resurrection of the dead. To be baptized "on behalf of" the dead, one must be "buried" with Christ by baptism (Rom. 6:4) and be "risen" in baptism. (Col. 2:12.) Then only is it that he proclaims a benefit to the dead, namely, a resurrection. And the author of the Concordant Translation well says of I Cor. 15:29: The argument here is founded on the sixth chapter of Romans. Baptism is a symbol of death. Its benefits are confined to those who are united to

Christ in His death. But even then it is absolutely valueless except as it also figures the resurrection of the dead.

What Ails the Advocate

The Gospel Advocate once bore the enviable reputation of being a fighting unit in the army of the Lord; ready to defend the truth against all gainsayers and to oppose everything for which scriptural precept or example could not be given. If brethren made no mistake in this estimate in former years, it has of late developed a case of moral hookworm or some equally debilitating spiritual disease. Bro. James A. Allen, in a recent issue of the Advocate, tacitly admits as much in the following quotation from his pen. "The back numbers of the Gospel Advocate contain great editorials hurled at these *preacher-infidels* of the past generation that would astound the weak-kneed soft-soapers of today who *expatiate upon love*. The smoke of that great struggle that prevented thousands of our churches from going into *digression* and *infidelity* still hovers over the field of battle, and we thank God and take courage that we still have men who have convictions and courage to come up to the firing line. If our *lovers* of today would go over one of these old battle fields, they would recognize that what occurred was not a *wrangle*, but was a *fight*."

All those wonderful champions seem to have died out, however, for I have spent years in the effort to arouse one of them to the defense of some of their own digressions and infidelity in a written discussion. I can assure them of one thing, if I should ever succeed in finding one of those doughty warriors, and engaging him in a discussion; he would know he had not been engaged in a wrangle but in a fight. In the same article Bro. Allen truly says, "But in fighting the Society the Standard has started other organizations that are but the *embryo* of another such octopus as that against which it is struggling." The Standard is not the only guilty one in view, for the Gospel Advocate and all who are lined up with it are self-condemned of the same offense.

Of late years they have simply been stepping in the foot-prints of the digressives whom they so scathingly denounce, adding one institution after another for which they can give no more shadow of scriptural authority than the digressives can give for the instrumental music. In fact they cannot even come as near giving a thus saith the Lord for their Sunday School, for the digressives number one can at least point to the old testament worship and show that it included musical instruments, but not a word or hint can be shown in the whole Bible that God ever did authorize such an institution. The Gospel Advocate itself, the strongest journalistic proponent of the Sunday School, has plead

guilty to this indictment, first by its refusal to allow it to be discussed in its columns and secondly by boldly declaring that this digressive institution is modeled after the public school system, which the Advocate lauds as the best known method of instruction.

Brother Allen gave utterance to a most potent truth when he said, a little farther along in this same article "The first prerequisite of acceptable worship and service is for man to recognize that God is God, and that God is the Lawgiver and Ruler. Man cannot please God except in the performance of worship and service of which God is the author. God is author of only such worship and service as he commands." Truer words than that were never uttered and must find a response in every honest Christian heart; but what are we to think of him who gives utterance to such precepts and by his acts gives them the lie? Like Samson of old, he buries himself in the ruin he creates for the destruction of others.

It is amazing that so many brethren continue to cling to the Sunday School in face of the fact that no man can show either precept or example to justify it and not a single paper will open its columns for an investigation of its claims. And if Bro. Allen ever musters courage to meet us, he, too, can say he has been in a battle, not a "row." Dare he now venture to the "firing line?" We are on the line waiting. Is it cowardice, or is it lack of ammunition that holds you back, brother? Speak out, and tell us.

G. A. TRÖTT.

Flesh and Spirit

In Gal. 5:19-21, Paul gives us the works of the *flesh* and he adds: "They that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." And in verse 24 he says "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

Have we, brethren, crucified our fleshy inclinations? If not, we are not Christ's and shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

In verses 22 and 23 of the same chapter, he gives the works of the Spirit, and says, "Against such there is no law."

We walk in the spirit when we obey the Spirit's teachings in the Bible. "Faith comes by hearing the word of God." (Rom. 10:17) Let us walk by what God's word teaches, then, for "what is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23). Then that which does not come from the word of God is not of faith.

H. H. MONTGOMERY
Shreveport, La.

The Truth Fund

C. D. Teurman _____ \$1.00
J. S. Bedingfield _____ 2.00

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

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

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR	- \$1.00
SIX MONTHS	- .50
THREE MONTHS	- .25

APRIL, 1928

Notice

If you do not get the paper by the seventh of any month, please notify us. We plan to have the paper to you by the first of each month.

Some have not yet written us who paid more than one dollar as subscription. Please tell us whether you wish a refund, or want your subscription extended, or want the amount above one dollar to be placed to The Truth Fund. We are holding this subject to your request, so write us, please.

Subscriptions will not pay our running expenses, so do not forget The Truth Fund, brethren.

Why not put The Truth into the hands of every member of your congregation? This will be a good way to spread the Cause of the Redeemer. Some are already doing this.

We wish to thank all our writers for the nice, plain copy they are sending into us. The printers have expressed appreciation of our copy.

If any subscriber has failed to get all the numbers of the paper from the first issue, please write us stating what numbers you lack, and we shall be glad to supply them as long as they last.

As It Now Stands

"I will not hold a position that I do not think I can defend in a public debate. I believe the contention over the 'one drinking vessel' will eventually fall of its own weight and come to naught. Many are seeing the weakness thereof already and have quit the contention. Any time the brethren pretty generally think such debate is needed, I am ready to represent what I believe to be the truth on the subject."—J. N. Cowan (Feb. 16, 1928).

"In regard to the proposed discussion, you may make any arrangements you desire. I have never had any reluctance to meet any man in defense of what I believe to be God's truth. I have no interest in life that compares with the propagation of the truth."—Dr. G. A. Trott.

"I regret very much the division that

is being caused by Bros. Clark, Johnson and Cowan over the cup. Nothing would please me better than to meet either of them in debate."—G. A. Trott (Sept 1, 1926.)

"Bro. Cowan and I corresponded briefly on the cup, but the subject was not gone into very deeply and consisted (on Cowan's part) mostly of queries, and I would not wish it to be published as a discussion of the subject, though I am willing to engage in a written discussion with anyone at any time."—G. A. Trott (Jan. 4, 1928.)

"As to the debate with Cowan, I am ready at any time."—G. A. Trott (Feb. 10, 1928).

"I am trying to exercise good judgment as to the handling of the question."—J. N. Cowan.

Yes, I see, the same good judgment that F. F. has been exercising on the Sunday School question. And this is the same good judgment that the organ advocate exercised. And they, too, were especially strong in "the opinion that the time is not ripe for such a discussion publicly." And they, too, did not want to "air our differences before the world."

And, as I remember it, they, too, were strong in the opinion that the contention "will eventually fall of its own weight and come to naught." But "the wish" evidently, "was father to the thought." At least it proved untrue. And some of them, too, quite recently have expressed a willingness to debate "any time the brethren pretty generally think such a debate is needed." In fact, digression is all alike, it seems.

"There is no open division on the question to any appreciable extent."—J. N. Cowan.

Are you waiting, then, until we are hopelessly divided before you will examine the question with one who is able to meet you, as was the case with the organ and the Sunday School advocates? And why were these things not discussed in their incipency? Was it not because those who were standing for them and wanted them at any cost, would not enter a discussion of them? It was. But they, too, liked to creep around among the churches and tell what wonderful things they could prove and how much Bible (this was for those that yet wanted to go by the Bible, which most of them now cared little for) they had on their side, and they, too, might jump on a novice occasionally, and browbeat him with some of the arguments (?) they had in readiness to kill giant antagonists "when the brethren called on them." And they, too, here meant brethren that wanted these things, right or wrong, Bible or no Bible. I know whereof I speak. "I am not afraid to discuss the question from the point of arguments."—J. N. Cowan.

If you really think your arguments will stand the Bible test, is not the church entitled to them before lines are drawn that will cause party and prejudice to bias sound judgment?

Why nibble at the thing as the organ advocates did? Yes, and as the S. S. advocates did for years? And thus they courted division. And it came, open, bitter, fierce division. And God will put the blame where it belongs. If you really believe your arguments will stand, why not hasten the death of the "One cup" by them? And echo answers "Why?" we are ready.

A Pretense

All Christians should be governed by the truth. And if we are governed by the truth, we shall always tell the truth, and never misstate facts. And we will always be in earnest about what we say we will do. If a Christian principle is involved in what we propose to do, we should evidently do it whether someone else does so or not.

If I propose a thing that involves such a principle and say I will do it if somebody else will, it shows that I am making pretense. And if I refuse to do such a thing because somebody else does not or will not do it, it shows that I am but a pretender.

I have seen a report in which one brother said he had agreed to lay down the use of more than one cup where it was causing division if another brother would lay down the Sunday School and that another brother had made the same offer when in debate on the Sunday School, but that the Sunday School man would not do it. Well, he evidently would not consider such a proposition because he saw it was only a pretense on the part of the one proposing it. For this same brother who made this proposal knew that there were brethren in his audience that lived in that community who were conscientiously opposed to more than one cup at the Lord's table, and yet he refused to lay down the use of more than one cup. And it is a known fact that this same brother has gone to places where division existed over the cups and things of like nature, and instead of teaching the brethren to lay down such things, he skinned the ones that contended for the one cup. And he has gone to places where the church was using only one cup, and has publicly preached in favor of more than one. Now, when he goes to teaching the brethren to lay down the cups and use one, regardless of what the other fellow does, we will have more confidence in his sincerity in making propositions to others. And until he does this, we may all know that he is only a pretender.

IRA L. SANDERS
Floydada, Texas

Investigation

Following are the propositions for investigation between Albert S. Hodges Adventist, and Jas. Douglas Phillips, Christian, to be conducted in "Law and Grace" and "The Truth," as announced in our March issue:

1. The scriptures teach that the

seventh day of the week is the Lord's day referred to in Rev. 1:10 and the observance of the same is binding on all followers of Christ. Hodges affirms; Phillips denies.

2. 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. Phillips affirms; Hodges denies.

3. Man is wholly mortal. Hodges affirms; Phillips denies.

4. The wicked will finally undergo eternal punishment in suffering. Phillips affirms; Hodges denies.

5. It is scriptural to preach the imminent coming of Christ. Hodges affirms; Phillips denies.

6. Christ is now king. (Hodges would not deny this.)

7. Ellen G. White was a prophetess inspired of God. (Hodges would not affirm this.)

8. Baptism is essential to salvation. (Hodges would not deny this.)

9. The "eternal punishment" of the wicked mentioned in Matt. 25:46 will be annihilation. (Hodges would not affirm this.)

10. The Seventh Day Adventist Church is an apostate church. (Hodges would not deny this.)

11. Adventists now perform miracles as was done in the days of the apostles of Christ. (Hodges would not affirm this.)

These investigations are to appear in each issue of the papers here mentioned, unless otherwise mutually agreed. Each writer will have four articles on each proposition.

How Readest Thou

(A. J. THOMPSON)

I will give you some "strong meat" (Heb. 5:14).

"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (I Cor. 15:50).

If Paul was a king while in the flesh he was a king without a crown, for he had not yet received a crown. (II Tim. 4:8; James 1:12; I Pet. 5:4; Rev. 2:10).

If Christ could not be a priest on earth and in the flesh (Heb. 8:4), then how can his saints be priests on earth and in the flesh? Remember it is said "God, who calleth those things which are not as though they were." (Rom. 4:17) Peter says, "We look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." (II Pet. 3:13)

In Rev. 20:4, we read, "And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." Again it is said, "They shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." (Rev. 20:6). In this connection read Isa. 65:17; 66:22).

After the resurrection (Ezek. 37) the Jews will be converted. (Rom. 11:23-36; Hos. 14:1-9; Isa. 45:17-25). And they say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Matt. 23:39; Lk. 13:35) And they will return to their own land. (Jer. 23:8; 32: 37; 33:6-26; Ezek. 11:17-20; 34:13; 36:24;

37:14-28; 39:28; Joel 13:15-21; Micah 4:1-13; Zech. 2:4-12; 8:3-23).

REMARKS

We know that "flesh and blood" (the Natural body)—I Cor. 15:44-45) cannot inherit the kingdom of God; but when Christ delivers up the kingdom to "God, even the Father" (I Cor. 15:24), then "this corruptible shall have put on incorruption." (I Cor. 15:35-56). Then the resurrection of the body has been effected: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body," a body "incorruptible," for "the dead shall be raised incorruptible." (I Cor. 15:43-55.)

But now Christians are in the kingdom of God's Son. In Proof of this we cite but one passage of the many, here. It reads: "Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us out of the power of darkness and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our sins." (Col. 1:12,13).

The writer in each case cited where we have "crown of righteousness," "crown of life," "crown of glory," and "crown of life" respectively has enriched the language by the use of a figure of rhetoric, using crown for reward.

The writer of Hebrews plainly states why Christ could not be a priest on earth. He sprang from the tribe of Judah; but the covenant then in force was administered, by the appointment of God, through the priesthood of the tribe of Levi. However, the covenant has been changed; and under the new covenant, Christ is now High Priest in the Holiest of all, in the presence of God, a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec, administering the service of the new covenant. In proof, we cite chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9 of Hebrews. Hence he is now king and priest upon his throne, as was Melchisedec. (Heb. 7:1). And all Christians are now "a royal priesthood, who offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," and "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, confessing to his name." (I Pet. 2:5-9; Heb. 13:15).

We are well aware that a future event is sometimes stated in the present tense, but that is not the case here.

We have no theory to put forth on the "thousand years" of the book of Revelation, however, we think we could beat some that are put forth.

"After the resurrection (Ezek. 37), the Jews will be converted." Never! Listen: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This is the language of the Christ himself. (John 5:28,29).

The eternal destiny of all is here hinged upon the manner of life each

spent before the resurrection. And the class—good or bad—each went down to death in is the class he is resurrected in. They that "have done good," says the Christ, at the time of the resurrection, have their eternal reward with the good; and they that "have done evil" have thus fixed their eternal destiny before the resurrection!

We challenge any living man to affirm a post mortem gospel of Christ to anyone. And we make the same challenge respecting a post-resurrection gospel.

Wherever the Jew is, in Palestine or on the ocean, if he is ever saved it will be before death and by accepting the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation to everyone (Jew or Gentile) that believeth. (Rom. 1:16). "Because of unbelief they were broken off" and "if they abide not still in unbelief, they also, shall be grafted in." (Rom. 11:20-23). Paul was not so certain of their conversion but that he used an "if," and no man can be more certain than he was. And if the gospel is to be preached after the resurrection, (they must believe, and "faith cometh by the word of the Lord"), by whom will it be preached?

The Jews will be converted just like the Gentiles "if" they accept the Gospel of Christ before death (Luke 12: 16-21) and walk in "newness of life." (Rom. 6; Col. 3).

Commendation

I read an article in the February issue of The Truth over the name of J. B. Otts, of Gainesville, Texas, and I want to say Amen! to this article, for I just as firmly believe in man's utter incapacity to devise a single work, or to take a single step toward the goodly land of himself without the direction and aid of God, as any one possibly can.

God's dealing with Saul in the case of the slaying of the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15), also with Aaron's two sons in the burning of incense with strange fire (Lev. 10:2), his dealing with the young prophet (1 Kings 13), should be a lesson to us all. God says, The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. (Deut. 18:20).

Poor old Uzza, no doubt a sincere and God-fearing man, thought to protect the ark of God from falling, and put his hand on it, and was struck dead. God had said it must not be touched, and his word must be obeyed. (1 Chron. 13:7).

I know Brother Otts. He is a young man, something near thirty years old, in the prime of life. He has a wife and three children. A carpenter by trade, he is a self-made man. He is one of our very best preachers. He is clean, without a spot upon his character. He is a man if you come in contact with, you can't help but like him. He is honest, unassuming, a

forceful speaker, and able to meet any gainsayer. Brethren, call him out. You will be proud you have done it. He will preach nothing but the truth, never speculate. Brother Otts never forces himself upon any church, yet he loves to be preaching all of his time.—H. C. PEARSON, Gainesville, Tex.

Paragraphs

Brother, sister, do you meet every Lord's day (Rev. 1:10) to be at the Lord's table (I Cor. 10:21) to "drink the cup of the Lord" (I Cor. 10:21) and so worship him as "it is written?" "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another." (Heb. 10:25.) Now if you assemble to receive this exhortation and the church does its duty as here imposed in giving it, you will be nourished so that you can endure the race in patience unto the end. (Heb. 12:1.) And so we read the command, "Wherefore comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as also ye do." (I Thes. 5:11.) "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, to exhortation, and to comfort." "He that prophesieth, edifyeth the Church." "According to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself." (I Cor. 14:3, 4, 31; I Thes. 5:11.) And remember, sisters, "As in all the churches, let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak." (I Cor. 14:33, 34.) Since Satan was able to influence woman, attacking the race at the more vulnerable point, God has interdicted her from giving the Tempter such an opportunity here. "Let a woman learn in silence with all submission, for I do not allow a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man, but to be silent; for Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not delivered, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression. However, she shall be saved through child-bearing if they abide in faith and love and holiness with sobriety." (I Tim. 2:11-15).

This sphere is marked out for her by the heavenly father for her own good and the good of all, a sphere of loving service not to be surpassed by any other; hence the direction, "That the younger women marry, bear children, guide the home, give no occasion to the adversary for reproach; for some have already turned aside after Satan." (I Tim. 5:14) Hence the need of teaching. "Aged women likewise . . . that they teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their husbands, that the word of God be not defamed." (Titus 2:3-5).

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall de-

part from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits." (I Tim. 4:1.)

It is only those that "keep the faith" that shall receive the reward. "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give me at that day." (II Tim. 4:7.) Hence a life of consecrated, faithful service to the Lord must be rendered to receive the crown.

"And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things." Yes, he will subject his will and ways to that of a trainer, and forego all dissipations, reject deteriorating drink and food, and rigidly conform to the rules of health in sleep, exercise, and rest.

"Now they do this to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible" (I Cor. 9:25).

Yes, and they put us to shame. They know it takes these things to win, and they will strictly follow the rules of their trainer; but we seem to imagine that we can condemn these rules of our "Captain" and do as we please, and yet win. They sacrifice pleasure; we imitate the world.

They endure hardness: we grumble at the first little tap. Yet, oh! the difference in the reward. Shame, brother! Shame, sister! Let us wake up to duty. "Quit yourselves like men," and press on, praying, hoping, trusting; but training all the time. The crown is incorruptible. Press on!

"Ye were the servants of sin, but God be thanked that ye obeyed from the heart, that mould (Gr. *typos*) of teaching in which you were delivered (born—John 3:5), and having been made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:1-18.) And as to this, the apostle says, "Therefore we were buried with him in baptism, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so also we should walk in newness of life."

News and Notes

Elbert E. Jenkins, Rusk, Tex. writes: Please send me seven copies of the Truth. I have handed out several copies, and think I shall be able to send subscriptions soon. I want to say it is a good paper. It shall ever have my support in every way possible. I want every copy—it is too good to miss.

O. C. Matthews, Healdton, Okla., writes: Enclosed find four subscriptions for the Truth. I think it is a fine little paper, and it will do much good. I am going to work for it. We are going to send it to everyone in this congregation that is not able to pay for it, and this would be a good thing for every congregation to do that wants to take nothing but the Word of God for its guide.

J. E. Nisbett, Dallas, Tex., writes: I am enclosing subscription for the Truth. Will send more as I am able.

You may count on me always as a friend for the paper. I appreciate it very much. I hope and pray that you live long and do much good.

Jeter E. Whigham, of Opp, Ala., writes: I am sending an article for The Truth. I expect to send in a number of subscriptions soon.

Brother Jackson Howton's friends will be glad to know that, after a long sickness of flu and pneumonia, he is up again, and he promises to write some for The Truth as soon as he is strong enough. He asks the prayers of the brethren.

Bro. J. E. Wallace, who knows how to appreciate gospel truth since he was once in the fold of the Baptist church, writes: I am enclosing subscriptions of the brethren here for the Truth. The paper is as good as your preaching, and there is none better. (Piedmont, Ala.)

Bro. W. M. Hunter, Palacios, Tex., writes: I see that you are publishing a paper, The Truth. Please send me a sample copy.

A. J. Jernigan, Altus, Okla.: I think The Truth is fine. I wish it could be placed in every home. Here find subscriptions.

A. H. Pinegar, Memphis, Tenn.: The first issue of The Truth was worth the whole year's subscription, Brother Harper. May God richly bless you. Our erring Sunday School brethren want another building. The little meeting house which we built and they took from us does not contain the necessary rooms to accommodate their classes, so they want to build a house with an auditorium and six classrooms as there is so much confusion, they say, when all are reciting in the present one-room house. But they never can make their human institution to conform to the Divine pattern.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.: Have read the Truth. I think you have made a fine start.

O. L. Head, Rawls, Tex.: I think I will subscribe for The Truth soon. It is real gospel news.

J. Y. Morgan, Newcastle, Tex.: I happened to get hold of a copy of the Truth today. It looks good to me. I have been waiting and glad for the time to come for it to start.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.: I am sending you a list of subscribers for the Truth, and hope to send others soon. My meeting at Nocona is postponed on account of sickness there. I am in a meeting at Devol, Okla., with fine interest and large crowds.

B. J. Everett, Scott, Ga.: I have gotten two copies of The Truth, and have read the same with much pleasure. I want the paper. It puts the truth where I can get it right at a glance. Please begin my subscription with the first issue. I do not want to miss a single number.

Ralph W. Hamilton, Norman, Okla.: Enclosed find subscription for "The Truth." Have just finished reading a sample copy. I am interested in the debate to be published soon.

The Plan of Salvation

In these days of style, fashion, creeds, and man-made "isms" let us study more and more about the qualifications of a member of the New Testament church, which is the Church of Christ, in order that we may adorn the doctrine of Christ.

It might appear to some, especially the denominations, as needless repetition to continually be preaching, writing, and talking the plan of salvation to each other, the church, and the world. But after all, isn't the whole theme of the New Testament construed so as to fulfill that purpose?

We must hear: "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." Matt. 7:24.

We must believe: "And they (Paul and Silas) said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house." Acts 16:31.

We must repent: "Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2:38.

We must confess: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father, which is in heaven." Matt. 10:32.

We must be baptized: Acts 2:38 bears this out. In no way can this be construed so as to mean "because of" remission of sins. "Repent" and "be baptized" are elements of equal rank in the statement of Peter. Hence they are commands of equal force and to say that baptism is not necessary in order to become a Christian, is to say that repentance is not necessary.

We must walk in the spirit; "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." Gal. 5:22, 23.

We must adorn the beautiful attributes of a Christian life: "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity." 2 Pet. 1: 5, 6, 7.

If we have followed the Divine Plan and have been born anew; are we living a Christian life? Or was the seed which was sown in our hearts sown on stony ground? No matter how good we fix a plow if we just lay it aside, it never benefits anyone. Even though we have followed the Divine plan of birth, if we fail to bring forth fruit, we have no reward. Do we go to church on Lord's day merely because it is a custom?

Brethren, I fear that many of us are dormant in the work of the Lord, like the Laodiceans. Let us wake up and show those who are in the field that we appreciate their preaching His

Word to us by doing our duty as Christians. Summer or revival meeting Christianity (?) will avail nothing as such. Suppose Christ should come during the winter? Let us *always* abound in the work of the Lord.—I Cor. 15:4-8).

JETER E. WHIGHAM,
Opp, Ala., Rt. 1

Appointment of Elders

A brother, writing under the heading, "Have we elders in the church," in his last article writes on how elders are appointed.

He refers to the contention that evangelists have the sole authority to appoint elders as "evangelistic assumption," and says that the Scriptures do not authorize this practice. "Designing men," he says, "have appointed men elders to satisfy some selfish desire to the ruin of the church."

Yes, "designing men" have done a great many wrong things; but the *abuse of authority* one has, can never be taken as a logical argument that one has not the authority.

He cites Titus 1:3, where the evangelist was authorized to ordain elders; but he tries to meet this by saying that the churches then did not have written instructions as we have them, hence it was necessary to have some one to teach them that it was necessary to have an eldership, and Titus did this work.

Titus, no doubt, taught them that it was necessary for them to have elders, but he did more, for when the material for elders was prepared, he *ordained* them to be elders.

The brother brings up the eunuch's case in conversion and tries to make an argument from it. He says that the eunuch had no book that contained the plan of salvation: hence God sent Philip to instruct him. But since we have these instructions in a book, we can learn how to become a Christian by reading them. And he makes the eldership a parallel case. We now have the instructions in a book concerning the need of elders: hence the churches may read them and appoint elders in the absence of any evangelist.

The case is against him. Let us see. Philip taught the eunuch. The eunuch qualified himself by accepting the teaching. Then Philip baptized him.

So also Titus taught them the eldership question, and when the material was prepared, he *ordained* them. This is what he was commanded to do.

The brother says: "Inasmuch as the appointment of deacons is associated with that of elders, I will cite Acts 6:1-6. Here we have the duty of looking out among those men fit for the position, *imposed on the Church*. The apostles and evangelists did not do this for them. 'And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of the Holy Ghost, and Philip,' et al. The act of choosing is all that is implied in the word 'or-

dain.' The apostles laid their hands on them after they were chosen or ordained. Laying on of hands constituted no part of the ordination."

Here you have the best that the brother can make out from this case to consider. And now we shall consider it. He did not quote the "saying" that pleased the multitude. Here it is: "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over the business." And this shows clearly that the *multitude* "chose;" the apostles "laid their hands on them."

When I read in Acts 8:38 that Philip and the eunuch "went down both into the water, and he baptized him," I believe that there should be a going "down into the water" when one is baptized. So, when I read (Acts 6:1-6) that the apostles laid hands on the deacons they appointed, I believe there should be laying on of hands when deacons are appointed.

He says that the word "ordain" in Acts 14:23 is from the same word that "chosen" in II Cor. 8:19 is translated from. And from this he seems to want us to infer that the choosing by the multitude in Acts 6:1-6 was the ordaining. He gives Webster's definition of ordain: "To appoint or set apart for some special work; to ordain a minister or priest."

May we not, then, say that when Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14:23) ordained elders, they, as the apostles who appointed the deacons laid their hands on them? The definition of Webster does not in any way preclude such a procedure as the laying on of hands as the appointment. And the definition of the Greek word to which the brother refers is: "Primarily, to stretch out the hand; secondly, to appoint by a show of the hand; and thirdly, to appoint or elect without regard to the method." (Grimm's N. T. Greek Lexicon.)

No man who accepts any of these definitions can object to the laying on of hands, for it would be hard to think of anything else that would meet the primary definition of the word; and this idea is suggested in the secondary meaning; and if any man prefers the third definition, he can not object to this procedure, for if he accepts this definition, he must be satisfied with any method.

When Paul and Barnabas were separated unto their special work, (Ac. 13), those who did this setting apart, prayed, fasted, and laid their hands on them.

The brother tries to make the marriage ceremony an illustration of his position. But here he fails again. He says that the law recognizes any marriage ceremony performed by anyone who is ordained a minister and any form of ordination.

Well, then the law recognizes those who are ordained by imposing hands and so this must be ordination. A man chooses a wife; after that they

must be married. The church chooses elders and deacons; after that they must be ordained, as I have shown.

The brother says that the hands of no uninspired man were laid on any one in N. T. times. But for this we have only his bare assertion. If he were inspired, we should consider the matter settled. But since he is not, we demand the proof.

Again he says: "Laying on of hands, no doubt, conferred some gift on them."

But again he gives no proof of his assertion. For argument's sake, suppose this were true, could not hands have been imposed for two purposes if the necessity demanded it?

I submit this for study. I want no one to accept it if I am wrong. I believe we can learn the truth by study, and the truth will help to unite us, for Christ is not divided.

HEWITT SMITH

Cullings and Comments

In apostolic times no preacher was ever called "Reverend" or the "Pastor."—The P. C.

True. The Reverend, the Pastor, the Classes, and the singing evangelist were all unknown to inspired men as those who never knew the truth, or from God. They came in through those who had departed from the truth. Bible things can be called by Bible names.

The word baptize came into the English language from the Old-French baptizer, from the late Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptizo, from bapto, dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkling is not to be associated with it.—The Lexicographer's Easy Chair, Literary Digest, March 7, 1925.

Where did the idea of sprinkling for baptism come from then? If no word carrying the idea of sprinkling is found in the command for this action, the idea is not in the command, and the one who sprinkles water for this act commanded by Christ would just as well do nothing, for what he does is not in obedience to the Christ at all. Dip does not mean sprinkle, neither is its meaning pour. And it is utterly impossible for a word to have meanings in the same sentence as contrary as dip, sprinkle, and pour. If baptizo means dip, it does not mean sprinkle, and if it means sprinkle, it does not mean dip, for dip does not mean sprinkle. The truth is that sprinkling in lieu of baptizing came in through the Romish Church, which claimed the right to so change it. And it was first used on sick folks who were thought to be too feeble to be baptized, and it became very popular when the sin of sprinkling babies in infancy became popular.

News and Notes

J. D. Tipton, Barnum, Texas: I haven't yet been able to see a copy of

your paper, The Truth. Would be glad for you to send me a copy; and if it is true to name, the Lord will be pleased and will bless it. But we have so many papers that are not true to their title, such as the—, I think of so many wearing the name Christian that are not true to name. Who is a Christian? Answer: Not just anybody that claims to be, but only those who are worthy of the name in life. Christian is to be Christ-like. I shall do all for the paper I can if it really is The Truth.

(Brethren will please send in names of those they think will be interested in the paper and help us get it before the public. We shall take pleasure in mailing copies for inspection. The paper is being well received already, and when I can devote all my time to it, I intend to make it second to none published in its stand for the truth of God.)

H. R. Stringer, Bogue Chitto, Miss: The March issue of the Truth was fine. Will try to help you some soon. Some sick folks to see after now.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas: I am now planning my work for meetings, and shall be glad to hear from places that want nothing but the Bible for their way. May God bless you for your stand for the truth. Yes, let us have The Truth twice a month, and we can do it if the brethren will all work for it to that end, not wait a year to do it. We need a paper that is not afraid to speak the truth without fear or favor.

Jas. Douglas Phillips, Everton, Ark: I have just finished reading the March issue of The Truth. I think it gets better with each issue. The Lord willing, I shall have the first installment of the investigation with Hodges in the offices of The Truth and Law and Grace by the 15th of March. I am to begin the meeting at Lyons, Ind., tomorrow, March 3. Had one baptism at Mt. Olive, near Ellettsville, Ind., last Lord's day. I go to Charleston, W. Va., soon. Will debate the kingdom question and the baptism question at Alco, Ark., with Roy Nichols, Baptist, beginning about the first day of July.

E. F. Morgan, Newcastle, Texas: Enclosed find check for The Truth. It is fine. I can't afford to be without it. Shall be glad to hand out copies you send me.

W. W. Dugger, Hillsboro, Texas: I just read the February issue of The Truth and like it fine. If it continues as it has, I hope it will increase the subscription price and increase the reading matter. I try to walk as Christ and his apostles taught us, and it gives me much courage to read and hear others talk that are yet satisfied with God's ways and God's thoughts. Bro. Walker N. Horne, a noble teacher of God's word, meets with us occasionally. We meet at the church at Arnotville, four miles west of Hillsboro: Bro. N. L. Clark will hold our meeting, beginning about the 27th of July. I am enclosing two dollars for my subscrip-

tion and my father's.

Herman M. Stewart, Menard, Tex: I am enjoying The Truth very much, and hope to see it soon come out at least twice a month. May God bless you in the good work. Enclosed find subscriptions.

Douglas Dunn, Lufkin, Texas: I have before me the March issue of The Truth, and wish to say I have enjoyed reading it very much. I am enclosing my subscription.

The Church We Find In The Bible

(III)

We find that the church is to do what Christ has commanded.—Matt. 28:20. This settles the matter, then, as to what the church may do: there is no room to do anything outside the commands of Christ. Now what do we find them doing with the approval of inspired teachers? We read upon the first day of the week, they came together to break bread. Christ had told them I appoint unto you a kingdom: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.—Acts 20:7; Matt. 26: 26. And Paul tells them that as oft as they eat of that bread and drink of that cup, they show the Lord's death till he comes. This is the Lord's table.—I Cor. 10th Ch. and 11th Ch.

This is the blood shed for the redemption of sins: in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.—Matt. 26; Col. 1; I Jno. 1:17; Eph. 1. Then we must not forsake the assembly, where we have this wonderful blessing from the Lord.—Heb. 10:25. And we also read, upon the first day of the week we are to lay by in store, giving freely as we have been prospered.—I Cor. 16; II Cor. 9:7. And we find the male members are to do the teaching, speaking one at a time.—I Cor. 14th Ch.

Then we also have the singing and the praying to the Lord.—Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:13. And we are glad to stand fast, and do all things decently and in order.—I Cor. 14.

And now, dear reader, are you a member of this church, and are you doing these things? Did you obey that form of doctrine (Rom. 6:17, 18) to be made free from sin? Are you wearing the God appointed name? Are you doing the commandments of Christ, not going beyond the things that are written?—I Cor. 4:6. Take time to consider these things, dear reader.

W. T. H.

Cullings and Comments

All practices having origin in tradition, human reason, or expediency are to be utterly eschewed.—Lard.

But some among us are esteeming expediency and convenience above the unity of the brethren and their soul's salvation.

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.

SNEADS, FLA., APRIL 16, 1928

Debate

The scriptures teach that the Seventh day of the week is the Lord's Day referred to in Rev. 1:10 and the observance of same is binding on all followers of Christ.

As affirmative in this proposition I am glad to debate this with Bro. Phillips. I believe he is honest in denying the above proposition and I am equally honest in affirming it, so we are to bring our strong reasons together for mutual benefit and for the edifying of our readers. And not going outside of the scriptures—Old and New Testament for proof of our contentions.

As the text in question does not specify what day of the week is Lord's day we shall have to look elsewhere for the connecting link to show what day of the week has been considered specially as the Lord's Day. There has been one single day singled out since creation that the Lord has made special claim to as a memorial of his creative work, and for the double purpose of honoring God for this work and to keep his people in touch with him by devoting one day of the divine appointed week, in dismissing from our minds all labor of a revile nature and devoting the day to feasting and rejoicing in spiritual things. This is a far-seeing and wise plan of the creator to keep his people in touch with him. For as long as people will relinquish their hold on all worldly affairs and devote one entire day of the seven to honor and meditate on the Lord's work and goodness that people will be in a better position to keep their minds riveted on spiritual things and in addition their bodies are in better trim for the arduous duties of the coming week, after a good wholesome rest from the toil.

Periods of rest and diversion are acknowledged by all as beneficial. I believe.

Now, if we can find any special day of the week singled out by the Lord and called "My Holy Day" I believe this ought to prove to reasonable people that this is the day referred to in Rev. 1:10.

Brother Phillips will agree that sanctity means to set apart for a certain use, and we shall proceed to locate such a day. "And the Lord blessed the Seventh Day and sanctified it. Because in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. Gen. 2:3. Now if we can find further proof that God followed

up this with other statements of sanction and command we believe we have established our proposition.

"If thou turn away . . . from doing thy pleasure on my Holy day and call the Sabbath a delight the holy of the Lord," etc. Isa. 58:13.

As the Lord definitely calls the Sabbath my holy day and nothing is on record to show any change has been made we conclude that the beloved John was resting on the Lord's day—"My Holy Day." We believe John was a follower of God as Paul taught "Be ye followers of God as dear children." Eph. 5:1.

God rested, follow him in the day he appointed for you to rest—my "holy day."

Paul is careful to advise the Corinthians "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ—and the head of Christ is God." How appropriate is the first verse of the Revelation, viz: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him . . . and he sent and signified it by his angel unto His servant, John. I say how appropriate for the Revelation to be given on a day when John was given over to rest and meditation on spiritual things. exclusively—on the Lord's holy day he had established from Creation.

We follow the apostles and they in turn follow Christ and Christ follows God, so we have an unbroken chain from Creation down to the present how man was to follow God and until Brother Phillips can show from the Bible that God has ever called any other day of the week "My holy day" except the seventh day we reasonably conclude that Lord's Day of Rev. 1: 10, and "My holy day" of Isa. 58: 13, are one and all the same day.

Here we rest for the brother's reply.

ALBERT S. HODGES.

REPLY

It affords me the greatest of pleasure to have the privilege of discussing this question with Mr. Hodges. I believe he is sincere and searching for the truth. I assure him the same concerning myself.

He is affirming that the seventh day of the week is "Lord's Day" (Rev. 1:10) and that Christians should observe it. He should have defined the terms of his proposition. Here is the rule of logic: "The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there could be no misunderstanding respecting

Statement

This supplement to our April issue is put out to take up as far as possible copy left over from our last issue. And if the brethren will continue to "pour in" the subscriptions and donations, we shall be able to issue twice a month ere long. Give us your support, brethren, and help us get the truth before the people.

them"—Hedge's "Elements of Logic." Why is this necessary? Because, as the same authority says, "If this is not done, the dispute is liable to be, in a great degree, verbal. Arguments will be misapplied, and the controversy protracted, because the parties engaged in it have different apprehensions of the subject." I hope he will define the terms of his proposition in his next article, so as to avoid further controversy here.

I want him to tell us what he means by "the observance of the same" at least. I want him to tell us what the Scriptures say this "observance" consists in. I have read something on this "observance" question, and could tell what the Scriptures say about it, but I am not going to get in the lead. This is his task.

In order for him to establish his proposition, he must show:

1. That Rev. 1:10 refers to the seventh day of the week; and,
2. That the "observance" of this day is binding on all followers of Christ.

He made an attempt to prove this, but failed. He seems to make no distinction between what Moses commanded and what Christ taught; nor between a disciple of Moses and a disciple of Christ, a Christian. There is much difference here, "For the law was given by Moses, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ" (John 1: 17). In the Law of Moses we have it: "Thou shalt not kill (Deut. 5:17). But, in the teaching of Christ we have it: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer" (1 John 3:15). Again: "Ye have heard that it hath been said of them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his own heart" (Matt. 5:28). Do you see the difference?

He quotes Gen 2: 3 and says that I will agree with him that "sanctify" means "to set apart," etc. But, for

(Continued on page three)

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

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

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR	- - - - -	\$1.00
SIX MONTHS	- - - - -	.50
THREE MONTHS	- - - - -	.25

APRIL, 1928

Cups vs. Cup

(By H. C. Harper in Firm Foundation March 5, 1912)

I see that Brother Holt of Florence, Alabama, is out in the Gospel Advocate of July 11, 1911, in favor of the cups in the communion. He says:

"I do not claim that this is the only scriptural way of taking the Lord's supper, but it is as scriptural as any other way, and besides it has the advantage of being clean."

Again he says:

"We are aware that some brethren ridicule the idea that microbes can be transmitted from one to another by the common cup, yet the weight of authority is against them."

COMMENT

Like sprinkling for baptism, various arguments have been advanced for the use of cups instead of "the common cup" in the communion. Brother Holt says to do so is "as scriptural as any other way." But he gives no Bible proof whatever for his assertion. In fact there is none, and evidently he knew it. Hence he dodges behind "microbes" and "clean." It seems to me, from the Bible standpoint, that this way is no more scriptural than is the Roman Catholic way, for they are both of man. Immersion was too dangerous it was immodest; it was unsightly. Yet the Bible says that the Son of God "was baptized in the Jordan." But some have learned to be more modest than he, and take the way of sprinkling.

Brother Holt's way is "clean" and withal free from "microbes." But the poor, dirty Jesus, ignorant of "microbes" took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying Drink ye all of it." (Matt. 26-27. "And they all drank of it." Mark 14:23.

Not I, say these "clean," ones of the present century. And they sigh, "How dangerous!"

In this connection I wish to give an authority, and I ask Bro. Holt to produce his. In the August number of the journal published by the State Board of Health of Florida, page 133, we have the following:

When someone says (It does not matter whether layman or professional man) that the common drinking cup is a prolific source of disease dissemination, the question naturally fol-

lows, How do you know? What is your proof? What diseases are thus transmitted from person to person. Simmered and chased down to proof, there is none."

When people depart from the word of the Lord, there has never been a time that they could not find an excuse for their sin. Yours for the faith and practice of the Book of God.

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 larger (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 as-

tonished 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

Note.—The man who says this question is new to the brethren must have been asleep for the past twenty years or so absorbed in politics that he did not notice what was going on in the church.—Ed.

Cup or Cups

(By Z. T. Winfree, deceased)
(From F. F., 1913)

Should one cup or more than one be used in the communion? Brother H. C. Harper and Brother L. J. Killion have been considering this question, and I wish now to say a few things on the subject.

I will assume that the readers of the Firm Foundation have noticed the discussion, hence I shall simply call your attention to Brother Killion's last article, of the date June 10, 1913, and then go to the word of God, as more profitable to quote, and to abide in. The word says: "And he took the cup." Mark 14:23: "And he took the cup and gave thanks." Luke 22:17.

"Likewise also the cup after supper, saying This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Luke 22:20. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" 1 Cor. 10:16. "Ye can not drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." 1 Cor. 10:21. "In like manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying this cup is the New Testament in my blood." 1 Cor. 11:25. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:26. "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. 11:27. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." 1 Cor. 11:28.

Here any one can see that we have multiplied instances where the Lord himself and the Apostle Paul spoke of "the cup," "this cup," and "that cup." But there is not a single precept or line for the cups, these cups, or those cups. And we cannot in good, common sense, say that the cup, this cup, or that cup means that more than one cup was sanctioned in the communion. by the Lord or by the Apostles afterward. Paul says on this matter: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." 1 Cor. 11:23.

Hence we have every "Thus saith the Lord" restricting the number of cups to be used in any one congregation at one service to be but ONE. The word of the Lord unmistakably re-

stricts us to "one bread" (Loaf R. V.) and "cup" in one congregation. So brethren, let us endeavor to preserve oneness in the Lord's way.

In conclusion, let me say that I am old and growing feeble, and I want to go on record in favor of "The Cup," one and only ONE in one congregation of the body of Christ.

With love to all the brethren, and an admonition to unity as it is enjoined upon us and so beautifully set forth in the communion, I beg to subscribe myself, Yours in the ONE faith.—(Firm Foundation, June 17, 1913)

Debate

(Continued from page one)

what purpose was it "set apart?" Was it "set apart" for people to "observe?" Was it? Watch for his answer.

Then he comes to Isa. 58:13 where the Sabbath is called "My holy day" and says, "As the Lord definitely calls the Sabbath 'My holy day' and nothing is on record to show that any change has been made, we conclude that John was resting on the Lord's day—'My holy day.'" We will admit that he is correct in saying that the Sabbath is "My holy day" (Isa. 58:13); but that does not prove the sabbath to be the "Lord's day" of Rev. 1:10; nor that "the observance of the same is binding on Christians."

He says, "And as nothing is on record to show that any change has been made" he concludes "that John was resting on" the seventh day of the week. Of course, he means by this that the seventh day of the sabbath is the "Lord's Day" (Rev. 1:10). But as the command to keep the sabbath was given to the Jews only (Deut. 5:15)—those who were "Baptized unto Moses" (1 Cor. 10:1-3)—and the ones who are "baptized into Christ" (Gal. 3:27) are nowhere taught to "observe" the sabbath—"the seventh day of the week"—he has failed to establish his proposition.

His reference to the fact that "we are to follow the apostles," etc., does his proposition no good unless he can prove that they "observed" the sabbath. This he cannot do. Hence, his proposition will not stand under the light of the Gospel.

JAMES DOUGLAS PHILLIPS
Everton, Arkansas.

Explaining

Brookhaven, Miss., 3-13-28.

Dear Bro. Harper:

I got the Mar. issue of "The Truth" yesterday. The brethren might get the wrong idea from what you say "Well, I signed on both lines and returned one copy, and that ended it."

You remember when Tucker wrote you that he could not go ahead with the debate, I notified you that we

had another man to discuss the prop. You replied to this Jan. 6, and said that Tucker was first in line. As my name was used in the report, please publish this as an explanation.

HEWITT SMITH

Yes, I say "Tucker is first in line" because he, in his latest letter to me, of Dec. 26, 1927, says: "You need not worry yourself about the matter of me affirming my proposition with you."

I replied: "I hope you will continue as anxious for the debate as you say you are, and become so anxious that it may materialize, as you say you hope, 'before any distant date.'" (Letter Dec. 29, 1927.)

So, Tucker seems to be still in line. But what hinders? You remember, Brother Smith, that at the close of the New Salem debate, when a written debate on the same proposition was proposed, and Tucker put up the excuse for not doing this, that he had not the time, the brethren then and there said they would pay him for his time. Well, when they approached him, as you mention in your letter to me of August 6, 1927: "You all were going to pay Tucker for his time in holding the written debate. Tucker has notified them that when they got the money in the bank and arranged it so he can get it he is ready to start the debate."

Yes, I understand that he demanded a hundred dollars be thus put in the bank, but the brethren were not disposed to pay this much to him and under such conditions. But if it takes that to get him, I do not blame you for wanting to supply "another man," as you wrote me. But you now know what will bring him across—at least "ready to start," unless he has changed his mind. And since he has signed the proposition since all this occurred, it may be that he is now looking to "you all," instead of us, to start him off. Who knows? Many a man has been whipped for less than that. See whether you can't "Jew" him a little. If not, and he thus acknowledges that he cannot meet me, we are ready to consider a cheaper man.

Women in Silence

(J. C. Falkner)

It seems from the writings of the Sunday School advocates that they fully understand the Bible to condemn a woman's preaching, or teaching in public or leading a public prayer or singing a solo, as E. C. Fuqua tells us in his tract; yet they seem to see their way clear to allow women to teach classes in the Sunday School on the grounds that such teaching is private or like one teaching at home.

I have attended such gatherings where there were four parts of the same room occupied by four classes, some with women teachers, and I won-

dered if they really thought women were teaching privately "as if at home." And did they really think the men were teaching in private, too? And all this going on in the same room and at the same time, too. Surely they know it is not private. All the difference I could see, and I could see and hear them all, was that the men occupied one part of the room and the women the other. If one part of the room was public and the other part private, I knew nothing of it. It was all public, as I see it; but I should like to have them explain this matter. In the first place, the classes are unauthorized by the Bible and so is the human literature as they use it. In fact the whole Sunday School system is contrary to the word of God. And if we walk contrary to God's word, we cannot expect to be saved. Think it over, brethren.

Questions

I desire to ask brother C. F. Reese a few questions, as I see he has an article in this issue entitled "Sin in the Worship."

First, I want to ask you what you mean by saying it is a sin to have classes? Now I contend that we do now and always will have classes. But don't understand me to mean that we should divide the assembly into classes to teach them, but we have the classes just the same. Don't we?

I notice you say it is a sin for a woman to have her head shaved or shorn. Is anything that is a shame a sin? In other words, is a shame and sin synonymous terms? If a woman has her hair bobbed is her head uncovered?

I also notice you say that it is a sin to pass the hat for the contribution. Then, I ask, is it a sin to lay on the table? Is it a sin to carry it and give it to the deacon who had charge of the finances of the church? How is he to get the contribution into the treasury? Please tell us so we will know just how to proceed in this matter, but be sure to give chapter and verse for your proof. I want to ask Brother Reese do you use song books in the song service? Do you use blackboards and charts in your preaching? Do you have the audience to stand and sing and invite those who may want to become members of God's family to come forward and give you their hand? If so, don't you sin? There is no scripture for such procedure.

Now Brother Reese, I expect that I am just as much in favor of speaking where the Bible speaks and being silent where it is silent as you are and contending for primitive christianity, but I am positive you are overstepping when you take such positions.

Now Paul says for "each to lay by in store" but he did not say how to do that did he? You answer No. And

he did not say how not to do it, did he? You answer no. Then I ask how must we do it? I answer, where God has not prescribed a way to do a thing by precept or example, then we are to use our own judgment in the matter. Christ said "Go into all the world and preach the gospel." Now he did not say how to go and left that to our own pleasure or convenience, but said "Go." He also said to preach or teach the gospel. He did not say how to teach it but said "TEACH." He also left that to our convenience or pleasure. We can preach or teach privately, publicly or in writing. But the thing to do is to teach, that is a command we must obey. See? I also notice that you say it is a sin to have a plurality of cups. Now I would ask what was it the saviour blessed when he instituted the supper? Was it the cup? If yes, then should we not use that cup and would we not have an awful time finding it? And don't you think we would have an awful time getting to Jerusalem to use that one cup? Now how many cups were necessary when the Master instituted the supper. Don't you think that if we are to use the one cup only, and follow the example exactly as set forth in the scriptures that we should meet at night and that in an upper room? So you can see what such positions will get us into if we are not careful. Now I extend an invitation to any one who desires to become a member of the Church of God to come forward and give me their hand, but I don't contend that there is any scripture for such procedure, but we are instructed to persuade men, and God left it to our own discretion as to how for the candidate to let us know that he wanted to obey his Lord. But let us keep in mind that where God has not given an explicit rule then we are to use our own judgment in the matter.

Now this is not written as one who knows all or cares to show any great learning, but more as a warning that we may steer clear of these rocks that might cause us much embarrassment when we come in contact with the Sunday School folks and the digressives.

Submitted in love,
DOUGLASS DUNN

Reply

I am glad to consider these things with our good Brother Dunn, who has lately come out from the Sunday School digressives. The Jews in the time of Christ had a vain worship, and why? Not because God had failed to tell them how to worship—no! And Christ plainly pointed out their sin, saying: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines, the commandments of men." Matt. 15:9.

And we are warned, too, on this point, for Paul says (Touch not, taste not, handle not, which are all to per-

ish with the using); after the commandments and doctrines of men.—Col. 1:21; 22.

And if we are "not to think of men above that which is written," as Paul says in I Cor. 4:6, we are to go by what is written.

But our good Brother does not seem yet to be out of the fog of digression. He tells us he said "go" but did not say how to go; he said "teach" but did not say how to teach. If he said "go," we do what he says if we go; and this does not mean to stay and "take a pastorate." He said "preach," and we do not obey this by praying nor by singing, but by preaching. And when the church is assembled, he says how to teach, "for you may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted." (I Cor. 14:31). There is considerable how here brother. Shall we follow this or do as man says?

And we do not have to go to Jerusalem in search of one cup. If any congregation does not know how to furnish one, just let me know and I will get one for them. But perhaps they like man's way better and do not want to follow Jesus and Paul. Jesus took "a cup" or "the cup" and gave thanks and Paul says "the cup" when instructing the church at Corinth how, yes, HOW, brother, it is to be done. Do you think "the cup" which means just one cup, which they used at Corinth was brought from Jerusalem? I will not shame you, brother, but you surely know there is not a thing in what you say here but folly. I do not know how to follow an example unless I follow it "exactly." If otherwise is permissible, why not sprinkle for baptism, which is not exactly the example as given. Do you call this speaking where the Bible speaks? I don't. And it is not, either. You seem sadly off, brother, in speaking where the Bible is silent, and being silent where the Bible speaks. This is old.

When you pass the hat for money to carry on the Lord's day worship, do you not solicit? You do, and that is to beg. And that violates every precept of giving in the New Testament. And do you not pass the hat to the non-Christian as well as to the Christian? You do; and you would as well ask him to pray.

We evidently must not violate one part of God's word in carrying out another. And if they laid their gifts then they did not pass the hat to get them. (Acts 4:36).

Yes, I use song books that I may sing, as God requires me to do. And I use a blackboard, that "they may see with their eyes" (Matt. 13:15); and be converted, and I invite sinners to obey the gospel. (Rev. 22:17).

Yes, a thing that is "a shame" is a sin as respects God. God says, Let her be covered. (I Cor. 11:6). "For her hair is given to her for a cover-

ing. (V. 15). "If a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him." (11). "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her." (v. 15). This is the decorum that becomes the children of God, and to violate it is sin, which is a transgression of this law of God. You can wink at this all you please now, but God will not wink at your sin. Therefore repent and reform. "Sin, a violation of divine law, or rule of duty." (Webster) Do you think the apostle of God was thus reproving for a matter of no concern to eternal interests?

If you want to affirm that it is Scriptural to have classes where I referred. I Cor. 14:31, I will deny it, brother. You seem to want to overlook some things to try to make out a flaw. I have no use for digressives or semi-digressives. Come clean, brother. Think this over.

CHAS. F. REESE.

Paragraphs

"Let us all give our aid and encouragement to Brother Harper, and let the people have the truth. The paper cannot be put out without our constant support. And since we have, as one brother says, "The right man in the right place," let us do our part in getting Bible truth before the people.—J. E. Wigham, Opp, Ala.

We are going to work for "The Truth." We think it is fine, and will do much good. We are going to send it to everyone in our congregation who is not able to pay for it.—O. C. Mathews, Haldton, Okla.

Statement From Hodges

I do not believe you are doing the Adventists justice in representing me as one of them. I am a member of the Church of God.—Albert S. Hodges.

Remarks

Turning to Besse's History, I find this: "Church of God, Adventists, is a branch of the Seventh Day Adventists, the division occurred in 1888. The chief cause of the division was the claim that Mrs. Ellen G. White had visions which were accepted as inspired. These the new organization discredited."

There are at least six branches of the Adventists, and if the foregoing does not get Mr. Hodges, I presume the following will: "Church of God in Jesus Christ, Adventists, popularly known as Age-to-Come Adventists."—Ib.

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.

VOLUME 1.

SNEADS, FLA., MAY 1, 1928.

NUMBER 5

A Letter

Savannah, Ga., March 27, 1928.

Dear Bro. Harper:
Bro. J. A. Dennis and Albert S. Hodges have signed propositions to be discussed here on June 10, 11, 12 and 13. Mr. Hodges has asked that Mr. J. C. Karr, of Chicago, Ill., be permitted to take his place, which we have granted.

We are few in number here, and we have only enough money to take care of the debate. We would like to run a meeting after the debate, but this is impossible unless we can raise about sixty dollars.

I am not making this an appeal for money, but only to let you know our circumstances. And my only intention in writing you is to ask you whether you could arrange to be with us during the debate. We have hired an auditorium, and this will have to be paid for whether we use it or not. And if Bro. Dennis is prevented by sickness or otherwise, we would like some one to be here who can take his place. We are praying for this to be a success from every point of view.

Your Brother in Christ,
A. C. KESSLER

Sneads, Fla., Mch. 29, 1928

Dear Brother:

Rest assured that I was glad to hear from you and to know that you are putting up a brave fight for the truth; and it shall be a delight to me to help you in any way I can. For anything I now know, I can be with you. And I shall be glad to spend some time in preaching while there. Of course you know I am very busy, but never too busy to do the best I can with what little time I can spare under the circumstances, for I am very much interested in seeing the work in these neglected parts built up. But unless we keep constantly teaching and warning the brethren, this work will amount to nothing, or worse than nothing, for as soon as the brethren become strong, they go off to humanisms, just as Israel did. We have had this sad experience all the time. So long as a work is small and insignificant the Devil does not trouble it much; but when it becomes strong and really able to push the fight to his ruin, he captures it and perverts it from the way of the Lord.

With love,
H. C. HARPER
(Perhaps some of our readers would like to donate to this work)

Self Condemnation

"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth." Brethren often use this in giving the lesson that we should not condemn a person for doing or teaching a thing when we are guilty of doing or teaching the same thing or something equally as bad. This is a good lesson. I have often heard it used against the Sunday School brethren, for while they condemn the society and the instrumental music brethren, they are themselves just as guilty of doing something which they cannot read in the Bible. And this reminds us of the Saviour's language: "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

When brethren condemn any one for saying that they believe a person can be saved in any church, they generally begin to reason with such like this: Christ is the head of the body, the church—just one. And we are called into one body, the church—just one.

And when they hear brethren say they believe in the class system, they cite them to First Corinthians, 14:31 and give them Christ and the apostles always teaching, but not in classes.

But now let some one present the same line of Bible reasoning and proof for one cup in the communion, and they say: "Oh, that is different."

Now, there is just as much Scripture for one cup as there is for one body, or church, or for one kingdom, or for one teaching at a time in the church. Why do we contend for one body? for one kingdom? for one table? for "one bread?" for one cup? The answer is: Because the Bible so teaches and gives us the example. He took the cup or a cup. And Paul gives it the same. It is never in the plural.

Some say that Christ had reference only to the contents. Wonder where they learned that. Not from the Bible, I am sure. Do they really think he handled the contents without the cup? The cup is the communion of the blood of Christ. Hence without the cup there is no communion. If we have two cups, for instance, and pass one to the north side and the other to the south side of the assembly we destroy the communion, for to be such it must be common. So I say let those who advocate cups first cast out the beam from their own eye then they can see

The Price of A Virtuous Woman

There are certain characteristics that belong to virtuous women, which are always appreciated. The Bible is the book that claims to furnish the man of God with all good works. The Bible also treats on all subjects that pertain to life and Godliness. 2 Tim. 3:16-17. 2 Peter 1: 1-3. The word virtuous as it is used, means purity. A pure woman is the greatest of all earthly blessings. When God gave Eve to Adam, He gave him a virtuous, or pure woman. Women should study to learn what it takes to be virtuous. I know, and all other people ought to know, that a woman must stay in her place to be considered pure. But the trouble with women today is, they do not know where their place is. They think that when they become rough like a man, that they should still be respected as women. They think that when they dress so as to indicate that they need modesty, men ought not to say anything about it. But they would not like it at all if men would not notice them. Virtuous women do not like to make a display to get special attention. Sometimes fashion lovers will try to attract the attention of men by their dress, or in other words, by their lack of dress. If they are forced to wear a dress that comes below their knees, they will pull the dress up a little above the knees to try to keep people from thinking that they are ashamed of nakedness. Men do not look on this as virtue. They despise and abhor all such silly displays. Real men like to see women have some timidity. The Bible requires, or in other words, the Lord requires that women profess Godliness with shame-facedness and sobriety. See 1 Tim. 2:9, 10, 11. A loud mouthy woman is not admired by sensible men, neither is a woman admired who is not sober. A giddy, foolish girl or woman, is to be pitied. A virtuous woman is not inclined to want to be specially noticed by men. They want men to respect them, but they do not want men to devour them with their eyes. A virtuous woman is made to blush when she knows someone is thinking

clearly to take out the mote from their brother's eye. In love and for unity.

TOM E. SMITH,
Haldton, Okla.

that she is trying to get undue attention.

Women are warned to not try to make outward displays in order to attract attention. Paul and Peter both admonish women to not wear costly clothing, wear gold, pearls, etc., in order to get men to notice them. The spirit of primping is like wild fire among women of this age. I am sure this spirit is vain, and should be avoided by all women. If women will take the Bible as a guide in daily life, they will not only please the Lord, but they will be attractive in a way that will lead men to Christ. See 1 Pet. 3:1-6. Men are not made better by looking at women's legs. But, says one, they do not have to look. They cannot help seeing. They have a right to look ahead of them. But when women come before them with knee dresses or dresses shorter still, they see their legs, whether they want to or not. If they sit in a house where women wear short dresses, they either have to shut their eyes or look up all the time, or be embarrassed. Women have lost their shame. Men are put to shame by women dressing in a way that they attract attention to their limbs, and man's lower nature is appealed to, and many are led to attack women in a way that is very sinful, simply because they are made to think continually about things that should not entertain the mind of man. Women are greatly responsible for the downfall of many men. A man who is not a Christian will not want a woman for a wife who is not virtuous. A Christian man would be disgusted if he should learn that he had gotten a woman that had been a lewd woman. Women who love virtue should strive to hold up before the public a standard of virtue. She should abhor that light, flippant way of trying to be in style, regardless of what kind of style it is. The crowd is not the standard for a Christian girl or woman. The world is animated by a carnal spirit, and when women or men follow after the world just to be like the world they really belong to the world. One reason why Christian women today are following the immodest fashions, such as wearing knee dresses, painting their faces, bobbing their hair, etc., is because they either have to do that way or take a stand by themselves. Many are too weak in faith to take the Lord's way. They love the praise of men more than the praise of God.

"What is a modest woman?" says one. She is a woman that is sober, chaste, and dresses so as to leave no room for anyone to speak about her legs or her body. She endeavors to conduct herself so no one will have reasons to speak reproachfully of her dress or her conduct. She loves the home, and tries to build it up by making it a place of decency, and order. She does not like to place herself in a man's place. She is truly modest.

D. J. WHITTEN.

The People of God

It would be a great blessing to the church today if every member would search the Scriptures to learn what God has said about his people. It is natural for us to want to know what others think and say about us. All of us would like to see, in writing, just what our best friends think of us. God is our Father and he has had much to say about us as well as to us. God esteems his children very highly. If we can learn how much the Father loves us, we will be better prepared to know how much he expects of us. We will notice a few things that he has said about us:

"But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellence of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." I Peter 2:9, R. V. It is clear from this verse that God's people are not of the world, and that they are an exalted people. God demands that his people separate themselves from the world. "He gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession zealous of good works." Titus 2:14. The 11th and 12th verses of the same chapter show how God does this. In speaking of our coming out from the world the Apostle says, "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? 2 Cor. 6: 14, 15. And in the 17th verse he says: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, sayeth the Lord Almighty." From the foregoing passages, there is no more communion between the people of God and the world than there is between day and night, etc. We are not of the world, and therefore should not live as the world lives. "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. Do we realize how much God loves us? Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the Sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not because it knew Him not." John 3:1. In view of this love that the Father has for us and in view of the things he has promised us, the Apostle Peter admonishes us "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless." 2 Peter 3:14. When we are made to realize how few brethren

try to do as the Lord would have them do, it causes us to feel as though but very few of the professed members of the church of Christ will be saved. How much does the Father demand of the church to be acceptable to him? A holy life, a life of sacrifice, a life of separation from worldly practices, and a life of faithful service to him, is what He demands in order that we may be approved in His sight. What do the churches of Christ demand of the world, in the name of Christ, in becoming members of the body of Christ? Do the churches demand a repentance of all worldliness and sinful practices? No. People do not repent of conforming to the world, they can come into the church, and remain in fellowship, without coming out of lodges, and other close connections with the world. They can come into the church and continue to forsake the assembling of themselves together, and remain in full fellowship with the congregation. They can go to shows, dances, chew and smoke tobacco, joke and talk foolish, and remain in the congregation in full fellowship. Women can come into the church without repenting of bobbing their hair, and continue to bob it, and paint their faces, wear knee dresses, and conform to the world in almost every bad practice, and remain in the congregation in full fellowship. Brethren, in the sight of God such is sinful. Will we repent and try to live better, or will we go on until the church is ruined? In the last and final accounts what will the Father say to us, if we don't repent? Will he say well done, good and faithful servant? Brethren, please study over these things and help to get the church to live so as to be a light in this world.

Brotherly,

D. J. WHITTEN

Wine

Since some brethren have claimed that grape juice is not wine until it ferments; and since I have been called upon to give the Bible teaching on this subject, I offer the following for the consideration of all who may be interested in the question.

Be it remembered in the outset, that the expression "grape juice" is not in the Bible. The word "juice" is found but once (Song. 8:2), and here it is not grape juice, but that of the pomegranate. "I would cause thee to drink of spiced wine of the juice of my pomegranate."

The Lord promised Israel: "I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil." (Deut. 11:14). "Thou shalt observe the feast of tabernacles seven days after that thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine." (Deut. 16:13; also Jer. 40:10-12).

From the foregoing scriptures it is

clear that the people gathered in their wine—that this wine was in the grape and by gathering the grape they gathered the wine contained in the grapes.

We read of "new wine" in many passages in the Bible. But what is "new wine?" It is the new (fresh) grape juice. "So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." (Prov. 3: 10). This shows that when the grape juice is pressed out, it is "new wine." Jesus said "Neither do men put new wine into old bottles; else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." (Matt. 9:17.) Bottles of those days were not glass bottles, as we have now, but were made of the skins of animals. New bottles would expand as the wine went through the state of fermentation, and, therefore, would not break. But if the "new wine" (unfermented—fresh grape juice) be put into old bottles (which had already expanded) the expansion of the wine in the state of fermentation would break the bottles. Hence the wisdom and the necessity of putting "new wine into new bottles," allowing for expansion. From these passages, and many others, we learn that when the juice is pressed out of the grape, it is wine, and that it is "new wine." But this is not all. Hear Isaiah the prophet: "Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is it; so will I do for my servants' sake, that I may not destroy them all." (Isa. 65:8). This shows that "new wine" is "in the cluster." And surely no one would claim that wine is fermented while in cluster, before it is pressed out of the grape. It was the Lord that said: "New wine is in the cluster." When the Lord says a thing, that ought to settle it. This is positive proof that grape juice is wine both before and after being pressed out of the grape.

Another proof that grape juice is wine is the place where it is pressed out is a "wine press;" for if the juice were not wine when being pressed out then the press could not be a wine press, there being no wine to press out. "Thy presses shall burst out with new wine" (See passage above quoted). The "wine press" presses out wine as sure as the oil press presses out oil. "Gideon threshed wheat by the wine press" (See Judges 6:11). Wine presses were sometimes made in the vineyards (See Isa. 5:2; Matt. 21:33).

The word wine is defined, "The expressed juice of grapes, esp. when fermented." (Webster's Condensed Dictionary).

Young's Analytical Concordance defines wine, "3. What is pressed out, grape juice." The Greek word oinos translated wine in Mat. 9:17; Mk. 2: 22; Lk. 5:37, 38, Young defines, "Wine grape juice."

We also learn that wine is fruit. "The first fruit also of thy corn, and of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the first of the fleece of thy sheep, shalt thou give him" (the priest). The first of all fruits was due the priests, and wine is named as one of the fruits. (See Deut. 18:4). "And as soon as the commandment came abroad, the children of Israel brought in abundance the first fruits of corn, wine, and oil, and honey, and of all the increase of the field," etc. (2 Chr. 31:5). "And the fruit of all manner of trees, of wine, and of oil" must be brought to the priests; for this was their portion. (See Neh. 10:37). Thus we learn that wine is called fruit in the Old Testament, and in the New, Jesus called it fruit—"fruit of the vine" when he instituted his supper (See Matt. 26: 29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18).

Once more, this "new wine" (grape juice) is blood. Hear a prophecy concerning Christ: "Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes." (Gen. 49:11). Of Israel it is said: "And thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape." (Deut. 32: 14). And Jesus made this "pure blood of the grape" ("the fruit of the vine") to be the semblance of his blood when he took it, blessed it, and said: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (See Mat. 26:27-28-29 Mk. 14: 23-24-25). Jesus drank of the "pure blood of the grape"—"the fruit of the vine"—himself, and commanded his disciples all to drink of it. What we so often hear called grape juice, in our day, is called wine, new wine, in the Bible.

From the foregoing scriptures quoted (with others) we learn (1) that grape juice is wine; (2) that, while it is fresh (before it changes by fermentation), it is "new wine;" (3) that it is wine, new wine, even before it is pressed out, while it is still "in the cluster;" hence, as soon as the grape is ripe, the juice it contains is wine, new wine; (4) That this "new wine" (fresh grape juice) is fruit—"fruit of the vine" being the product of the grape vine; (5) That is has such a close semblance to blood, it is called blood—"the pure blood of the grape" and (6) That Jesus said of it, "This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

J. P. WATSON.

Cullings and Comments

The final end to which we should look is a complete return to primitive Christianity in doctrine, in practice, and in spirit: to believe precisely what the Scriptures teach, to practice only what they enjoin, and to reject everything they do not sanction.—Lard.

But we have progressed (?) somewhat since your time, Brother Lard,

and having taken off the brake, we have gone into the ditch, religiously speaking. And now we are getting together what is left of this religion wreck, and starting again; and may God help us to keep a hand on the brake, lest we, too, be lost.

"The word for angel is taken from the Hebrew Malak and the Greek Angelus and means a messenger. Los Angeles, California, is named for a lost angel."—Present Truth Messenger. (Adventist).

This would be amusing were it not for the fact that the average reader accepts such statements for the truth. People should be warned to be on the watch for error.

As a matter of truth, *angelus*, is the Latin for angel, and *angelos* is the Greek for the same; and Los Angeles is Spanish for *the angels*. Los, the; Angeles, angels.

News and Notes

J. Tom Williams, Eden, Texas.—I just saw a sample copy of your paper "The Truth," and I want it. You will find enclosed one dollar. I wish you success in publishing it.

J. W. Boatman, Dawson, Mo.—Having seen a copy of your paper, I like it very much. Am handing you here one dollar for one year.

E. A. Brown, Garland, Texas.—Herewith find one dollar. Please send me "The Truth" one year. I received a January sample copy, and it sounds good to me. Hope to send you more subs soon.

Mrs. Lila Phillips, Slaton, Texas.—I thank you very much for sending me the January and February numbers of the paper and if you have a March issue, would be exceedingly glad if you would enclose one with the April issue.

Brethren who wish the back numbers can get them by writing us what numbers they want.

Mrs. Zella Mullen, Ottumwa, Ia.—Enclosed find my subscription to "The Truth." A copy was sent me, and I think it is a fine little paper. I wish you success in your undertaking, and shall look forward to receiving the paper regularly.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.—I was with the church at Christian Home the first Lord's day in April with fine interest and good results; and with the church at Sweet gum on the 15th, but was almost rained out.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.—I came in from a preaching trip last week. Preached here Lord's day. I handed out copies of "The Truth" on my trip. Am glad we have one paper that is not afraid to publish both sides of any question. I have the evidence that some who make this claim simply state a falsehood. And I can furnish this evidence. The F. F. is not the only traitor to the cause of Christ.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

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

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR	- - - - -	\$1.00
SIX MONTHS	- - - - -	.50
THREE MONTHS	- - - - -	.25

MAY, 1928

Born Again

The following excerpt is taken from "Present Truth Messenger," a paper that advocates the teachings of the "Second Advent Christian Church." Read it carefully, and then read with the same care my reply.

THE SPIRIT BIRTH

The wind bloweth where it listeth (desireth or chooseth), and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. St. John 3:8.

We hear many dissertations on the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus.

Remarks as to him making a night visit and surmises as to the reason; his evident faith, his part in the burial of the crucified Christ, and other points are freely discussed: but the 8th paragraph is passed over as if of no moment.

It is the divine key that unlocks the mystery of "Ye must be born again." To call conversion the second birth will never stand the test of that 8th verse.

As plain and evident as can be; it is the resurrection of the saints to life eternal. The forty days that Christ was on earth after his resurrection, were marked in the recital by just that characteristic of his coming and going.

Let us be a little more careful in weighing evidence.

REPLY

But this dissertation on the eighth verse is not a weighing of evidence at all: it is simply assertion without proof. He has not attempted to analyze the sentence, and moreover he cannot correctly analyze the sentence without refuting his theory here asserted.

In the first place, why does he refer this to the resurrection only of the "saints?" Does not the Bible teach that "there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust?" It does. (Acts 24:13; John 5:28, 29.)

And this shows the absurdity of this theory.

In the second place, Jesus, in this conversation, is speaking of a birth of "water and the Spirit." Not two births, either, but "born again," and this birth is "of water and the Spirit."

And it is pneuma in every verse here in the Greek, hence the margin has it "Spirit," for the absurdity of one's being born of water and the wind, or of the wind, is too apparent to be seriously considered. The word pneuma occurs in the Greek New Testament scores of times, and this (John 3:8) is the only place where the King James version renders it "Wind." In fact, in this same verse, they have rendered it "Spirit." And it is a violation of the laws of any language that the same word should experience so radical a change of meaning in the same sentence.

In his debate with Mr. Rice, Presbyterian, Mr. Campbell said: "I wish Mr. Rice would give us the predicate of—So is every one that is born of the Spirit."

And seeing that Mr. Rice would not attempt to do so, Mr. Campbell said: "His main argument is—it is a mystery, and we cannot understand it; therefore his doctrine is true. I asked him to explain the predicate of the last proposition. The words are—So is everyone that is born of the Spirit. But he has not done so. He will not, I predict, explain even the word so in that clause. "So" what? That is the question he cannot answer and hold his theory."

I here give the verse in question from Anderson's translation: The Spirit breaths where it pleases, and you hear its voice, but you know not whence it comes, and whither it goes: so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit.

"Voice," not "sound" is evidently correct here, as the American Standard translators have put it. The Spirit was to "speak." (John 16:13), Hence "voice" as Jesus says.

"So" does not describe the condition or state of the thing born,—not by a long way. The Greek word here rendered so, is defined by Thayer: In the manner spoken of; in the way described; the way it was done; in this manner; in such a manner; thus; so." (Page 468). Hence "so" in this verse expresses the manner in which the birth is effected, this birth "of water and the Spirit." Now look this "square in the face."

So is every one that is born of the Spirit.

One is not "born" of the masculine sex, properly speaking, but is "begotten." Hence where the King James has "born of God," etc., the Revised has it "begotten." Then we have it:

In this manner is everyone that is begotten of the Spirit.

Putting this in what is called the natural order, we have—

Everyone that is begotten of the Spirit is in this manner.

Is *What* in this manner? Now we are coming to the "weighing of evidence." And the only thing that will logically complete this thought is—

Everyone that is begotten of the

Spirit is "begotten" in this manner.

And I challenge adverse criticisms. So the manner of the Spirit's function in begetting had been previously stated. What was it? Here it is: The Spirit breaths, or speaks as Jesus says. John 16:13) and you hear its voice (R. V.) . . . in this manner is everyone begotten that is begotten of the Spirit.

The inspired word is the word given by the Spirit. (Acts 2:4; John 16: 13; I Pet. 1:12). They spoke as the Spirit gave the utterance; they preached the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from Heaven, these Scriptures tell us.

And by hearing this "voice" one is begotten of the Spirit. Read it in so many words from the Bible. Here it is: "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God . . . And this is the word of good tidings which was preached unto you."—I Pet. 1: 23 (R. V.).

Paul tells the Corinthians: "In Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel." I Cor. 4:15 (R. V.) "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth."—James 1:18.

How is this? Let the bible answer. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."—Rom. 10:17.

No seed, no crop. "The seed is the word of God."—Luke 8:11. Then no word of God, no child of God. The Devil knows this much, for we read: "Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." (V. 12) On the other hand, "That on the good ground are they, who in an honest and good heart having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." (V. 15).

At the point of faith, then, there is an embryo child of God. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness."—Rom. 10:10.

Now we are on the way for a birth. There is a development through repentance, that is, as defined in the Greek by Thayer, a change of mind with a view to a reformation of life. Jesus said that "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, beginning from Jerusalem."—Luke 24:46.

Hence the command from the Apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost, in preaching the first gospel sermon (for unto him were given the keys of the kingdom.—Matt. 16: 18), to repent." And later he was called upon to preach to the Gentiles (Acts 10), and we find this: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."—Acts 11:18 to "repent." And later he was called upon to preach to the Gentiles (Acts 10) and we find this: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."—Acts 11: 18. Here, then is a genuine development for a birth. And so continuing this development we read:

"See, water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Phillip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."—Acts 8:36, 37. This is certainly a proper development, for we read: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."—Rom. 10:10.

And Paul says: "That is the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."—Rom. 10:9.

Jesus is the sinner's mediator; there is no approach to God without him.—Heb. 2:17. And he says: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven."—Matt. 10:22.

After this heavenly confession, "They went down into the water, both Phillip and the eunuch, and he baptized him . . . And he went on his way rejoicing."—Acts 8:38, 39. And no wonder, for Jesus said: Preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."—Mark 16:16.

In this manner is every one begotten of the Spirit by hearing the Spirit's voice through the Word: and thus is everyone brought forth in the birth of "water and the Spirit."—John 3: 5-8.

Here is now a child of God, one who has come into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.—Matt. 28:19

There may be many steps to the house; but there is a last step that takes one into the house. And so we read: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Gal 3:27. There is no "into Christ" till one is baptized.

Now don't all jump on this at once. I am ready to take one at a time. And "first come, first served." And I guarantee satisfaction.

("Present Truth Messenger"
Please Copy.)

How Readest Thou Again

Remember that in the new heaven and new earth things will be different. Rev. 21. You cite John 5:28, 29. Does Christ here say that the saints and the wicked will all be raised at the same time? No. But Paul says: "And the dead in Christ (not out of Christ) shall rise first." I Thes. 4:16. This agrees with I Cor. 15:23. And in Matt. 27:52, 53, it was only the saints which slept that arose, and not the wicked. In Matt. 25: 1-13, it is only the wise that get in, but the foolish are shut out. And this agrees with Dan. 12:10. Can you believe what Paul says in Rom. 11:25-36? In the new earth they will have a pure language.

Zeph. 3-9. They will be one. And Christ's prayer (John 17) will be answered. Read I Cor. 15:42-58, and see whether you think what is said in these verses will apply to the wicked. Then read Rev. 20: 6 and see if you think the wicked are included there. In Rev. 19:20, 21 the wicked are dead. In Rev. 20: 5 they are still dead. But in Rev. 20: 8 they are alive. Therefore the wicked will be raised after the Devil is loosed, which will be one thousand years after the saints are raised.—A. J. Thompson.

Rejoinder

I cited John 5:28, 29 in proof of the proposition that the eternal destiny hinged upon the manner of life each—the good and the bad—lived before death. All shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.

All hear his voice, and come forth; this makes the resurrection of "all" simultaneous. And both classes stand before Christ in judgment simultaneously. "And he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth sheep from goats. And to "one" he says, "inherit the kingdom;" and to "another" he says, "Depart . . . into eternal fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels . . . And these shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."—Matt. 25: 31-46.

"The dead in Christ shall rise first." I Thes. 4:16. You misapply this. Paul applies it to "we who are alive and remain," while you apply it to the "resurrection of the wicked." Not "the dead in Christ shall rise first" and then the wicked, as you have it; but "the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them" to meet the Lord; and thus it is explained how the living saints, at Christ's coming, "shall not precede them which are asleep." For these dead ones arise first, then with the living they are caught away.

And I Cor. 15:23 says, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Vs. 22, 23.

"Each in his own order," or class. And we have shown that there are just two classes—"the just and the unjust." Acts 24: 15; John 5:29; Matt. 25:46; Rev. 20: 11-15. Each is made alive "in his own order," or class. The class or "order," that he went down to death in, is the class he is "made alive" in at the resurrection; and there is nothing here to indicate that both classes are not "made alive" at the same time. In fact the context clearly shows that it is at the same time.

Notice, "By man death, also by man the resurrection of the dead." Vs. 21. "The dead" includes all, the good and

the bad, "For as in Adam all die (the good and the bad), even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Verse 22. "But every man in his own class."—Verse 24.

Again: "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" Verse 35. "The dead" includes all the dead. "With what body do they come?" "The dead shall be raised incorruptible."—Verse 52. "It is sown a natural body: it is raised a spiritual body." Verse 44. "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." Vs. 54.

Then so long as even one mortal body remains death is not conquered. But there will be a time when "Death is swallowed up in victory." And that time is when "the dead shall be raised incorruptible." Verse 52.

Yes, in Matt. 27:52, 53 only the saints arose, hence some contend that this is the "first resurrection" of Rev. 20: 6.

Yes, as you say, "Only the wise get in, but the foolish are shut out." Matt. 25: 1-13. And this is further shown in the same chapter, as I have already quoted, in verses 31-46. And the "foolish" are those that fail to make preparation before death (Luke 12: 16-21), or before Christ comes. Matt. 25:13. And Dan. 12:10 simply points out this fact.

Yes, I can believe what Paul says in Rom. 1:25-36. Can you point out something there that I do not believe?

When Christ comes, he leaves the mediatorial throne (Heb. 9:28), and hence if his prayer in the seventeenth chapter of John is answered, it will be answered before he comes. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, . . . that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John 17: 20, 21.

Time for believing will have passed when Jesus comes.

I have clearly shown that the wicked are included in I Cor. 35-58.

No, the wicked are not included in Rev. 20:6, but they are in Rev. 20:15. And both classes were before God in judgment in verse 12, after the resurrection. There was a resurrection of some "saints," at least, after the resurrection of Christ. Matt. 27: 52, 53. But there is yet future "a (one if you please) resurrection both of the just and unjust." Acts 24:15. Both are in "a (one) resurrection."

I have no theory to put forth on the thousand years of Rev. 20:5. And no theory should be held that contradicts the plain, unfigurative parts of the Bible. I am ready to affirm with any man that the just and the unjust shall be resurrected simultaneously and appear at the same time before the judgment seat, and are there sent to their respective places eternally.

The Plan of Salvation

(Number 3)

We have seen that "dia" (Rom. 4: 25) is not the preposition used in Acts 2:38, but "eis" is there used, and if Mr. Vanzandt knows anything worthy of credit on this subject he knows that "eis" determines the meaning of "for" in the Common Version, and not "for" the meaning of "eis." And according to a united scholarship, yes, according to Mr. Vanzandt himself, "eis" means "unto, or in order to," not "on account of, or because of." Hence, according to his own showing, baptism is proved to be "essential to salvation."

We might safely rest the whole case here, but let us examine another inspired sermon. The next day Peter preached again, and when the people believed ("Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17), as on the previous day, he said: "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out."

Here are two things yet to be done (that your sins may be blotted out) namely, "repent and turn again." Who will deny this? Here were people in the same condition that others were on the previous day when he said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto, or in order to, the remission of your sins." And when they repented, all were in the same condition again. Hence, if the holy spirit "testified" the same on both occasions, the conditions of salvation were the same for both. Hence to "turn again" these would have to "be baptized"—and this too, "that your sins may be blotted out." Who cannot see this? Here again we see that "baptism is essential to salvation," just as Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Sinner friend, can you take him at his word? Can't you trust Him?

It should not read, "is saved" instead of "shall be saved." Look at His "logic." Take, for example: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved" (Acts 16:31). Now let us perform the Vanzandt act using "belief" instead of "baptism:" "It is claimed that this (Acts 16:31) makes belief essential to salvation. I admit it, but ask, what kind of salvation? The verse does not say. Believe and thou 'art saved,' but 'shalt be saved.' This future salvation is not due until Jesus comes." Wonderful "logic!" It looks as though he is trying to evade the truth instead of seeking the truth!

He seems to think that baptism is not a condition of "justifying faith," but it is. A faith not "made perfect" is not counted; it is "dead." Hence "a man," and that is any man, is justified "not by faith only." (Jas. 2:21-26). And this agrees exactly with the Spirit's "testimony," as we have seen in the foregoing passages.

Yes, baptism comes after repentance. And repentance comes after faith;

for repentance is pleasing to God (II Pet. 3:9), but "without faith it is impossible to please him" (Heb. 11:5). Again: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17); hence, if repentance comes before faith, it comes without the word of God and makes preaching useless, but it is not (I Cor. 1:21.)

In conclusion I wish to ask: Does Mr. Vanzandt believe that Peter commanded persons who already had the remission of their sins, saying: "Repent, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out?" Does he? If so, let him tell us.

(To Be Continued)

The Law of Adoption (?)

You, dear reader, have doubtless listened to many a sermon upon the law of adoption; it has been, and is, a favorite theme with many christian preachers and I would hesitate to say how often I have listened to eloquent and soul stirring preachments upon this subject, but always my mind would revert to the expression of the old lady who for the first time looked at a giraffe—"there ain't no sich animal." We would be amazed to hear of anyone speak of adopting into the family one who has been born into it, and as we are born into the family of God on earth, certainly we are illogical in speaking of a law by which we are adopted into it.

But, you reply, adoption is a Bible word and must express a Bible idea. True enough, but the Bible idea is quite different from the one set forth in the sermons I have heard upon this subject, and I am positively assured there is no mention in the Bible of any law of adoption. When baptized for the remission of sins, we are born of water and spirit into the family of God on earth, the church, the body of Christ, and have no need to be adopted. What, then, is adoption? Surely this word is one of vital significance to the child of God; for Paul says, "having predestinated us unto the adoption of children of Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." Eph. 1:5. I would call attention to the fact that the "us" of whom this is predicated are not alien sinners, but refers to some who are already the children of God, and cannot refer to the passage from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Adoption is something God has predestinated for us, for we are the children of God. What is this something? Why not get the Bible definition of this word? It is given in terms so unmistakable that there is no reason why the wayfaring man, though a fool, should err therein.

A plain Bible statement will always clear up the mystery that often hangs like an obscuring cloud about the theories that men preach. In Romans 8:23, Paul says, "And not only they,

but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit (Christians, if you please), even we ourselves groan within THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY." The adoption, then, is the redemption, or resurrection of the body into the glorious liberty of the children of God at the coming of our Lord. But some will say, Paul speaks of our having the spirit of adoption in this very same chapter, verse 15; and if we have the spirit of adoption, have we not the adoption? Can we have the one and not the other? Suppose we let Paul explain himself on this point. In the 11th verse of this same chapter he says "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Could any explanation be clearer than this? The Spirit of adoption is the spirit by which we are to be raised from the dead, in other words, accomplish the adoption spoken of, "the redemption of the body."

To show how beautifully the scriptures all harmonize, let us use the term resurrection of sons in lieu of adoption in another passage, Gal. 4: 4, 5. "But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the resurrection of sons." But some one is ready to say, I still see the same objection you pointed out in the beginning; if we have been born into the family when baptized, how can we be adopted at the resurrection? Paul has not left us in any doubt upon that point either; the body we now have, which was born of water, is not the same body we will have in the resurrection, hence the body that is given us then is adopted. "But, some man will say, how are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or some other grain, but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." Our earthly, mortal bodies are born into the family here, and in the resurrection we receive glorious, spiritual bodies, which are adopted in lieu of the ones of dust which are laid in the tomb.

G. A. TROTT

FALL AND RESTORATION OF MAN

(Rufus T. McNeely)

When man came from God's hand by creation, he was good. No change in his body or spirit would have made him any better, because he was made in God's image. He was put on trial, and through temptation, fell. And if we consider this matter closely, it will greatly assist us in understanding the law of restoration.

God has spoken his law: Adam and

Eve knew its meaning, for they were responsible beings. The serpent presented a plea to Eve, which was contrary to the word of God. She heard it, but this did not condemn her. She evidently believed this false testimony; but this belief was not what condemned them. They obeyed the voice of the serpent, and this act brought condemnation. They ate of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and God had said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."—Gen. 2:17.

When Jesus, that is, Saviour, came into the world, he said, "I am the way, the truth and the life." John 14: 6. Then he is the way back to God, for he tells us, "no man cometh unto the father but by me."

Now how are we brought back to God?

1. We must hear the truth. Matt. 13:15; Rom. 10:17; Luke 8:15.

2. We must believe the truth. Heb. 11:6; Mark 16:16; Acts 8:12.

3. We must obey the truth. Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth." 1 Pet. 1:22; "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36.

Nothing can be more reasonable than this, for if hearing, believing and obeying a falsehood led man away from God, then hearing, believing, and obeying the truth must bring man back to God. And this is just what the Bible teaches. But some men advocate a different way back, claiming that man is justified before God when he believes. But in as much as man was not condemned when he believed and before he obeyed the falsehood, it is not reasonable that he is justified when he believes and before he obeys the truth. And the Bible clearly teaches that faith without obedience will not save. James 2:17-22.

Man, in his restoration, is not brought back to the garden of Eden, but he is brought into the kingdom of God's dear son." Col. 1:12, 13. And here he has all spiritual blessings.—Eph. 1:3; 2:6.

He must obey all the laws of the Son of God. (Matt. 29:20), or he will be cast out forever. Matt. 8:11, 12.

Man was made in the likeness and image of God, and this places him above all other creatures of earth. This means that man has a spiritual nature, which other creatures did not have. At first he was pure and innocent. In the fall he did not lose his spiritual nature, but he lost his purity and innocence. In Christ he is forgiven all sins (Acts 2:38; Col. 2:12, 13; Rom. 6:17, 18), and is restored to purity and innocence. He must now continue to be conformed to the image of God's son. Rom. 8:29. And Christ is the express image of God's person. Heb. 1:3. So in becoming like Christ we become godly.

Let us ever continue this growth

and move on a higher plane of Christian living, ever contending for the truth, which will make us free.

My time is now open for meetings, and I hope to be busy. If you wish a meeting, write me at Healdton, Oklahoma.—Rufus T. McNeely.

Baptism Of The Holy Ghost

If you will furnish me space in your paper I would like to say a few words on the subject of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and how people get into Jesus Christ. We will first notice Rom. 6:24. Paul said our redemption is in Christ Jesus and Peter tells us in Acts. 4:12. "Neither is there Salvation in any other." Then for one to be saved he must be in Christ Jesus, then how do we get into Christ? Paul says in Rom. 6:4. "We are Baptized into Him" the question, then, is it Baptism of the Holy Ghost? Some of our most prominent preachers say it is. The apostles, were they children of God before Jesus ascended? He said they were. John 15:3 4-19. Had they received the Holy Ghost? Yes! John 20:22. Were they Sons of God before they received the Spirit? Paul said they were. Gal. 4:6. Had they been Baptized with the Holy Ghost? Jesus said they had not; but would be not many days hence. Acts 1:5. Had the baptism of the Holy Ghost been prophesied? Yes. Joel 2:25. Was it fulfilled? Yes. Acts 2:11-17.

Then there is a difference in receiving the spirit and the baptism of the spirit. You will note Baptism takes its name after the element, and not after the subject nor administrator. You will note also it takes three things to constitute a baptism; first, an administrator; second, a subject; third an element. Matt. 2:11. I indeed baptize you with water, hence water being the administrator, and believes the subject, John's baptism was water baptism.

John also tells us that Jesus is the administrator of the Holy Ghost baptism. Matt. 3:11. Luke 3:16. And Paul says in I Cor. 12:13. That the Spirit is the administrator of the baptism that puts us into the one body, (or Christ) therefore Jesus being the administrator of the Holy Ghost baptism, and the Spirit that put us into Christ. It surely is not baptism of the Holy Ghost that puts us into Christ, the Spirit then being the administrator of the baptism that puts us into the one body (or Christ). We can readily see, beyond a doubt, that the baptism by the Spirit, not of the Spirit is the baptism that makes disciples out of people of the devil's kingdom. Gal. 1:13. Hence the Spirit, being the administrator of the baptism that puts us into the one body (or Christ).

We must now look for the element while some might ask what is the subject? It is the soul or Spirit of man;

the intellectual part of man that has the power of judging, that governs every act of man; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness. Rom. 6:16.

Now to the element. Mark 1:4. John indeed baptized with water and preached the baptism of Repentance. To whom did John administer baptism. To those that brought forth fruit of repentance, were they children of God? Indeed they were. Luke 1:17. These had believed John's preaching they had repented, and had received the baptism of repentance. Acts 19:4. To whom did John refuse to administer baptism? To those who brought no fruit of repentance. Matt. 3:11. Hence John administered baptism to believers! children of God! Jesus said: except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish! Therefore the baptism of repentance puts us into Jesus Christ.

We find that in all ages, repentance is the unifying act that man must do in order for reconciliation with God. Sinners have been commanded to repent in every age of man upon this earth; and because of repentance, God pardons the sinner, and in the act of pardon he becomes a child of God. And because he is a son, God sends forth the Spirit of His Son into his heart crying, Abba, father. Gal. 4:6. Then we receive not the Spirit in order to make us sons. But we receive the Spirit after regeneration, to make us know we are sons. Rom. 8: 16. I John 3:24. So then the act that makes a child of God out of a sinner is repentance, and John called it a baptism. Mark 1:4. And as a man cannot be a child of God out of Christ it must be the same act that puts us into the one body of Christ, that Paul called baptism in Rom. 6:4. And the administrator of that baptism is the "One Spirit," that Paul spoke of in First Cor. 12:13.

I wish to emphasize the great fact that sinners of all ages have been commanded to repent of their sins as the only way of receiving pardon. And the New Testament refers to repentance as a Baptism. John the Baptist preached the baptism of repentance for remission of sins. And Paul taught the same in Rom. 6:4 in which is shown the baptism of repentance, "By the Spirit," is the great unifying act that makes all people look alike in their relationship to God as His Children.

ELD. C. C. KITCHENS
Gravelly, Ark.

Review of the Foregoing

It is astonishing to what people will resort to evade the truth. It is so clearly stated and so often repeated that sinners are not saved until they have been baptized, that but few have the conscience to deny it. "Baptized into Christ," "baptized into his death" "baptized into one body," "baptized for the remission of sins," "He that

believeth and is baptized shall be saved," "baptism doth also now save us," "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," are Bible expressions familiar to every Bible reader.

That Jesus commanded baptism and that the apostles in carrying out his commission commanded sinners to be baptized, is plainly stated in the scriptures. But there is another baptism mentioned in connection with the beginning of the New Covenant: Jesus said to his Apostles after his resurrection, "Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Acts 1:5. And ten days later "when the day of Pentecost was now come," this promise—for it was a promise, not a command—was fulfilled. And here now they "preached the gospel by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven." I Pet. 1:12.

And the Holy Spirit, through Peter speaking as the Spirit gave him to utter forth, here commanded sinners, saying: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." Acts 2:38. "They then that received his word were baptized and there were added in that day about three thousand souls." Acts 2:41. Hence "By one Spirit" they were "all baptized into one body," for the Spirit directed the whole matter: just as "Jesus baptized." "Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," that his disciples baptized by his direction.

Jesus commanded his apostles to preach the gospel, adding: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16:15, 16. And man is the administrator of this baptism.—Matt. 28:19.

It is conceded that "for one to be saved he must be in Christ." But for one to be saved one must believe and be baptized, "Man being the administrator, as here stated in the Scriptures. Mk. 16: 15, 16.

Therefore to be "in Christ" one must be baptized, "man being the administrator." To break this argument, one must break the scriptures.

It is clearly shown in the above article that the baptism that takes one "in Christ" cannot be "Holy Ghost" baptism, for Christ is the administrator in this baptism. But he makes as big a blunder in his contention as his brethren do who contend that this is "baptism of the Holy Ghost."

He says: "So then the act that makes a child of God out of a sinner, is repentance, and John calls it a baptism." Again he says: "And the New Testament refers to repentance as a baptism."

It is hard to restrain a smile at this, but we shall treat it seriously. He cites Mark 1:4: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

"Of repentance" is here the translation of one Greek word in the gen-

itive case modifying the word rendered baptism, just as in the expression where Jesus says, "The baptism of John, whence was it?" (Matt. 21:25), "of John" is the translation of one Greek word in the genitive modifying the word rendered baptism. In the expression "baptism of John." John is not referred to as a baptism; neither is "repentance" referred to as a baptism in the expression "baptism of repentance." But these expressions both signify what was being performed "in the Jordan." Hence Thayer, in his lexicon of the New Testament, says: "Baptism of Repentance, baptism binding its subjects to repentance." And this disposes of his feeble effort to escape the baptism commanded by the Son of God.

Now listen to another absurd effort from the same paper, "The True Blue," issue of Jan. 1, 1928. They say that "They teach that it takes testimony to produce faith, and that there (are) two kinds of testimony, one is the testimony of men, which is termed historical testimony (this produces historical faith) this produces repentance; there is a divine witness which is the Holy Ghost, this witness produces divine evidence, and this divine evidence brings about divine faith, this faith follows repentance."

Let us examine this. They say historical faith "precedes repentance," and is produced by the testimony of men; but divine faith "follows repentance," and is produced by divine evidence of the Holy Spirit.

But by their contention they have the man saved at repentance, as the above article shows; then if the man is saved by faith at all, it is the faith that precedes repentance, which is historical faith and is produced by the testimony of men. Hence, according to Baptist doctrine a man is saved without "divine faith" for this faith follows repentance and man is saved at repentance, per Baptist doctrine.

The truth is, the Bible makes no such classification of faith. But says "Faith comes by hearing the word of God." Rom. 10:17. And the Devil says Jesus took the word out of the man's heart "lest he should believe and be saved." Luke 8:12. There is a "dead" faith, which is "faith without works," which avails nothing for salvation. Jas. 2:20-26. Hence Paul says they "obeyed that form of doctrine" and were then made free from sin, and were then in Christ, having been "baptized into Christ." Hence it was a baptism in which they obeyed the command of Christ. But this was the baptism the apostles were to administer as the Spirit directed. (See Rom. 6: 1-8; Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:1-38).

In fact, as Paul states, "there is one faith and one baptism." Eph. 4:4. And this settles this matter. A faith that will obey in the baptism commanded by Christ brings to salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," says the Son of God.

And his promise is sure to such. May God help us to stay with the word.
W. H. REYNOLDS,
Kinston, Ala.

Cullings and Comments

"I cannot believe the soul is immortal for then I must believe the unscriptural, unreasonable, infidel-making dogma of eternal torment."—Present Truth Messenger.

Well, man has both soul and body. We read: "And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul."—Matt. 10:28. Can you kill a thing that does not have life? Men can kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul. You can kill only that which is mortal. The body is mortal—"your mortal body" (Rom. 6:12), "your mortal bodies" (Rom. 8:11), "our mortal flesh" (II Cor. 4:11). Hence only the body dies.

But the Bible says Adam "died." Yes, and the Bible says: "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die" (I Cor. 15:36); "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (John 12:24).

The Bible says the grain dies, but the germ does not die, neither does the soul die. If it did, there could no more be a resurrection than there could be another grain without a creation.

Only the "mortal body" dies, and only the body is resurrected. "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?"—I Cor. 15:35.

"The dead shall be raised incorruptible."—I Cor. 15:52. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory—it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."—I Cor. 15:42.

"The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death . . . 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 Hades, where is thy victory?"—I Cor. 15:26-55.

And since "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts 24:15; John 5:28; Rev. 20:12; Matt. 25:1-46), there must be a place for the unjust. Hence we read; "But rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gr. gehenna). "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye accursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels."—Matt. 25:41. "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire . . . And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."—Rev. 20:10-15.

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.

VOLUME 1.

SNEADS, FLA., JUNE 1, 1928

NUMBER 6

Inference vs. Faith

What, really, is an inference? Can it ever be rated higher than an opinion in other words a guess? I know that we often hear of "necessary inferences" and are told that a necessary inference is of binding force; but unfortunately, what seems a necessary inference to one may not be so accepted by another and speaking personally, I value my soul's salvation too highly to risk it on inferences (a guess, if you please) unless I can find that there is neither precept or example in the word of God to follow.

Human reason is always fallible and the best gifted men along that line may have some undetected flaw in their logic that would lead us astray. The God who created man gave him dominion over the earth and all things earthly and gave to him a mind that is fairly capable of solving all problems pertaining to his life, but He never intended man to rely upon it in matters pertaining to spiritual things. In such things we are expected and warned to distrust the human mind entirely and allow God's word to reign supremely in our lives. "It is not in him that walketh to direct his steps," therefore God never failed to give adequate instruction, by precept or example, which our faith in Him as the source of all wisdom and knowledge impels us to follow, for in things spiritual, we "walk by faith and not by sight," and God has never left any vital matter to be determined by the inferential reasoning of man's fallible mind. It is a lamentable fact that some of the keenest minds and intellects that have been sharpened by the highest educational culture have led men into some of the most grievous and damnable errors that exist in the religious world today. It is never safe to argue that such and such a thing is not anywhere forbidden in the scriptures. The old testament scriptures abound in such expressions as "thou shalt not," but in the New Testament scriptures we have positive precept and example and commands of a negative kind are seldom seen and even where things are expressly forbidden there, such as the women speaking in assembly, plenty of men have tried to prove by inferential reasoning that the apostles did not mean what they said, and seem to have succeeded in satisfying themselves and many followers.

It is an old saying that "one man's opinion is as good as another's" and so

Notice to the Brethren

I shall be out west in meetings all summer, and brethren desiring me to visit them should write me in time to do so as I pass. I shall start the last of May or early in June. Address me at Sneads, Florida, or at some other place as I pass.

H. C. HARPER.

far as I am concerned, it may be so, but I would hate to rest my hopes of salvation on any man's opinion. "The testimony of the Lord is sure." (Ps. 19:7). "All his commandments are sure." (Ps. 111:7). And the only way to be SURE in our striving for our heavenly goal is to adhere closely to the precepts and examples of the New Testament. I believe the only safe thing for the child of God is to search diligently to learn what God wants us to do and whether he has furnished us with precept or example as to how it was done by the apostles and take them as our guide, for which purpose they were surely given. I am perfectly willing to admit that there are a few things the Lord has left to our discretion and that in such things we may be sure that no vital principle is involved and are at liberty to adapt our obedience to the command in the way that circumstances may demand exercising care that we do only that which is in entire harmony with all other things taught. It is never safe to seek for some way in which we can maintain our own preferences nor to what limit we may extend our liberty without offense. The main thought in the true Christian's mind being to know what the Lord commands and to do it as nearly as we can in the revealed way.

G. A. TROTT

Propositions For Public Discussion

Discussion between Jas. D. Phillips and Ira C. Moore, at South Charleston, West Virginia.

Proposition 1. The Scriptures teach that the properly constituted Elders of a congregation of the Church of Christ are the rightfully 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

News and Notes

A. W. Fenter, Jacksboro, Texas.—I saw a copy of your paper a few days ago. I like it fine and appreciate your effort in the work with a paper like "The Truth". You will please find enclosed five dollars for subscriptions.

Jim Baker, Floydada, Texas.—We like the paper fine.

G. A. Trott, Munday, Texas.—I am enclosing a short article. I wish you success.

W. J. Harris, Blevins, Ark.—Please send me a bundle of sample copies of "The Truth". I'll put them to best use, and good reading matter is badly needed by the people here. I just found you again through Brother Trott, and I want the paper. So let 'em come; I want a paper where I can read after you and Bro. Trott. Now "forget me not."

B. J. Everrett, Scott, Ga.—Your paper puts the truth right where I can get it at a glance. Start me off with the February issue, please.

J. C. Wheeler, Essom Hill, Ga.—I like the truth in its purity and so contrasted with error that anyone can see the difference.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.—I intend to give you all the support I can. I regard you the ablest writer we have and one of the soundest men in the brotherhood.

knowledge of God's word in their community, even 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.

Ira C. Moore, affirms.

Jas. D. Phillips, denies.

Proposition 2. The Scriptures teach that to preach that an assembly (any and all assemblies of the Church of Christ that are under the oversight of the Elders of the church), for better and more efficient teaching, may be divided into groups or classes, and that suitable women may be appointed by the Elders as teachers, is heresy.

Jas. D. Phillips, affirms.

Ira C. Moore, denies.

Notes and Comments

"I was convinced that the Church of Christ has a 'thus saith the Lord' for what she does."—John C. Roady, in "What the Church of Christ Believes and Teaches and Why It Teaches It."

Yes, I see. You were "convinced that the Church of Christ has a 'thus saith the Lord' for what she does," but that proves nothing in behalf of the faction you stand identified with, known by its friends as the "Review family". It is evident that the Review family isn't 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 People's Meetings and Pastorates held by A. W. Harvey and L. N. Raines at Bloomington, Indiana.

"The Church of Christ teaches that a man must confess Christ in order to enjoy Heaven after death. Matt. 10:32: 'Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in Heaven.'—Ibid.

Yes, the "Church of Christ" does teach "that a man must confess Christ in order to enjoy Heaven", but the "Review family" with which Brother Roady is identified, teaches in practice, if not in theory, that it is right to go to a Baptist meeting, confess that he "feels that God has for Christ's sake pardoned his sins," be baptized on that confession, be received into the fellowship of the Church of Christ as one who "has obeyed the right doctrine, but joined with the wrong church." There is a difference, then, in the "Review family", a faction in the Church of Christ, and the real church of Christ.

"But I shall call your attention to different translations of this passage (Acts 2:38). The Modern Speech New Testament reads: 'Repent', replied Peter, 'and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ, with a view to the remission of sins.'—Ibid. Good! But, why is it that Brother Roady will teach thus and at the same time receive Baptists and others who have not obeyed the command to "be baptized with a view to the remission of sins," and who have made no confession except that "God for Christ's sake pardoned my sins," into the fellowship of what he calls "the church of Christ" without Baptism? Echo answers, WHY?

"We are to walk by faith, and that comes by hearing the Word of God. Rom. 1:17. We cannot use the music by faith because the Word of God does not say to have it. Therefore it is a sin for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23.—Ibid.

I wonder why Brother Roady learned that it was wrong to use instru-

mental music in the church and right to have the classes—a thing not only unauthorized, but positively condemned by the Scriptures (1 Cor. 14:31).

JAMES DOUGLAS PHILLIPS,
439 N. Drury Ave.,
Kansas City, Mo.

Debate

The Scriptures teach that the Seventh day of the week is the Lord's Day referred to in Rev. 1:10 and the observance of the same is binding on all followers of Christ.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

As the Text in Rev. 1:10 does not name the day of the week we are to locate it elsewhere in the scriptures. Remember our proposition is broad and says "the scriptures teach" and when we find that no other day of the seven has ever been set apart for rest and worship by the Creator and since the Apostle John was a passionate lover of God and had written, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments (1st John 5:3), we reasonably conclude that he was observing the (Sabbath) seventh day of the week and properly called it the Lord's Day—the one sanctified at Creation. Gen. 2:2-3.

Brother Phillips wants to know what observance means. Webster defines the word as "the act of keeping, or adhering to in practice." Sabbath observance is to do no SERVILE work. Lev. 23. To kindle no fires. Ex. 35:3. Not doing your own way or finding your own pleasure." Isa. 58:13. But delight in the Lord's Way. V. 14.

Brother Phillips says, "He seems to make no distinction between what Moses command and what Christ taught." It was God's teachings in each case and they SHOULD BE IN PERFECT HARMONY. The only exception being the remission of sins by pardon through the name of Christ without a compliance with sacrificial law. This right God has always observed, even when sacrificial offerings were in order. The "curses" of the law were a part of the same and were a part of the agreement or covenant. These "curses" were only remitted or forgiven, being nailed to the cross.

Keep this in mind and you will never be confused over what was taken out of the way by the Gospel. To make it plain by illustration. A man is pardoned in our state by the chief executive. Now all the penalties or curses against that man are removed. Question: Has the governor abolished any law from the statute books. He has given "good news" or "gospel" to the man, but no law has been abolished.

When martial law is declared in a district the laws of the land are only suspended temporarily, and all jurisdiction placed in a commander. This is just what God has done in the earth. Made Jesus mediator and commander and no law is abolished in an absol-

ute sense, and there is distinction between what God taught by Moses and the Gospel that came by Christ.

There were no "Jews" until after the covenant was broken and God was their enemy. (Lamentations 2:5).

It was after this that a portion of Israel were called Jews so why use such petty foggerly as "Jewish laws" when as a matter of fact they were GOD'S LAWS given to Israel, his chosen people, and He also chose their name Israel and let's call them by their proper name.

Bro. Phillips is in error when he insists that the law given through Moses was for Israel only or he puts it "the Jews only". All strangers were welcome to join Israel by subscribing to God's laws—"One law shall be unto him that is homeborn and to him that is a stranger." Love ye therefore the stranger. Exod. 12:49. The Lord loveth the stranger, love ye therefore the stranger." Deut. 10:18-19. Thou shalt love him as thyself. Lev. 19:34.

Wise up, Brother Phillips, and never say again that the law was given to "Jews only". John saw the immortal host in vision and declared, "here are they that keep the commandments of God and have the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. Keeping the commandments of God includes sabbath observance, thus linking up the commandments of God with salvation.

The apostle met on the sabbath with both Jew and Gentile. Acts 13:14-42-44. Acts 16:13. Acts 17:2-3. Acts 18:4-11.

Jesus when asked what to do to inherit eternal life replied—keep the commandments and proceeded to enumerate them. Mark 10:19. Jesus loved such (verse 21). Do you?

—Albert S. Hodges.

REPLY

1. His first argument is a repetition of one in his first article. I answered it. Hence I pass it by.

2. He says I want to know what "observance" means. Not so! I know the meaning of "observance". But I did ask him what HE meant by "the observance of the same", for he says it "is binding on" Christians. I want to know how he learned that Christians are to "observe" the Sabbath and HOW Christians are to "observe" it.

3. I said, "He seems to make no distinction between what Moses commanded and what Christ taught". He replied, "It was God's teaching in each case and they should be in perfect harmony." But he ignored the fact that I proved there IS a difference (Matt. 5:28). We are not under the law Moses gave to Israel, "for the law was given by Moses, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ." (John 1:17). For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (Heb. 7:12). "So that the Law is our tutor unto Christ."

But the faith having come, we are no longer under a tutor." (Gal. 3:24-25). His assertion that the "only exception" is the remission of sins, is assertion

without proof. Hence amounts to nothing. It serves only to "darken counsel". Since the Law has been taken away and there is no command to Christians to keep the Sabbath, it is sinful to try to bind this practice on them.

4. He accuses me of saying "Jewish laws". I said no such thing. The charge is false! Then he calls it "petty foggerly." We agreed to use no such expressions as this. Hence he has violated our agreement.

I proved by Deut. 5:15 that the Law containing the Sabbath was given only to Israel. But he ignored the proof as advocates of error usually do. And it was to dodge the issue here that he resorted to slang and ridicule, saying "petty foggerly." Deut. 5:3 further proves that the Sabbath Law was given only to Israel.

6. Exod. 31:13,16,17 proves that the Sabbath was a "sign" between God and Israel. If it was a sign between God and Israel it wasn't intended for any other people.

He says I am in error when I say the Law was given to Israel only. Of course that means that Moses was in error when he said, "God made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day" (Deut. 5:3), including the Sabbath. Verse 12.

8. He refers to Exod 12:49, etc., to show that strangers were welcome to "join Israel." It is true that the Law said: "He that is born in thy (Abraham's) house, and he that is bought with thy money, must be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh", etc. (Gen. 17:13) There were two conditions by which they were to enter the covenant: BIRTH and PURCHASE. If people were BORN INTO THE FAMILY OF ABRAHAM; they entered the covenant; if people were BOUGHT WITH HIS MONEY, they entered the covenant. I would like for Mr. Hodges to tell us which condition he came in on!

9. He refers to the fact that the Apostles met with Jews and Gentiles on the Sabbath. But that doesn't prove that they taught them to "observe" the Sabbath. They evidently met with them to teach them the way of salvation.

10. He refers to the fact that the ones mentioned in Rev. 14:12 kept the commandments of God. Sure. But they were Christians who "follow the Lamb" (Christ. (Rev. 14:4). Christians are NOT commanded to "observe" the Sabbath, hence his reference to this fact does his position no good.

11. The Law was "nailed to the Cross." (Col. 2:14; Eph. 2:14-16). The Sabbath was a part of the Law (Exod. 20:8). "Whosoever among you are justified by the Law; ye are fallen from grace." (Gal. 5:4). Hence if we keep the Sabbath we are "fallen from grace."

12. Jesus is now our Lawgiver and King. (1 Tim. 6:15). He has "all authority." (Matt. 28:20). He hasn't

taught us to "observe the Sabbath". Hence we are not required to "observe" it.

13. Paul kept back nothing that was profitable. (Acts 20:28). But he did not teach us to "observe" the Sabbath. Hence such "observance" is not profitable, nor binding on us.

—James Douglas Phillips,
439 N. Drury Avenue,
Kansas City, Mo.

Truth and Fairness

I have recently read an article in a paper that claims to be loyal, in which the editor makes the claim that he is giving to his readers both sides of all questions, yet there are many who know that such is not the case. He publishes article after article condemning the class system yet he has refused to publish articles condemning the use of cups on the Lord's table, as a number of brethren can testify, and he has refused to publish an announcement of the White-Cowan debate or a report of it.

And in the same issue of said paper a brother who has signed his name after the expression "yours for more investigations" gives his unqualified endorsement of a certain debator to meet anyone the S. S. people may put up, but I notice he did not endorse him to meet any one who opposes the use of cups on the Lord's table. But it may be that he did not mean that he was for more discussions on the cup question. At least he has up to the present refused to discuss this question with one who is able to meet him. Why? It may be that he realizes that those who oppose his practice on the cup question use the same class of scriptures and arguments against the use of more than one cup that he uses against those who use the class method of teaching, and he realizes that he cannot defend himself and at the same time condemn the other.

In referring to a brother who recently attempted to defend the class teaching, he said that he thought that brother would soon go by the way of some others, to rise to a little fame and then like the flower of the grass pass away. But he himself has not yet risen even to a little fame in trying to defend himself against those who have called in question his practice in the use of cups on the Lord's table. But we can't blame him, for he does not want to fade away like the flower of the grass. He with others signed a statement calling for one hundred debates on the teaching question, provided they be allowed to select fifty of them. Will he now sign up for one hundred debates on the cup question on this condition? We wait for reply.

IRA L. SANDERS.

Support "The Truth"

"If brethren will continue to 'pour in' the subscriptions and donations, we shall be able to issue twice a month ere long."—H. C. Harper in Supplement to April Issue of "The Truth."

"If brethren continue to support us as they have done, we can issue a supplement occasionally to keep copy from accumulating and so lead up to a semi-monthly paper." H. C. Harper in a letter, April 13.

"Let us give our aid and encouragement to Brother Harper, and let the people have the truth. The paper cannot be put out without our constant support. And since we have, as one brother says, 'the right man in the right place', let us do our part in getting Bible truth before the people."—J. E. Whigham.

"We are going to work for 'The Truth'. We think it is fine, and will do much good. We are going to send it to everyone in our congregation who is not able to pay for it."—O. C. Matthews.

As Brother Harper says, "If brethren continue to support us as they have done, we can issue a supplement occasionally and thus lead up to a semi-monthly," let us do everything we can to support "The Truth". I am sure that every reader can send Brother Harper at least one sub a week. Most of us can send from one to five dollars a week as a donation. If we will all do this, "The Truth" will soon be coming twice a month and maybe weekly.

Bro. Matthews says, "We are going to send it to everyone in our congregation who is not able to pay for it." That is fine. And it will not only strengthen "every member", but will go a long way toward supporting "The Truth".

There are some things about "The Truth" that should make us all want to work for it:

1. It carries no commercial advertising. Most of the papers among us are full of "Itch Cured in 24 Hours"; "Cod Liver Oil Tablets"; "No. 666 For Colds," etc. But "The Truth" is devoted wholly to the restoration of Primitive Christianity.

2. It has been said that "A paper is no better than its editor", and this is true. But H. C. Harper has for many years, contented for "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6) in word and work. The paper is sure to teach the truth as long as he is its manager and editor.

3. It has been said that "H. C. Harper is second to none in the brotherhood as a writer" and this is true. His pen is dreaded by all advocates of error for his arguments are unanswerable.

So let's work for "The Truth", brethren. Get subs for it. Make donations to it. Let's make it a mighty medium through which to expose error and exalt the truth.

James Douglas Phillips,

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

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

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR	- - - - -	-\$1.00
SIX MONTHS	- - - - -	.50
THREE MONTHS	- - - - -	.25

JUNE, 1928

Be Fair

I have just read "The Truth," and it has caused me to feel like writing some, seeing so many of our brethren writing and making arguments, trying to cause division in the Church of Christ. I see where one brother has made a statement referring to me causing division because I suggested where congregations have more than one container not to allow a preacher to come in and cause division. And I also said in the same writing, where a congregation has one container not to allow a preacher to divide them. I have heard this same preacher three times on the cup question that caused me to study the question; and the more I read the more I was convinced he is wrong and so are all that agree with him.

They will all agree that the fruit of the vine is a part of the cup. Now what makes them believe that? If the container and the fruit of the vine is the cup, now explain to me how can I drink THIS cup? (1 Cor. 11:26-27). Notice it says THIS cup. If you brethren want to speak where the Bible speaks, make Scripture harmonize. Notice this does not say drink OF the cup, or a cup.

Brethren, don't try to cause division where you can't prove such stuff.

And I notice another brother says there is no communion in using two containers in one congregation, yet he will contend that two or more congregations are the one body. They have a container at each place. How do they commune with one another? There can't be two cups in the fruit of the vine. That is all the writer had in mind. The container is a man-made thing, and this is what the church divides over, the man-made things. If we would use it as we do our automobile, church house, seats, and song books, for convenience, there would not be any division.

Brethren, I am for peace and harmony. Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent; and make the Scriptures harmonize. Don't put construction of your own on the Scriptures. Be fair and don't misrepresent. Submitted in love.

H. T. EVANS,

Elk City, Okla., Box 93.

REMARKS

We should not "fall out" because we

differ; to do so blocks all avenues of approach for candid investigation. I have spent many a day in the home of Bro. Evans and we have fought the digressive Sunday School shoulder to shoulder, as many can testify; but when it comes to the truth of the gospel, I say with Bro. Trott, I know no man after the flesh, but always try to please God. We should have no bickering among us; but we must contend for the truth. Let us have a discussion by qualified men and in a shape that all can get in; then let each face the question as he must at the judgment.

1. I cannot agree with the policy proposed by Bro. Evans. This is what entrenched and nourished the organ. The "anti-organ" brother was debarred, as my father testified to me many times. And this policy caused the M. S. to grow and flourish. No one was allowed near enough to touch it. And thus did the S. S. incubate and develop; the "anti" was debarred, as Bro. Evans and many other supporters of the truth can bear witness. In this way the thing that has become popular gains sway. How many "anti's" got to preach to an "organ congregation?" How many ANTI'S have the Sunday School congregations called without knowing that they would submit to be muzzled? When would a "sprinkling congregation" learn the truth about baptism with all debarred but sprinklers? Such a policy not only shuts out the light, but places man in his own light who submits to it.

2. It is my judgment that muzzling the truth for fear of division is nothing less than a device of the tempter to seduce the unwary to ruin. When investigation and contention for the truth cease, Satan reigns supreme. And when Christians cannot calmly face each other and investigate the Bible on any topic, it is time to remove the cloak of the profession and profess what they are—anything but Christian.

3. You heard the "same preacher three times." Very well; now let others hear, and then decide for themselves in view of the judgment, as you have done.

4. Drink THIS CUP and drink OF THE CUP, need no harmonizing. Both are New Testament expressions. In one case the figure metonymy is used, and without the leteral cup this metonymy would be impossible here. In his letter to me of Oct. 10, 1925, J. N. Cowan said: "I will affirm that 'the cup' as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' are one and the same. J. N. Cowan affirms. You most assuredly will have to deny this proposition, or else give up your contention on this passage. The above is no negative

Under date of Oct. 25, 1925, I replied, I accept your proposition; namely, 'the cup,' as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27, and 'the fruit of the vine' are one and the same.

Affirmative—J. N. Cowan.

Negative—H. C. Harper.

And this is the last I heard from Cowan on the matter. There has been a persistent effort to smother the truth on this matter. Get your man in line Brother Evans, if you want to see what can be proved and what not? I say with Brother Trott: "Since it has been started (much to my regret) it will have to be settled and settled right. If the position be true that 'the cup' means only the contents of the cup, then I am ready to join the Sunday School advocates." (Nov. 11, 1925). And it would long since have been settled right had not the publisher of that once loyal paper decided to assume a dictatorship over the owners and editors. The advocates of the cups then assumed a boldness that became effective for division, which has been growing.

5. "Congregations commune with one another." But this you cannot prove, for it is impossible. "Can't be two cups in the fruit of the vine." Sure but the fruit of the vine can be in two cups or in individual cups; and there is no communion of a congregation with two cups or with individual cups—not so long as communion means communion.

6. "Man-made thing." A man-made thing ordained of God is not a cause of division; but man-made things not ordained of God, when thrust upon a church, will cause division so long as there is a member there of sterling worth who will contend for "that which is written." (1 Cor. 11:19; 4:6). In fact no man can drink "this cup" without a man-made thing. Let us see you try it.

7. "Convenience." Convenience is all right so long as it does not interfere with divine appointments. For convenience some sprinkle, but does this please God? If so, how do you know?

8. "Construction." Yes, when he makes "two or more" of "a cup" or "the cup". Thou art the man.

I Want To Be Right

That we should seek the truth on all questions that come up and that we should treat all questions with fairness, regardless of who holds the position, I think all fair-minded brethren will agree. God is no respecter of persons, and why should we be when it comes to sifting out the truth on any—yes, any question that is before the brotherhood?

I notice that some want to pound on the wrong of the Sunday School all the time; and in the strongest language and most convincing arguments they show the unscriptural practice of such a thing. But when it comes to meeting other issues that are confronting the church and the people are seeking the right way, these same Sunday School fighters shy around and begin the plea of all di-

gressives, "Don't discuss this: it will break up the church."

I am glad to see our good Brother Trott going after the fellow they are styling "The Singing Evangelist." He says if there is any more scriptural authority for the singing evangelist than there is for the located evangelist, the Sunday School, the organ, and others he names of the more lately introduced innovations, "they seem to have neither the confidence nor the courage to show it."

And he tells us that the old digressives had the hardihood to try to defend their practices, but the later digressives have learned to sidestep discussion and it seems to be impossible to stir them up to the point of a written discussion.

And this shows up the advocates of the cups on the Lord's table who are shying around a written discussion with Brother Trott with equal force. If the practice can be defended by the word of God, why do they not step out and "show it?" If it is not because they have "neither the confidence nor the courage," what is it? Is not truth worth seeking?

I read several papers and I notice that the editor of one of them says: The subtle manner in which Satan has learned to pass through the ranks of the children of God is still being practiced by him. He never fights unless he is cornered. He may get around and fuss and "jaw" about nothing just as a matter of keeping up confusion, but when a real issue, a real question of doctrine and practice comes forward, like the Sunday School fight, he (his agents) says, "I don't believe in so much fighting," and he says this so effectively, so often, so cunningly, so deceptively, that many of the brethren opposed to the Sunday School innovation begin to cry, "I think we are having too much fighting."

This brands the cup question as "a real issue" and the leading advocates of the "cups" as "his agents". And if anyone calls for further proof, I can furnish it in this very language. I do not think anyone can justly accuse Brother Trott of making an issue where there is no vital truth concerned. Really I have been used to the cups and I had, until recently, given the matter only a passing notice; but when I see strong men sidestepping when confronted by this issue, it is about as convincing to me as any thing can be that there is no Bible defense for the use of the cups. I am for peace on Bible ground, and no other. And the more these debaters shy the more the brethren are going to demand a written discussion of the issue. Is there anything but a partisan plea to prevent this question or the class question from being committed to writing for all the church?

J. WILSON.

NOTE

There is not, Brother Wilson. And when I took up the matter of a written investigation of this question with

Brother Trott, I told him that he could not expect to be with us always, and that the church now as well as that of future generations is entitled to his talent in handling this question with the ablest exponent the opposition could put forth. And to this task he has expressed himself as prepared and ready. So if there is no investigation, the blame for the failure should rest on the heads of those who love darkness rather than light.

Hodges-Phillips Debate

The Scriptures teach that the Seventh day of the week is the Lord's day, spoken of in Rev. 1:10 and the observance of same is binding on all followers of Christ.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Phillips wants to know how I learned that Christians are to OBLIGE the Sabbath. My answer is from "the Holy Scriptures." (2 Tim. 3:15). And this was no part of the New Testament for it had not been written at that date.

Brother Phillips cites Matt. 5:28, to show that the law has been taken away and replaced by a new and better one. Well, lets see about it. "Who-soever looketh on a woman to lust after her had committed adultery." This was just as sinful under Moses' regime as under Christ. Christ only MAGNIFIED it. IT WAS ALREADY THERE. The reader is asked to turn to Isa. 42 and begin at the first verse and read to the 14th verse where it says "He (Christ) will MAGNIFY the Law and make it HONORABLE." It had fallen into dishonor with the Jews and Christ was raising it back to its high standard. Grace and truth coming from Christ did not signify that what was given through Moses was not truth. The Grace of God existed for creation and was no new thing by any means.

PRIESTHOOD CHANGED: Christ heads the New Covenant as Moses did the old but bear in mind that it was a NEW AGREEMENT to keep the same laws, made on better promises. Not on better laws for the law was perfect (Psa. 19:7). Instead of abolishing any law it was a case of more Grace and Truth added to what they already had. Instead of sinners approaching God through Moses they do so through Christ. Grace is offered on condition of Faith, repentance and confession. "The law" said to execute murderers, adulterers. The Covenant required this. But Israel fell down on this and they HAD NO COVENANT. Only God's oath to Abraham and the fathers held good and it was up to Jehovah to make good and this he is doing by taking out a people with Christ as a mediator instead of Moses. It was the "Curses" of "the law" that was taken out of the way—nailed to the cross, nothing more or less.

Brother Phillips thinks I misrepresented him by accusing him of saying "Jewish Laws". Well it is current

usage among his brethren to speak thus about God's Sabbath and laws and in his first reply he stated that the commandment was to the "Jews only". But I showed that it was to strangers as well. See Isa. 56:6.

True God made the covenant with Israel but all the world were at liberty to "join themselves to the Lord". This was neither birth nor purchase. Brother Phillips wants to know how I came in. Answer, "by faith, repentance, confession and baptism for remission of sins. It would be superfluous for the Apostles to be exhorting the Early Christians continually about Sabbath desecration when they were already over-scrupulous about it. Brother Phillips makes no distinction between the "curses" of the law and the "blessings" of the same. Observing the Sabbath was one of the BLESSINGS while paying penalties in sacrifice—from the washing of defiled things to capital punishment were the CURSES of "the Law" and were graciously forgiven in the Gospel—good news.

For a follower of Christ, who had his sins remitted by faith to weaken and resort to sacrificial offerings would be truly a falling from Grace. First Tim. 6:15 is cited as proof of Jesus being a law-giver in contradistinction to God's law given through Moses, and which is absurd.

The reader will please turn to Verse 13 of the same chapter and see that God is the AUTHORITY, "which is His (God's) times He (God) shall show who is the blessed and only potentate, etc. (on earth). God is supreme in whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning, "wherefore the children of Israel . . . shall "observe" the Sabbath . . . for a perpetual covenant Exod. 31:16. If it ceased at the cross then it was not perpetual.

ALBERT S. HODGES.

REPLY

He says he learned from the Holy Scriptures that Christians are to observe the Sabbath. Well, where do the Scriptures say so? Yes, WHERE?

He says I cite Matt. 5:28 to show that the Law has been taken away. Not so! I referred to Matt. 5:28 to show that there is a difference in what came by Moses and what came by Jesus Christ (John 1:17). Christ said: "Ye have heard that it hath been said (referring to Exod. 20:14), thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that he that looks on a woman to lust after her commits adultery with her in his heart." Read Matt. 5, 6, 7 and see the manner in which such terms are employed in the New Testament. Christ says, "ye have heard that it hath been said," etc., referring to the law; "but I say unto you," etc. After repeating this a number of times, he pronounces a blessing upon those "who hear these sayings of mine and do them." The lesson taught in the

transfiguration (Matt. 17) is this: We should hear Christ, not Moses.

He says the New Covenant was a "New Agreement" to keep the same laws. How did he find this out? Yes, HOW? Paul says, "not according to the covenant that I (God) made with their fathers." I have given a number of references to show that the Old Covenant, Sabbath and all, was "nailed to the cross" (Col. 2:14); but he has ignored them all! Why? Because they KILL his theory. Jer. 31:31-35; Heb. 8:8-13; 10:9; 2 Cor. 3:6-18; Gal. 4:21-31, all show that the Law "given by Moses" (John 1:17) has been done away with.

He refers to Psa. 19:7 to show that the Law is perfect. But this refers to the New Testament law—"the perfect law of liberty" (Jas. 1:25); "the law of the spirit of life" (Rom. 8:2). Heb. 10:1-4 shows that Moses' law was not perfect. Heb. 8:7-8 says it was a faulty covenant and that God found fault with it. See?

He refers again to the fact that strangers were allowed in the Old Covenant. He failed to tell us how they got in. But I introduced Gen. 17:13 and showed the two conditions—BIRTH AND PURCHASE—by which the people entered the covenant. I challenged Hodges to tell us how he came in. He said, "by faith, repentance, confession and baptism for remission of sins." That is the way we enter the New Covenant—not the Old. The New Covenant nowhere authorizes Sabbath observance.

I cited 1 Tim. 6:15, which says of Jesus that He is the "only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords". Hodges says this is "absurd". This is a fair sample of what men will do when trying to uphold a false theory. Jesus being King, Lord and Captain (Heb. 2:10) is our lawgiver. He has given no law for Sabbath observance. Therefore we are not required to observe it.

TRUTH—NINE

In Rom. 7:6-7 Paul says, "we are delivered from the Law," then he says, "Is the Law sin? God forbid." Then he quotes, from the Law, "Thou shalt not covet"—one of the Ten Commandments—as having been done away. If one of these commandments has been done away and "we are delivered from" it, they have all been done away. I challenge special investigation here.

Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Galatians and Hebrews were all written for the purpose of showing the difference in the Law and the Gospel and that the former has been done away with. To take the position Mr. Hodges takes is to brand the greater portion of these books as FAISE! Beware of such a theory!

—James Douglas Phillips,
439 N. Drury Avenue,
Kansas City, Mo.

The Truth Fund

H. R. Stringer \$3.00

Phillips-Robinson Debate

Brother Ried Robinson and I closed a debate at Stanford, near Riley, W. Va., Saturday night, April 27, 1928. It lasted six days. A large crowd was present at each session. Fine order prevailed throughout. This was the first debate ever held on the Sunday School question in the state of West Virginia. Many good people, even the members of the Church of Christ, did not know that a bitter, open, fierce division had been forced upon the Body of Christ.

The preaching brethren present part or all the time were: C. C. Thompson, Spencer Thompson, Elihue Dosier, I. G. Williams and G. W. Terry. The preachers were all on my side of the question.

Brother J. J. Warden moderated for me and Brother Stanley moderated for Brother Robinson. Brother Warden is Elder of the Beckley congregation and Brother Stanley is an Elder of the Stanford church where the debate was held. All the moderators had to do was to call time.

Brother Robinson is a bright young fellow, quick, grasps an argument readily, and speaks with force. No two defenders of the Sunday School will take the same position nor the same route in debate. I tried to force Bro. Robinson to tell us who the head of the Class System (he objected to the name Sunday School) is and he would not say, but finally said, "Jesus is not the Head of the Class System, but is the head of everyone that teaches the Word of God". I replied that, since Jesus is not the Head of the Sunday School Class System, it was an evident fact that it was not the church. Therefore it is a separate organization from the church. And since he said Jesus is the "Head of all who teach the Word of God," Jesus must be the Head of the Devil, since the Devil taught God's word at the temptation of Jesus.

I offered Brother Robinson a \$10.00 bill for every scripture he would produce that showed that a woman ever taught in the public assembly of the church. He didn't claim the ten dollars.

I offered him another \$10.00 to show where a congregation in apostolic times ever used uninspired literature as they use it now. He didn't claim that \$10.00.

I offered him another \$10.00 to show where any assembly of the church was divided into classes in the days of the apostles, the division into classes being for the teaching of God's word. He didn't claim that \$10.00.

He said the church couldn't have been divided into classes then since they had no Bible to study; but right then and there he went to Acts 2 and said the Apostles divided into classes on Pentecost to teach the multitude.

Several amusing things were said,

but for lack of space I will not give them. I think the debate did much good. The brethren have been using such digressive preachers as: I. D. Janney, Ried Robinson, A. W. Wagoner, et al., but they have agreed to quit using heretics and use men who are sound in the faith, "faithful men." (2 Tim. 2:2).

Brother Ira C. Moore, senior editor of the Christian Leader, and I will debate the Sunday School question at Charleston, W. Va., soon if we can agree on propositions, date, etc.

James Douglas Phillips,
439 N. Drury Avenue,
Kansas City, Missouri.

Cullings and Comments

It has been said that, "you can fool all of the people some of the time, and you can fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

"Dr. Trott and I, being agreed on this question, have felt that it should be privately studied rather than publicly debated."—The Apostolic Way, in regard to "The Cup Question." April 1, 1928.

Let us see whether we can get at the truth of this matter. Just consider the following:

"I regret very much the division that is being caused by Bros. Clark, Johnson and Cowan over the cup. Nothing would please me better than to meet either of them in debate."—G. A. Trott, September 1, 1926.

"I stand strictly for the one cup and for the publication of the discussion between you and Clark."—G. A. Trott, August 20, 1926.

"Personally I would have preferred a full discussion in the Way."—G. A. Trott, February 17, 1926.

"I feel impelled to write to express my admiration for the way you handled Bro. Clark's arguments. It is true I had read it in advance of its publication, but getting it all together impressed me very much more. I cannot see how anyone with a reasonably good mind can fail to see how you refuted his every effort."—G. A. Trott, Sept. 22, 1926.

"Now as to your discussion with Clark, I am glad to know that it is to come off and will gladly do everything I can to assist in a manifestation of the truth."—G. A. Trott, February 5, 1926.

J. N. Cowan, Robstown, Texas—Brother D. J. Wnitten has been writing me somewhat on the cups, and I told him that those favoring the cups should select a man and we would select one, and have a written discussion in pamphlet form by two of the best men we could get. I suppose you are unwilling to discuss the proposition you sent me which I signed and returned to you, as our correspondence will show; but if you will affirm

that proposition or any other that sets forth the issue, we will furnish a man to meet you. The brethren seem to look to you to defend the practice, so far as I have observed the course of things, and you have been advocating the cups."—H. C. Harper, Nov. 20th, 1927.

"In regard to the proposed discussion, you may make any arrangements you desire. I have never had any reluctance to meet any man in defense of what I believe to be God's truth."—G. A. Trott, Sept. 9, 1927.

"In regard to the debate with Cowan ready at any time."—G. A. Trott, Feb. 1, 1928.

"In regard to the debate with owan I am always ready and always try to do my best when called on to defend the word of God."—G. A. Trott, March 10, 1928.

"Bro. Cowan and I corresponded briefly on the cup, but the subject was not gone into very deeply and consisted (on Cowan's part) mostly of queries and I should not wish it to be published as a discussion of the subject; though I am willing to engage in a written discussion with anyone at any time."—G. A. Trott, Jan. 4, 1928.

"No one can regret more than I do any discussion among us, but trying to smother it is a poor way out, for it simply can't be done. The only way I see is to come out in the open and investigate it thoroughly in the light of God's word."—G. A. Trott, April 21, 1928.

"Any time the brethren pretty generally think such debate is needed, I am ready to represent what I believe to be the truth on the subject."—J. N. Cowan, Feb. 16, 1928.

Not only for the benefit of the present conditions of the church but also for the benefit of future generations, we hope to have Brother Trott to meet the best effort that can be put forth in behalf of the use of cups in the communion. We realize that time is swiftly passing, and "The Business of the King demands haste." Brother Trott will not always be with us. Are the brethren who favor the use of cups willing to have the light turned on? Do they want to "smother" out the light? If not, pass the word to Cowan.

News and Notes

C. C. Cleary, Wichita Falls, Texas.—I am openly and publicly opposing the class system, the use of individual communion set, women teachers, quarterlies, etc., in fact all innovations of men. I would like to do work in the field from June 1 to October 20 as a song leader. I give as reference Chas. F. Reese, A. J. Jernigan, J. R. Stewart, Bob Musgrave, N. L. Clark, and can give many others. Our congregation here is now doing fine. A wolf got in with us, and did a great deal of harm to us; but now we have a fine little church here. Bro. Jernigan is with us

again. Bros. F. M. Cox and O. W. Hines preach for us also. I think we will build a new house soon. Address me at 204 Cowan —, Rt. 4, Box 110.

"Of course, you know that I am in perfect agreement with you on the cup matter."—G. A. Trott, June 21, 1926.

"The one who holds to the use of two or more cups renders himself defenseless against the proponents of the individual cups."—G. A. Trott, Feb. 17, 1926.

W. T. Taylor, Burnett, Texas.—I received the papers you sent me. They have the right tone for a gospel paper. We need just such a paper, one that will stand firm for the truth. The church seems weak in places, afraid to have the light turned on, and afraid to defend what they practice. Push on with unflinching faith and courage. We are bound to win with those who want the truth. A clean life and the truth is what the church needs. Many do not know their duties as Christians. I am hoping to be able to assist many to a better knowledge of the precious word of God. I am determined to press on for the truth and right, for the faith revealed and a pure life. I want to get in touch with the brethren in this part of the state in order to plan an effective effort in behalf of New Testament Christianity.

Burley F. Black, Ottumwa, Ia. — I am sending price of my subscription for "The Truth". I like the many good and helpful articles.

J. B. Jones, New Orleans, La.—You surely are giving us a good paper. Every issue gets better. It should be in every Christian family. And if all will work, we can soon place it there. Every issue has been worth a dollar to me. I never did save any use for a paper that was always trying to hide something.

A. J. Jernigan, Wichita Falls, Tex.—I have read with delight the two pamphlets written by Brother Harper, which he offers to the readers of "The Truth" free. The first is Scriptural Baptism. This booklet of twenty-four pages sets forth what it takes to constitute a Scriptural baptism in a clear and convincing way and is unanswerable. The second is a pamphlet of twenty-four pages in answering the claims of materialists on the nature of man in a way that no materialist can refute it. These should be placed among the people before their minds have been settled in error. Just send postage to the office of "The Truth", Sneads, Fla., and get a bundle of them and put them out where they will do good.

J. Madison Wright, Columbus, O.—During January I held a mission meeting in Columbus, O., resulting in seed sowing for the future work there. In February I was at Newell, W. Va. where two were added. In March I was at Millsville, O., where one was added.

April 1-16 I was at Sandy Ridge, near Barnesville, O., where seven were added. April I met with the brethren at Reynoldsburg to help them. While waiting for the roads to dry so people could get out to the country church at New Castle, a man took me to two sessions of the Convention of the Christian Church, where on seeing the error of these people, I was fired with greater zeal for the work of the Lord in the Church of Christ. To see the onward sweep of error always arouses me to greater efforts and sacrifices for the cause of truth as we find it in God's word.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—Enclosed find subs. I like the spirit of the paper fine. The Truth uncovers and brings to light errors, and this is what we need, lest we walk in darkness and stumble and fall. The truth will hold us up but some seem to be afraid to look for fear they will see the truth and have to do differently from the way they are doing. This was just what ailed the Jews in Paul's day. Let every reader of The Truth send in at least one new subscriber this month. I am going to do my best to get ten, and I believe I can do it. Some are trying to create a prejudice against the paper just like some do against what the Bible says to try to keep the people from knowing the truth. But truth will stand the test with God and we might as well come to it, and not try to bend it to suit our notions. Push The Truth, brethren.

Lafe, Ark., R. F. D. 1,
April 20, 1928.

I noticed in the April 16th issue of "The Truth," Bro. Chas. F. Reese criticizing Bro. Douglass for contending for passing "hat" for contribution and said to do so was "begging".

I have passed the "hat" for contribution and I did not consider that I was "soliciting" or "begging" for money to carry on the Lord's work. I did it simply for convenience of those who wished to contribute.

Of course when one is passing the "hat" it will pass a sinner occasionally, but in so doing, we are necessarily "begging".

You said, "we must not violate one part of God's word in carrying out another". That is exactly "right", and note, we read in the Holy Writ, "to do things decently and in order". We are also admonished not to create "confusion" and I dare say, where there is a dozen at a time stalking up to a table at once, to cast down their contributions, that there is as much "confusion" and "disorder" in so doing, as a bunch of good old Methodists and Baptists, collecting around their "mourners bench" would create, to pray for their mourners. What say you?

Now I am no preacher, but just an ignorant lay member, and I want to admonish you that you are liable to cause some of us ignorant and weakly members to "stumble" by taking such

positions as that, unless you can give a "thus saith the Lord". You remember the Book gives us some plain language in regard to the man who should cause his "weak" brother to "stumble". Where in the Book are we to find the "form" in which to give us we have been prospered? Bro. Reese we are badly in need of information and if you can give it from the Holy Writ, I am through passing the "hat", for I want to obey God.

W. T. JONES.

The Plan of Salvation

(Number IV)

Mr. Vanzandt says: "Because Ananias said to Paul: 'Arise and be baptised and wash away thy sins,' it is claimed that our sins are never really forgiven until the act of baptism."

Well, if there is dependence to be placed in the testimony of the spirit; this "claim" is certainly correct. And Christ himself testifies to the truthfulness of this "claim" for he says: "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" Mk. 16: 15, 16). And how does Mr. Vanzandt meet it? He says: "I repeat, that inasmuch as baptism is the last of the series of acts required in accepting and confessing Jesus, it properly includes the whole of the list, when it is only a public testimony that we have accepted Jesus as our personal Saviour."

Now, since baptism is the "last" of the series of acts required in accepting Jesus, it is one of the series of acts required in accepting Jesus, according to his own admission. And since baptism is one of the series of acts required in "accepting" Jesus, how can the statement be true that "It is only a public testimony that we have accepted Jesus as our personal Saviour?" It is not true. No act can be "required in accepting Jesus" and yet be "only a public testimony that we have accepted Jesus." Never! The testimony of the Spirit abundantly sustains the statement that baptism is the last of the series of acts required in accepting Jesus as our personal saviour; but for the statement that baptism is only a public testimony that we have accepted Jesus as our personal saviour, we have nothing but the ipse dixit of Mr. Vanzandt.

But he says: "Baptism is sometimes spoken of as doing the work of the whole list." True, if he means that baptism is the only condition of salvation sometimes mentioned in a given passage of scripture. And he might have referred us to Acts 22:16; I Pet. 3:21; Gal. 3:27. And he might have told us that "repentance" is "sometimes spoken of as doing the work of the whole list," as Acts 11:18; Acts 17:3 and other texts show. And he might have said the same thing of "faith" as Acts 15:9; Acts 16:31 and other texts show.

Using Mr. Vanzandt's logic (?), Mr. A. says "baptism doth also now save

us," and he forthwith builds up a theory of salvation by "baptism only." Mr. B says "repentance unto life" is taught in the Bible, and he sets forth a theory of salvation by repentance only." Mr. Vanzandt says, "Unless there are conditions that must be met before we can exercise faith, it is the ONLY condition of becoming a Christian."

But any honest soul can see that these are all in "the series of acts required in accepting Jesus as our personal Saviour," that is, they are all divinely stipulated conditions of salvation from sins. And the same logic (?) that cuts out one as a condition of salvation will cut out any other one! When Naman was commanded to dip (baptizo—Greek Tr.), he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but "dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." II Kings 5: 14. One dip was as essential as another. The water did not cleanse his leprosy; neither did the faith that took him into the water do so: but when he complied with the conditions stipulated for cleansing (staggered not at the promise of God), God cleansed him.

The blood of Jesus is the procuring cause of our salvation from sins; it is that which purchases our release (redemption, Eph. 1: 7); and you cannot make blood out of faith any more than you can make blood out of repentance or baptism. However, salvation from sin is conditional, and while no divine condition can be given a purchasing value, yet every such condition is essential. And Naaman could as logically have hoped for relief from his leprosy while leaving out one of the God-given conditions. Yes, indeed, and here is where Satan may rob many a soul of "a crown of righteousness." II Tim. 4:8. Better not become wise "above that which is written." I Cor. 4:6.

If baptism is not essential to salvation, the Holy Spirit never would have said to those distressed by sin who asked, "What shall we do?"—"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." Acts 2:38. What did the Spirit tell them to do—to do "unto the remission of your sins?" He said, "Repent and be baptized," clearly showing that when these conditions were complied with, "remission of sins" would be granted. The same reasoning that proves these people received "remission of sins" before baptism, proves that they received "remission of sins" before repentance! Did the Spirit tell these sin sick souls to "repent, and be baptized" because if, or "on account of," or "to declare" the remission of sins—a remission they had not yet received? He did not. They were told to "repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus

Christ"—unto the same end: "the remission of sins." "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Acts 2:41. And now having received the remission of sins, the next verse says: "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and the prayers." They thus receive the "teaching" after their baptism, as commanded by Christ (Matt. 28:20), and begin, after their baptism, to "walk in newness of life." Rom. 6:4. When they "obeyed" in being "buried by baptism," then they were "made free from sin." Rom. 6:4, 17, 18. Then they were "born again." John 3:5. Then they were "forgiven." Col. 2:12, 13. Then they became "children of God." Gal. 3:26, 27. Then they were granted "the remission of sins." Acts 2:38. And Jesus says they were "saved" then (Mark 16:16), and I believe Jesus.

And now to Acts 22:16. If baptism is not essential to salvation, Paul never would have been commanded—"Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do," when he asked, "What wilt thou have me to do?" Acts 9:6. Never! He is there to be told what he must do—something that is essential, if you please. And what was he told to do? Ananias said to him: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise (as he had done to come into the city) and be baptized and wash away thy sins. Acts 22:16.

There can be no question with any honest soul that "wash away thy sins" (Acts 22:16); "unto the remission of your sins" (Acts 2:38); "that your sins may be blotted out" (Acts 3:16); and "shall be saved" (Mk. 16: 16), all refer to the same thing, namely: the forgiveness of sins. And Dr. Hackett (Baptist) comments on the clause "and wash away thy sins," saying: "This clause states the result of baptism in language derived from the nature of that ordinance. It answers to 'for the remission of sins' in Acts 2:38, that is, submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." (See his commentary on Acts).

Never was comment more truly and justly made. Look at this case squarely in the face now. Paul had to go into the city to learn what he "must do." There he remained for three days in great agony, smitten in conscience, not knowing what he "must do." He tasted no food. But when Ananias came and told him what he "must do," and he obeyed in being baptized, relief came, his conscience became "good" ("Baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the seeking of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ"—I Pet. 3:21), and now he takes food and is strengthened.

This is too plain to be misunderstood by those who want the truth. It clearly shows that baptism is essential to salvation.

A. W. Fenter, Rt a.

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.

VOLUME 1.

SNEADS, FLA., JULY 1, 1928.

NUMBER 7

The Legs of the Lame Are Unequal

"Some brethren want an open forum provided the side they believe in is advocated, but think the side they oppose should not be advocated. That is exactly the attitude of the Firm Foundation."—R. F. Duckworth, letter to J. H., Apr. 1926.

And that is exactly the attitude of The Apostolic Way, since Duckworth attacked it, hence he refused to publish a report of my debate with Cowan, his hanger-on, and my challenge to meet him again in his home town and also in mine. Truly, a Firm Foundation "attitude."

"We propose to allow both sides of questions to be presented."—R. F. Duckworth, (Ib)

Why, then, did you refuse my manuscript? It is not Cowan's side. You give Cowan right-of-way unstinted and to nauseating degree, but say to White "You keep out." I have your letters to prove it.

"Truth has nothing to fear from a statement of error so long as both sides have been presented."—Ib.

Why, then, did you run a one-sided thing by blue-pencilling Brother Harper out? Such an "attitude" toward the owners of the paper was far worse than any "attitude of the Firm Foundation." And now take a little advice, "Physician, heal thyself," and then we can have a little more confidence in your boasted "fairness to all."

JAS. T. WHITE,
Lometa, Tex.

Read the following and then be on the watch:

"Bro. G. W. Tucker came to my home April 26, 1928, on a tour working in behalf of The Way. He had letters or copies of letters with him. He said that Bro. Duckworth gave them to him just before leaving The Way office.

"Bro. Tucker asked me to read them. Bro. Hayhurst had written to a brother in Oklahoma, or Bro. Tucker said he had, about you, and a Bro. Keith had written Bro. Stark of Dallas, Texas, leaving a very bad impression of you, but not accusing you of anything in particular. And one from Doctor Trott. But the main thing in it was that he was satisfied with the management of the Way, and one from Duckworth himself.

"Bro. Tucker had just started on his campaign when he got here, but when we got through he returned to

A Request

Otis F. Youngblood, Bloomington, Ind.—Bro. Homer L. King, of Lebanon, Mo., closed a twelve days' meeting for us here at Unionville, Ind., on May 17th. We believe much good has been accomplished. Visible results were eight baptised. Two of these had been Baptists, and there was one restored. Many of our young men have begun to show a greater interest in the work, some read for the first time in the assembly and a greater interest in general was manifested.

the Way office, and I have not heard from him since.

"Bro. Tucker said Duckworth was trying to keep Cowan from discussing the cups question in 'The Truth.' He said it would give too much prestige to Harper's paper. He said Duckworth was grieved because Trott favored 'The Truth' as much as he did the Way. I was convinced that you should know what they are resorting to to try to kill 'The Truth.'

"Your humble brother,
I. G. HAYES.

REMARKS

The brethren everywhere are requested to be on the watch for these campaigners, and to get copies of these papers and send them to the office of "The Truth."

More Scriptures

If you give the following a careful reading, you may be convinced. Christ says: "Gather ye together first the tares," etc. (Matt. 13: 30, 41, 42). "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. 13: 43). Also read Lk. 21: 31; Acts 14:22; I Cor. 15: 23, 42, 58; Eph. 1: 10; 2 Tim. 2:18; Col. 3:4; 1 Thes. 4:16; 2 Pet. 1:11; I John 3:2; 2 Pet. 3: 7, 13.

Christ will sit on the throne of his glory: Matt. 19:28; Matt. 25:31. The apostles will sit upon twelve thrones. Matt. 19: 28; Lk. 22:28-30; I Cor. 6: 3; Rev. 2:26-28; Rev. 20: 4-6. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Rev. 20: 5; 19:21; 21: 8; I Thes. 5: 3; 2 Thes. 1: 8, 9; 2: 8; Matt. 25: 41-46. Do you not reckon Christ will have a table in his kingdom? Luke 22: 30; Matt. 19: 28; 25: 31-40; Rev. 3: 21; 7: 14-17; 2: 26-28; 11: 15.

Pray for me.

Brotherly,
A. J. THOMPSON

Sommer Somersets Again

(BY H. C. HARPER)

In his tract "The Sunday School question Considered" Daniel Sommer says: "But the forming of classes is left to the decision of each congregation. In every assembly where one or more persons in good standing will object to the forming of classes they should not be formed. It is not expedient to form them if so doing will become offensive to even one brother or sister in good standing. The same is true in regard to women becoming teachers of classes in a meeting house." (P. 10).

But now in the Review of Dec. 25, 1923, he says: "For a time I thought we should avoid classifying in order to satisfy objectors of good standing in the church, but later found those disposed to object to classes in order to adopt (adapt) teaching to those of different ages and abilities cannot be satisfied except by letting them have their own way in everything."

Now compare this recent teaching of Sommer's on what he admits is no more than an "expedient" with Paul's teaching in the fourteenth chapter of Romans. For example this: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak."

Sommer's teaching constitutes pure Sommerism, the very spirit of all aggressives; and they can, with this spirit, override the faithful with the organ, the Missionary Society, the Sunday School—yes, anything under the sun they want, regardless of the Word of God and the protests of faithful and holy brethren. And why brethren will continue to follow such a wavering, ungodly teacher is more than I can tell. He hardly stands in one place long enough to make a footprint.

Several years ago I discussed the forming of classes with W. G. Roberts of the Review, he taking the position that the Scriptures authorize them: I defeated his every effort and finally threw Sommer on him. He ran whining to Sommer, and then told me that he had seen Sommer and that Sommer told him he had changed on that because of the "Christian College" advocates. That was seven years ago. And now Sommer comes out and tells us in the Review that he has changed, but assigns a wholly different reason for the change. In fact, there is no

sense in either reason assigned.

Now, in this connection, I wish the indulgence of our readers while I here reprint an article I wrote in our issue of May (the Way was then a monthly), 1916. Please read it and study it. Here it is:

THE DIVINE LIMIT

In the New Testament Scriptures there are things commended, 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 long 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 cannot and will not let it go even if they see that many are offended and that the church will be rent asunder.

4. A thing, though neither commanded nor forbidden, if, when done, displaces a thing commanded, or in any way interferes with it, becomes and is an expedient.

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 commands us that we may do; whatsoever is not commanded is prohibited. Who-

ever 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 LIPSCOMBE, 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. Kurfee, 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.

H. C. HARPER

Administering The Lord's Supper

It is, perhaps, impossible to secure absolute uniformity of practice among all our churches, variously situated as they are, in the method of observing the Lord's Supper. It is very desirable, however, that there should be

some general understanding among us concerning the main features of such observance. We have found ourselves embarrassed recently in worshipping with some of our congregations, in which we found ourselves out of harmony with the others in partaking of the emblems. Whether the ordinance be observed before or after the sermon, and whether the individual communion cup be used, are matters to be decided by each local congregation, according to local conditions. There is not likely to be any confusion on these points. But if some congregations observe the order of having thanksgiving for the loaf and for the cup together, before the distribution of the first element, and others adopt a different order of giving thanks, first for the bread, which is then distributed and afterwards for the wine, there is likely to be confusion, especially for a visiting minister, if called on to officiate. If some observe the order of having the emblems partaken of at once when received, and others hold the same until all the congregation is waited upon, in order that all may partake at once, there is likely to be confusion and embarrassment among those who are visitors. It seems to us very desirable that there should be some uniform method of observing this memorial institution, especially as respects those features in which difference of methods is likely to result in confusion, when members of different congregations worship together.

Speaking for ourselves, we have never liked the custom of giving thanks for the loaf and cup at the same time, and have them passed together, the members partaking first of the bread, and then of the wine immediately following. The only motive that we can see for adopting this method is the saving of time; but whatever time is gained, it seems to us, is at the expense of good order and of proper solemnity. Each emblem has its own special significance, and suggests its own line of meditation. The bread naturally suggests Christ as the bread of life, on whom we feed by faith, while the wine suggests the blood by which we are cleansed from all sin. There should be some time given for proper thought and meditation between partaking of those separate emblems.

The motive for the practice of having the emblems held in the hand until all are ready to partake is that of uniformity, which has its value, but it does not seem to us that it lends itself so readily to proper meditation as the other method; besides, it is a little awkward to hold emblems in the hand for a considerable time, as is necessary in large congregations when all partake at the same time. On the whole, it seems more desirable to have the worshipers partake of the bread and of the wine as each is presented to them.

If, however, there are reasons why the method of partaking simultaneously is more desirable than the one usually observed, let us adopt it. What we are here urging is the desirability of some common order on those points of the observance in which difference of method is likely to result in confusion and embarrassment. We should be glad to have an expression from a number of brethren on this subject with a view of reaching uniformity of practice on the points mentioned. The weekly observance of the Lord's Supper among us, which we all feel has vindicated itself in our experience, makes it important that the best and most impressive order be agreed upon and observed, in order that it may be a source of spiritual profit to all the churches. Among other things which we are setting in order, could we not come to some agreement on an order for the observance of this institution which we could recommend to all churches? If it is necessary to have a conference of the leading representative ministers and other to agree upon and recommend such a method, it would be vastly worth while to have such a conference.—Christian Evangelist, 1908.

Comment

Those who favor the cups will here find a practice that will save a little more time. Since example does not count with them in this matter, why not give thanks for both bread and wine at one time. And if they cut loose from the Bible way, they will be "messed up" in a short time as the Christian Church is. So why not join the "conference" at once and figure out a uniform way? They should be able to do as well with it as the Catholics have in making it a little shorter in letting the priest drink all the wine.

Satan, it seems, strikes at vital points. Baptism and the communion are perverted in many ways. And it is high time that we were taking our bearings as to examination whether we are in the faith. II Cor. 13:5.

What Is Man?

The psalmist says, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?" Ps. 8: 4.

Man is the crowning work of God's creation on this earth, having both body and spirit. He has a mind that can delve into the mysteries of creation, solve the laws of nature, mount upon the wings of space into the starry zodiac, and give us glimpses of worlds beyond. The mind can make sick or it can heal; can kill, or make well; can make happiness or sorrow.

The materialist, as were the Sadducees, teaches that man is composed wholly of matter, and that no part of

him survives the disintegration of the body. But if this is true, the Apostle Paul was mistaken in speaking of the outward man and the inward man. Paul said he was a Pharisee on the nature of man. The Pharisees teach that "the soul is ever immortal, and is a portion of the divinity that inhabits our bodies." And if we will study the following Scriptures, we can see that this is true: 2 Cor. 4: 16; Heb. 12:9; 2 Cor. 5: 1, 2; 2 Cor. 12: 1-3; 1 Pet. 1:13, 14; Mk. 14:38. Here we learn that man is a dual being, composed of body and spirit, and at death the body returns to the dust; and the spirit returns to God, who gave it.—Ecc. 12:7.

And God, being mindful of man, has prepared a place for him hereafter. Matt. 25:34. And God has visited man in the person of His Son to prepare man for this prepared place. I John 4:14; John 3:16. Who will Jesus prepare? All that will obey him. Heb. 5:8. Then if we expect to enjoy the unalloyed bliss with Christ hereafter, we must now obey him.

Jesus says, "No man can come unto me except the Father who hath sent me, draw him and I will raise him up at the last day." John 6: 44. Now how does God draw people to Jesus? By his power, of course; then it is by the gospel which is the power of God unto salvation. Rom. 1:16. And this is done by preaching. Matt. 28:19; and Mark 16:15; for as Christ says, quoting the prophet, "And they shall all be taught of God." John 6:45. And, as Paul says, "It pleased God by preaching to save them that believe." I Cor. 1:21.

In I Cor. 15: 1-5 states the facts of the gospel—that Jesus died for our sins, that he was buried, and that he arose from the dead. And he tells the Thessalonians that man must OBEY the Gospel or be punished. 2 Thes. 1:7.

This shows that the Gospel also has commands. You cannot obey facts, but you can obey commands. In John 8:24 Jesus says, "Except you believe that I am he (the Christ) you shall die in your sins." Here, then, is a command that man must believe or be lost. Jesus also taught that unless man shall REPENT he shall perish. Luke 13:3. So we must obey his command. And Jesus again tells us that we must CONFESS him or be denied before his Father. Matt. 10:32. And we must be BAPTISED, thus putting on Christ. Gal. 3:27. So we see that out of, and depending upon, the facts of the Gospel come the commands; and out of both facts and commands come the PROMISES of the Gospel; namely, saved, remission of sins, son-ship and citizenship.

And now as an obedient son and citizen in the kingdom of Christ (Col. 1: 12, 13) we must by denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, live soberly righteously, and godly in this present

world, looking for the blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our savior, Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works. Tit. 2: 12.

H. R. STRINGER,
Bogue Chito, Miss.

Items

There is much being said today on the eldership, much of which is good, but I think many writers are missing some of the most important points. You never hear of a brother pointing out the truth as to how an elder is inducted into his work by prayer and the laying on of hands.

Hold on there say some; prayer and laying on of hands passed away with the apostolic age. If so, what did Paul mean when he instructed Timothy to "lay hands suddenly on no man?" Timothy had not the power to impart the Spirit by laying on hands, as an apostle had. So it could not have been for that purpose. Therefore, I conclude it was for the purpose of inducting men into the Eldership. And so we find by prayer and the laying on of hands men were inducted into this work, and that it did not apply to the age of miracles exclusively. The qualifications of elders are plainly stated in several passages of the scriptures, and men possessing these are the only ones that should be ordained as elders over a congregation. Almost all will admit that to be so, yet in practice they seem to forget this fact. I have heard men talk about bobbed hair, short skirts, picture shows, and condemn these in very strong language, yet the same men suggested a man for elder and appointed him when the so-called elder did not have a child that was a member of the church. The bible says that one qualification of an Elder is "having children that believe." Titus 1.

I know another congregation that has a so-called elder that cannot read. A good man, but can such be "Apt to teach?" And to "convince the gainsayers?"

There are men posing as elders that know nothing of language, and hence could not give an interpretation of the simplest statement found in the New Testament. The preachers are to be censured for much of the present condition of the church. They are too eager to have something to report. No preacher can know the qualifications of a man for an elder by associating with him a week or ten days. When I was a young man I went through the farce of organizing a congregation where I had just closed a meeting at two different places. I have learned better.

W. T. TAYLOR,
Burnett, Texas.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

H. C. HARPER - - - PUBLISHER

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

SUBSCRIPTION

ONE YEAR - - - - -	\$1.00
SIX MONTHS - - - - -	.50
THREE MONTHS - - - - -	.25

Fifteen Years Ago

The following article was in the first issue of the Apostolic Way, owned in equal shares by Brethren Rice, Harper, and Trott, and which made its first appearance on May 1, 1913, with J. W. Rice publisher, who commented thus: "We give Bro. Harper credit with being first to strike a blow at the digressive Sunday School innovation. Thank the Lord for brave men.—J. W. Rice."

Now read the article. Maybe the Leader is now ready to open its columns for a discussion of this question, since Bro. Moore has mustered up courage enough in fifteen years to debate it. Here is the article:

GOT PLENTY

The following article, my second in reply to Bro. I. C. Moore, was sent to the Leader-way. After keeping it about two months, Bro. Rowe returned it, saying: "If I should publish your second reply it would of course bring out an answer from Brother Moore, and I don't really believe it would be profitable to our readers to continue it"

Not profitable to the Sunday School cause, of course not. But if the article and the discussion of the issue were profitable to the "will worshipers" (Col. 2:22, 23) the Sunday School papers would gladly publish it.

In this connection I wish to quote the following from Bro. S. H. Hall's tract, titled "Prove All Things," as follows: "The complaint against open discussion is, with but few exceptions, a certain ear-mark of the advocate of false doctrine. Where did Christ and the apostles ever exhibit this complaining spirit when their doctrine was called in question? Without any doubt, this, nine times out of ten, is an unintentional confession that the party is conscious of the weakness of his side of the question. Suppose some of our Methodist neighbors should attack the position of our digressive brethren on the mode of baptism, telling them there is no authority for immersing people, and challenging them to defend their practice: what would they do? begin to complain and say, "We don't believe in public discussion?"

I trow not. Certainly they would come out boldly and say, "We will gladly meet you in defense of our practice." Why? Because they are right

on this question: they have the truth and they know it.

But call on them to defend their practice on the music question (and the Sunday School question, too, Bro. Hall) and the air is rent with the pitiful cry, "We don't believe in public discussions; you are disturbing our peace in making such a demand."

Now, to the Sunday School advocates I will say (and we can now add the advocates of the cups) in the words of Bro. Hall: "Shall we hope to see our brethren who have departed from 'the old paths' cease this complaining, and come out boldly in defense of their practice?" Shall we thus hope, and not hope in vain?

Bro. Moore, in trying to justify the innovation of dividing a church assembly into classes with women teachers accuses me of referring to men and women as cattle and horses because I said that under this system each goes to his own "stall." Webster defines this word to mean "a bench." And I am fully justified in using the word in that sense; but if Bro. Moore prefers to go with the cattle and horses, I shall not object.

The innovation which he tries to sustain by "good judgment" enables the boss to say to this brother, "Sit thou here," and to the sister, "Sit thou there;" and to the children of that brother and sister, "Sit yonder," in the church of God.

Brother Moore says he rather likes the plan of having separate rooms for these classes.

Forsooth! And King David rather liked the plan of having an ox-cart to move the ark of God. So Bro. Moore is not much ahead after all!

What need have we for the Scriptures if "good sense and judgment" can guide aright? Why go to the trouble to instruct men how to "behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God," if men are at liberty to proceed as they "rather like?" And why did God, in the Scriptures, "thoroughly furnish his people unto every good work if good sense and judgment can direct them?"

Beecher once said that there is no authority in the Bible for infant baptism, neither is there for an ox-yoke, but that both worked well, and therefore "good sense" required the use of both. And Bro. Moore can say no more for the Sunday School.

He talks about getting the best results in the church by following the public schools as models. The New Testament church, as a model, does not stand the ghost of a show with him. He gets "results," and so does the Missionary Society; and what does he care how they come!

He proudly points to the public schools, and says to the Elder of a church of Christ, "You follow this system, or you lack good sense and judgment." He gave us about two columns of the Leader-Way in trying to establish his contention for the Sunday School, but where does he give us

the Bible for what he advocates? Yes, where? He ignores the law of the Lord completely, and rests his whole case on the "good sense and judgment" of man. But, remember, brethren, the church of Christ is not a human institution. It has a divine head, Christ, who has expressed his will—the New Testament, and his will is supreme. And since we are to "walk by faith," we must follow God's word, for "faith cometh by hearing . . . the word of God."

Bro. Kurfees, of the Gospel Advocate, says: "Of course, when a church undertakes to worship God, as directed in the New Testament, it must follow the directions as therein given. Such meetings conducted as the New Testament directs will indeed develop Christians and more and more of them will be able to teach and exhort."

Then, brethren, why not conduct meetings of the church "as the New Testament directs?" Do you think man's way is better? I caution you to think seriously before you lay down the Bible way to take up man's way.

By the way, I call your attention to an authority on the public school system. Mr. Bagley says: "Whether it is wise even to divide a room into separate classes is a disputed point in educational policy, but the condition is well-nigh universal in American schools."—Classroom Management, page 1.

Now, if good sense and judgment cannot get on one side or the other of this "disputed point in educational policy," and settle the matter for the public schools, how can we expect it to do so in the church? Shall we settle it in a creed of man?

Bro. E. G. Sewell says: "This passage (I Pet. 1:3) assures us that we have, through the Holy Spirit, everything God wants us to know or intends us to do. So when anything is introduced that we cannot find in the word of God, nor as examples of inspired men, we may know at once that they are not of God, and are liable to lead us away from God if we adopt them, and cause division, strife and animosity."

Now, lets see about Bro. Moore's "supplement." Webster says this word means "an addition, to supply, to add," and brethren who supplement in connection with God's church would do well to read Rev. 22:18, and take heed to their ways, or they will lose their part.

I care not for any nice distinctions between "preach" and "teach," for I have made it clear that when a church assembles under its Elders with Christ as Head, it must follow the directions given in the New Testament. If not, it rebels against God.

And unless Bro. Moore can sustain the practice he advocates by the authority of God's word, we will do well to know that it is not of God, and to adopt it will result only in "division, strife and animosity."

H. C. HARPER
Pinella, Florida.

Both Sides, Eh?

During my debate with Cowan at Ft. McKavatt, Texas, in December, 1927, he announced that he was taking subscriptions for The Apostolic Way, representative ministers and others to a sixteen-page paper that publishes both sides of every question. This I emphatically deny, and I can give facts that disprove it. Not one word of that debate can be gotten into that paper. A report was sent to that "both sides" paper, and after waiting weeks and weeks for it to appear, I finally asked that at least the propositions with the time and place be printed and that I had publicly challenged Cowan to meet me again on the same propositions at Robstown, where he lives, and at Lometa, my home town. To do this would not have taken one half a column, but lo! he writes me that he could fill his space with more important matter. He said that the brethren were not interested in that discussion. How does he know? Is he the brethren? Both sides, eh? What a farce! He has given valuable space to a discussion of the nature of the contents of the cup, yet this question has never attracted enough attention of enough brethren in Texas, where he publishes his paper, to be debated before. And he has closed this out with a wave of the hand until "protracted meeting season" is over, which I venture is but a pretext, for it looked as if Cowan was facing a discussion with Trott, and the wine question would not down to his liking.

I do hope the brethren will get their eyes open before it is too late and find out that they have been hoodwinked. From what I can gather it seems that just such actions were the cause of the rupture of the "staff" on that paper. I made inquiry, but could get nothing but this—

Sneads, Fla.,
Jan. 6, 1926

R. F. Duckworth,
Dallas, Texas.
Dear Brother:

After weighing your communication of Nov. 21, 1925, I have decided to pursue the following course: In that communication you state this:

"Now Brother Harper, since the 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."

Now, since the owners of the paper are by this policy brought in subjection to Brother R. F. Duckworth as to what shall be published that they may write for their paper, and since by this policy the paper can publish every shade of heresy and the owners are unable to come before the readers of their paper except as Brother R. F. Duckworth wills to suffer them; and since this policy subverts the paper from its due and rightful mission, I

hereby sever my connection with the paper as editor or as a writer to be effective as long as this policy remains in effect. Hence, you will please remove my name from your mailing list and from the editorial staff. You will find stamps enclosed for the return of any manuscript of mine that may be in your hands.

Respectfully submitted,
H. C. HARPER

And I have found out by actual test that "Both sides of all questions" only means as in the caprice of the publisher and a certain bunch of preachers the whim strikes him. No living man with even a jumble full of honesty in his make-up can say that this is right, much less Christian. It is an embodiment of unrighteousness.

Now watch Cowan dodge. I again challenge him to meet me at Robstown and Lometa. Let us give the people both sides.

JAS. T. WHITE
Lometa, Texas

May 15, 1928.

Alexander Campbell
on
The Worship

In 1835, when Alexander Campbell, the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths in which to dwell" (Isa. 58:17), was in the prime of life, he wrote a book called the "Christian System," in which he advocated a universal return to the primitive order of things in the church of Christ. Brother Campbell had no hobbies to ride, no man-made theory to advocate; but made a strong plea for "Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to Him as our only Lawgiver and King, the ONLY TEST of Christian character, and the ONLY BOND of Christian union, communion, and co-operation, irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments, and traditions of men."

Campbell restored the primitive plan of salvation which consisted, on man's part of:

1. Faith in Jesus as the Messiah—John 3:16; Heb. 7:7:6.)
2. Repentance of sins, bearing fruit in a reformation of life (Acts 2:38; Luke 13:3; Acts 17:30, 31).
3. Confession of faith in Jesus of Nazareth, as the Messiah—the Prophet, Priest, Lawgiver and King (Matt. 10:32; Acts 8:37; Rom. 10:8:10.)
4. Immersion in the name of Jesus into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19), "for the remission of sins". (Mark 16:16; John 3:5; Acts 2:38; 22:16).

He advocated a return to the Lord's way of worship laid down in the Acts and Epistles. The following from the "Christian System," pages 290-292, shows that he approved of a meeting in which the male members did the teaching "one by one" (I Cor. 14:31), while "the women learn in silence with all subjection" (I Tim. 2:11, 12; I Cor.

14:33-35). It also shows that he approved of one cup in the communion service. Read the article.

"The following extract from my memorandum book furnishes the highest approach to the model which we have in our eye of good order and Christian decency in celebrating this institution. Indeed the whole order of that congregation was comely:

"The church in— consisted of about fifty members. Not having any person whom they regarded as filling Paul's outlines of a bishop, they had appointed two senior members, of a very grave department, to preside in their meetings. These persons were not competent to labor in the word and teaching; but they were qualified to rule well, and to preside with Christian dignity. One of them presided at each meeting. After they had assembled in the morning, which was at 11 o'clock, (for they had agreed to assemble at eleven and to adjourn at two o'clock during the winter season), and after they had saluted one another in a very familiar and cordial manner, as brethren are wont to do who meet for social purposes; the president for the day arose and said, "Brethren, being assembled in the name and by the authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, on this day of his resurrection, let us unite in celebrating his praise." He then repeated the following stanza:

"Christ the Lord is risen today!
Sons of men and angels say;
Raise your joys and triumphs high.
Sing, O Heavens! and earth reply!"

The congregation arose and sang this psalm in animating strains. He then called upon a brother, who was a very distinct and emphatic reader, to read a section of the evangelical history. He arose and read, in a very audible voice, the history of the crucifixion of the Messiah. After a pause of a few moments, the president called upon a brother to pray in the name of the congregation. His prayer abounded in thanksgivings to the Father of Mercies, and with supplications for such blessings on themselves and for all men as were promised to those who ask, or for which men are commanded to pray. The language was very appropriate: no unmeaning repetitions, no labor of words, no effort to say anything and everything that that came into his mind; but to express slowly, distinctly and emphatically the desires of the heart. The prayer was comparatively short; and the whole congregation, brethren and sisters, pronounced aloud the final Amen.

"After prayer a passage in one of the Epistles was read by the president himself, and a song was called for. A brother arose and, after naming the page, repeated—

"'Twas on that night when doom'd to know

The eager rage of every foe—

That night in which he was betrayed
The Saviour of the world took bread."

"He then sat down and the congregation sang with much feeling.

"I observed that the table was furnished before the disciples met in the morning, and that the disciples occupied a few benches on each side of it, while strangers sat off on seats more remote. The president arose and said that our Lord had a table for his friends, and that he invited his disciples to sup with him. In memory of his death, this monumental table," said he, "was instituted; and as he Lord ever lives in heaven, so he sees and lives in the hearts of his people. As the first disciples, taught by the apostles in person, came together in one place to eat the Lord's supper, and as they selected the first day of the week in honor of his resurrection, for this purpose; so we, having the same Lord the same faith, and the same hope with them, have vowed to do as they did. We owe as much to the Lord as they; and ought to love, honor and obey him as they." Thus having spoken, he took a small loaf from the table, and in one or two periods, gave thanks for it. After thanksgiving, he raised it on each side of him, who passed the broken loaf from one to another, until they all partook of it. There was no stiffness, no formality, no pageantry; all was easy, familiar, solemn, cheerful. He then took the cup in a similar manner, and returned thanks for it, and handed it to the disciple next to him, who passed it round; each one waiting upon his brother, until all were served. The thanksgiving before the breaking of the loaf, and the distributing of the cup, were as brief and pertinent to the occasion, as the thanks usually presented at a common table for the ordinary blessings of God's bounty. They then arose, and with one consent, sang—

"To him that loved the sons of men,
And washed us in his blood;
To royal honors raised our heads,
And made us priests to God!"

The president of the meeting called upon a brother to remember the poor, and those ignorant of the way of life before the Lord. He knelt down, and the brethren all united with him in supplicating the Father of Mercies in behalf of all the sons and daughters of affliction, the poor and destitute, and in behalf of the conversion of the world. After this prayer the fellowship or contribution was attended to; and the whole church proved the sincerity of their desires, by the cheerfulness and liberality which they seemed to evince, by putting into the treasury as the Lord had prospered them.

"A general invitation was tendered to all brotherhood if they had anything to propose or enquire, tending to the edification of the body. Several of the brethren arose in succession and read several passages from the Old and New Testaments, relative to some matters which had been subjects of former investigation or inquiry. Sundry remarks were made; and after singing several

spiritual songs selected by the brethren the president, on motion of a brother who signified that the hour of adjournment had arrived, concluded the meeting by pronouncing the apostolic benediction.

"I understand that all these items were attended to in all their meetings; yet the order of their attendance was not invariably the same. On all occasions on which I was with them, no person arose to speak without invitation, or without asking permission of the president, and no person finally left the meeting before the hour of adjournment, without special leave. Nothing appeared to be done in a formal or ceremonious manner. Everything exhibited the power of godliness as well as the form; and no person could attend to all that passed without being edified and convinced that the spirit of God was there. The joy, the affection, and the reverence which appeared in this little assembly was the strongest argument that was in favor of their order, and the best comment on the excellency of the Christian institution."—Alexander Campbell.

The early disciples "continued in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship in the breaking of the loaf and in prayers," so let us do likewise. They had no Sunday School. Hence, if we wish to be Apostolic, we will have none. Let us ever abide in "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4: 6), thus "keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4).

JAMES DOUGLAS PHILLIPS,
439 N. Drury Avenue,
Kansas City, Mo.

News and Notes

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—Am just home from a meeting at Spaulding, near Holdenville, Okla. The brethren came from there to hear me. I gave anyone the privilege of asking any questions or making any reply, but no one said anything; but when I got home I received a challenge from J. H. Wiggs, Jr., of Holdenville, who sent the following propositions for a debate, which I accepted for oral debate; but he said he wanted a written debate in the Way and The Truth, so I referred him to Dr. Trott and you. But I signed his propositions to meet him in oral debate, and told him he could publish it in any paper he wanted to. Here are the propositions:

1. "The cup" as mentioned in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper, is used in the literal sense.

BOB MUSGROVE, Aff.
I. H. WIGGS, JR., Deny.

2. "The cup" in every case mentioned in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper has direct reference to "the fruit of the vine" and that only.

I. H. WIGGS, JR., Aff.
BOB MUSGRAVE, Deny.

He wants a debate on what it is. I sent him some propositions on the number of cups, asking him to discuss that issue. At Holdenville when some of the brothers wait on the table, they have two cups; and when others wait on the table, they have one.

Note: We have not heard from Bro. Wiggs, but I assure him that we will be very glad to discuss his propositions with him or anyone else through "The Truth." And I do not blame him for standing up boldly for what he believes to be the truth. I have no use for the man that tries to "smother" the truth. The brethren who oppose us should meet us openly, fairly and honestly, or cease their opposition.—Ed.

C. D. Moore, Paden City, W. Va.—Am sorry to inform you that you need not send me any more extra copies of your paper, as I will not hand them out with the "one cup" wrangling therein.

Everyone should know that Jesus dedicated that one element, the fruit of the vine, to be drunk in remembrance of Him.

Everyone should know that He did not dedicate that one cup, vessel, for us to drink from.

Note: If it takes "wrangling," brother, to learn the truth on this subject, it is evident that we need a lot of wrangling just now. But why do the proponents of the cups get so huffy about the matter? If they have the truth, they can easily meet their opposers; and if they are simply afraid we will take their "candy," they should not murmur, for it will be only the better for them at the judgment. Better not make so much "fuss" yourself or they will think you belong with the Sunday School ranks and do not want the truth. Where did you learn that Jesus dedicated "that one element, the fruit of the vine, to be 'drunk' in remembrance of him, and not that one cup, vessel for us to drink from? Jesus says, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." And "Everyone should know" that this one element, the fruit of the vine, to be drunk in remembrance of Him, is not "this cup" and cannot be correctly spoken of as "this cup," when it is in "cups," and "everyone should know" that if "this cup" for which thanks have been given is poured into cups, it is no longer "this cup."

Let my brother show where Jesus commands us to bless and drink the fruit of the vine separate from a cup and my opposition to his contention will cease. Is he ready for the task? No, but he can "holler," "one cup wrangling."—Ed.

M. H. Northcross, Ocala, Florida.—You see "the cup" business is all O.K. in D's paper, but all wrong in "The Truth" with Commodore. Give us the truth, and if they do not wish to be hit, let them keep out of the way. I candidly think you are giving us a high grade religious journal, yes, far above the average; and it deserves the

support and patronage of all loyal Christians. I always did detest a man that will smother the truth, and I am glad that we have one open forum. The paper has a neat appearance, and when you read its inviting pages, you realize its heaven-born desire to spread pure and unadulterated Bible teaching to humanity everywhere. Its spirit of kindness, glowing through its pages of truth and love, and manifested to the brotherhood, is certainly making a lasting impression upon its many readers. And I am simply filled with joy the first of every month when it greets my little family with its load of religious knowledge. I feel just like saying, "Oh, you've come at last; why have you stayed so long?" Instead of twelve times a year, I wish this paper would come at least 52 times. Its editorials are logical and convincing, and its contributors are writers of no mean ability, who hew to the line and let the chips take care of themselves. May the editor of "The Truth" be spared to the church many years to unravel the kinks that policy preachers have let gather in the thread of truth.

Homer L. King, Spencer, Ind.: I am sending subs for "The Truth." Many have promised to take it later. I am delighted with the way you are handling the paper. I do not see how it could be better, unless it appeared oftener. The brethren are expecting you in the East just as soon as you can get there.

C. H. James, Roswell, N. Mex.—We received the May issue of "The Truth." We read it and handed it out to be read again. You can put me down as a regular subscriber, as long as the paper contends for the truth.

Bro. Sidney W. Smith closed a good meeting at L. F. D. Church, baptized two and two reclaimed. Bro. Smith does not fail to preach the gospel as "it is written." Bro. T. F. Thomason of Artesia, N. Mex., preaches each first Lord's day at Greenfield, each second at L. F. D., and each fourth at Hagerman, and we have good, working congregations at all of these places, and carry on the church work in the Lord's appointed way. Bro. N. L. Clark will hold a meeting at the Fifth Street Church in Roswell in June.

Homer L. King, Spencer Ind.—May 19, I have just closed another good meeting at Unionville, Ind., on the night of the 17th day of May. Had splendid interest and attendance throughout the meeting. House would not hold the people at times. The meeting continued for about twelve days, and resulted in eight confessions and baptisms, two took membership and one was reclaimed. This makes the third meeting I have held with these good brethren within a period of fourteen months. The first resulted in fourteen additions; the second in forty, and the last in eleven, making a total of sixty-five additions. To God and His Son be all the praise.

I believe I have met some of the

very best people on earth at Unionville. We have the finest band of young people, all Christians, there I ever saw in any church. The church treated me royally, and remembered me and my family financially, for which I am very thankful. May God ever bless the dear brethren at Unionville and elsewhere. I am now in a meeting at Spencer, Indiana, and am expecting Bro. Jas. D. Phillips to be here Monday and preach with me until the meeting closes on the 27th.

The Literal Cup (or Drinking Vessel)

There is no law of God's dear son, To use one cup and only one: Discretion should decide the case, Just as it does the time and place. When the disciples are but few, Then Prudence says, "One cup will do:" But in large crowds, as some of yore, Discretion says, "Use two or more." For there's no law from Christ, the Son Binding us to use but one. Hence, we may use one, two, or more. When of the sacred wine we pour. When hundreds or thousands thus meet To take this communion sweet, They're not commanded all to sup Out of just one and the same cup. Not being in the plan of grace, This one-cup law is out of place: Great danger here hangs o'er the one, Who binds a law where God bound none.

A selfish spirit has planned it up, To give each one a separate cup: It magnifies some dreadful germ, To make love cold, and faith unjust. Those who will not with brethren drink, Neither would they with Christ, I think The sin lies not in the tiny cup, But in the spirit that works it up.

—J. P. WATSON
Rt. 9, Cookeville, Tenn.

Reply: "Cup," Not Cups

Christ took the "cup," and then gave thanks; (Mt. 26: 27).
And said, "You must all drink from it." (Mt. 26:28).
And so obeying ev'ry whit,
It says, "And they all drank from it." (Mk. 14:24).

—GOODSPEED TR.
We can by faith thus acting do,
And whether many, whether few,
Thus walk by faith in ev'ry thing,
And to our Lord all honor bring.
If we now do as they have done,
And take the "cup," just only one,
The Lord's example and command
Will make us one united band.
But Prudence—the's a fractious Miss—
When courted by Discretion bold,
She'll trifle e'en with sacred things,
And never do as she was told.
When holding to Discretion's hand,
She has been known—I vow 'tis true—
To sprinkle, yes instead of dip,
To save (?) her health or dainty shoe.

So why not she, her Lord defy
With some "convenience" or whim.
And substitute the cups for "cup,"
And dare her Lord, yes, mock at him?
And when the cups you hear them
preach,
As some will do—"two, three or four"—
Hear Prudence prate, "Just one cup more"
Until she has a cup for each.
And all must bow to Prudence's way;
She binds her law, a human fake;
And there's Discretion backing her,
So you must yield, or not partake.
So Prudence now will have her way,
And be by Satan led astray
To satisfy her ev'ry whim—
And in the end be damned with him.
(Mt. 25:41, 46; Rev. 20:10).

—Ed.

REMARKS

We will furnish a man to discuss this issue with Brother Watson in writing on any one of the following propositions:

I. The Scriptures authorize the use of more than one container in the distribution of the wine used in the Lord's Supper.

This is the proposition that Brother Clark affirmed.

II. "The cup," as used by Christ in att. 26:27, and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same.

This is the proposition Brother Cowan wrote and signed and sent to me in 1925 and was signed by me and returned to him, but he has failed to meet it.

III. Brother Watson says: "I have arguments that I think are irrefragable in support of the position that the word 'cup' is used figuratively in every instance where it refers to the Lord's Supper.

Then let the proposition be: The word "cup" is used figuratively in every instance where it refers to the Lord's Supper.
This we deny.

IV. Again Brother Watson says: When conditions are such that prudence suggests the use of more than one cup in a congregation, to use as many cups as sound judgment through prudence may suggest is in perfect harmony with every inspired Scripture on the subject of the sacred communion.

If he will affirm this, we will deny it. He may make his own arrangements as to the number of articles, the length of the articles, and the publication of the discussion he chooses; or we will publish the matter if confined to not more than eight articles to each disputant and not more than 800 words to the article.

The Plan of Salvation (Number V)

By H. C. Harper

Mr. Vanzandt says: "Jesus was not buried to kill him, but because he was dead;" and adds: "Neither should we be buried in baptism to kill us, but because we are dead to sin."

Here his theory signally fails again. There are two states: 1. "Dead in sins"—notice "in" sins (Col. 2: 13; Eph. 2:1); 2. "Dead to sin"—notice "to" sin (Rom. 6:2, 11). And the one who is dead "to" sin, is "alive to God." "So also reckon yourselves to be dead indeed to sin, but alive to God" (Rom. 6: 11). Hence, Mr. Vanzandt's man was alive to God before baptism and alive to God after baptism—alive in the same sense before baptism that he was after baptism; so was buried alive.

Or, if you please, his man was dead (to sin) before he was baptized (buried), and dead (to sin) after he was baptized—dead in the same sense after baptism that he was before baptism, hence never had a resurrection (in baptism) to "life." And if he is "quicken" after he is "dead to sin" (and he is "dead to sin" before baptism, according to Mr. Vanzandt's theory) he is surely "made alive" to sin when he is baptized. Mr. Vanzandt can take either horn of the dilemma he chooses!

The teaching of the Bible on this point is: we bury (in baptism) those "dead in sins," who are unforgiven (Col. 2:12, 13); and they arise "quicken," "alive to God," "forgiven," made free from sin—to "walk in newness of life" (Col. 2:12, 13; Rom. 6:2, 4, 11, 17, 18). And they are exhorted to continue in this glorious resurrection life, as Christ does in his, and not let sin henceforth reign over them (Rom. 6: 4-23). "Having been buried with him in baptism, in which also ye were raised with him through the faith of the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, he made alive together with him, having forgiven you all offenses" (Col. 2:12, 13).

This makes it clear that the spiritual union with Christ takes place when "made alive together with him" in baptism and raised "through the faith of the working to God, who raised him from the dead." Dead (in sins), buried (in baptism), made alive (to God), "forgiven," raised to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4)—this is the gospel plan of salvation.

But hear Mr. Vanzandt again. He says: "Baptism being a burial in water is a symbol of death, burial and resurrection of Jesus in our behalf, and inasmuch as it is the last of the public acts required in acknowledging Jesus as our savior, it is spoken as the whole of the requirements necessary to take us into Christ."

So here he admits that baptism is one of the requirements "necessary" to take us into Christ. In other words he admits that we are not "in" Christ until we are baptized. Of course, he cannot refute the plain statement that as many as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death—into the benefits of his death, of course. Rom. 6: 3. And the apostle

tells us: "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins" (Eph. 1:7).

But he tries to break the force of this candid admission by saying: "Baptism does not take us into Christ in the sense of saving us." Well, since we cannot be saved out of Christ, and since, according to his own admission, we cannot get into Christ without baptism, he makes baptism essential to salvation—as much so as any other one of the requirements necessary to take us into Christ! We all know that the blood of Christ saves us, and we see that Mr. Vanzandt himself makes baptism just as necessary to reach the blood as any other one of "the requirements necessary to take us into Christ," "in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins" (Eph. 1:7). He cannot evade it!

But he makes another struggle. He says: "I Pet. 3:20, 21 tells us that baptism saves us just like Noah and his family were saved by water and Gen. 7:1 tells us that they were righteous; Hence, saved from sin when they entered the ark, and baptism saves us in the same way, we must be saved from sin before we are baptized."

Here he is hopelessly entangled again. As a matter of truth, Noah and his family were "righteous," "perfect,"—saved from sin, if you please—long, long before they entered the ark (Gen. 6:3, 8, 9; 7:1; I Pet. 3:19). Nor were they thus "saved by water." But there was a salvation of Noah and his family "by water," and this is the salvation contemplated by Peter; for he says: "Eight souls were saved by water" (I Pet. 3:21). And we read: "God . . . spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly" (II Pet. 2: 4, 5); also: "And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground . . . and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark" (Gen. 7:23). This is the salvation Peter is talking about. Noah and his family might have remained in the ark a lifetime, had not the flood come, and not have been saved by "water." And had the element been fire, for example—instead of "water," Noah and his family would not have been saved—they would have "perished" with the rest. "Water was the appointment of God for saving Noah and his family. When the water came, it bore up the ark (Gen. 7:17, 18) and "saved" Noah and his family, but destroyed the others (Gen. 7:4). And truly "I Pet. 3:20, 21 tells us that baptism saves us just like Noah and his family were saved by water." It says: "Eight souls were saved by water which in the antitype baptism doth also now save us, 'save from sin'—Matt. 1:21) us." Hence, Ananias said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins" (Acts 22:

16)—language that is nonsensical if "we must be saved from sin before we are baptized." And Peter said:

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins"—language that cannot, according to the laws of syntax, be made to mean that "we must be saved from sin before we are baptized." And Jesus said: "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—language that cannot mean "final salvation," which depends upon faithfulness after baptism; nor can it mean that "we must be saved from sin before we are baptized"—never! And it is the very constitutional law of the New Covenant. Let Mr. Vanzandt tell us, if he can, how a person can be saved by a thing (in any sense but nonsense), when the person is already saved before the thing is administered!

"Intenable"

"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 intenable position for a man to be in. Harper and Trott insist that it is wrong to use more than one cup. You and Cowan think that more than one may be used, while all of you are opposed as I understand it, to the individual cups. So am I, but how to oppose the individual cups and defend the use of two, four, six or a dozen cups is beyond me." (R. F. D. to N. L. C., Sept. 2, 1925).

"Intenable position," does not express it. This straddling of the fence is not new to a man of my age after facing the organ fight. And I want to ask Doctor Trott whether he does not think that there is something wrong with the heart of such a man. I do not mean, Doctor, as to whether he needs something from the saddle bags for his heart, but whether you do not think he needs a gospel dose, and a strong one, from the great Physician. Practice a thing, yet condemn it. Practice a thing, yet refuse to defend it. Just try for one brief moment to analyze the conscience of a man in this "intenable position," Doctor. I insist that there is something wrong with him, and I want you to give us a diagnosis of his case. He certainly is in danger, and I am really alarmed for his safety. When such symptoms developed with the organ patient, it almost invariably carried the patient off. So there is no time to lose, Doctor. I am going into eighty, and I have known but few to recover when such symptoms developed. I have been watching the trend of things lately with much anxiety for the Cause, and some things are alarming. We need men of convictions now and courage to stand for the Bible.

OLD DISCIPLE

A. W. Fender, Rt. A.

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.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, AUGUST, 1928

A LETTER WITH AN ARTICLE

The Truth, Sneads, Florida:

I am enclosing an article which I sent to Bro. Duckworth to be published in the Way, but he kept putting me off and finally wrote me that he did not think it advisable to publish it, so I wrote for the return of the article and am sending it to you. If Duckworth and Conner would put forth the energy for the spread of the gospel through the Way that they are spending to advertise a secular school and human enterprise, there would be some hope for the cause of Christ

L. I. GIBBS

Los Angeles, Calif., 7735 Whitsett Ave.

ARE WE DRIFTING?

In I Cor. 2:2 we have these words uttered by the Apostle Paul himself: "For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him Crucified."

This is a fine sentiment and is expressive of the character of the great worker for the salvation of men. And every man's expressed sentiments are expressive of his real character.

The above scripture shows us that the Apostle Paul did not intend to preach anything but the pure and unadulterated GOSPEL OF CHRIST. And a curse is pronounced upon any man who would pervert the true gospel or preach any other than the pure GOSPEL—Gal. 3: 6-9.

With this much before our minds, I wish to ask my readers this question: What would you think of me if I were running a large mail-order house, hiring only Christians to conduct my business, and requesting religious journals to give me at least a page of free advertising once a month, also requesting preachers to spend their time campaigning for the secular business, drumming up business for me, while they preached Christ what spare time they had to give to the Lord's work after advertising my business—I say what would you think of me, yes, and of those preachers, too? I hope brethren will stop and think before we drift so far on the brakers that we cannot recover ourselves, and again go to digression.

I believe my readers can readily see the danger here. Just watch the Way—is it drifting? I stand for the defense of the old Book, and for God's institutions—the family and the church, and I will go no farther. I intend to hew to the line and let the chips fall where they will, and this regardless of what brethren say, even if I stand alone. Perhaps some brother is ready to say these secular institutions, be they wholly such, or be they religio-secular, but why should the church be burdened by them? Where is there one that has not gone

NEWS AND NOTES

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., July 8, 1928—I am now in a good meeting four miles northwest of Pernell, Okla. Was intending to run until Sunday night, but was rained out, and had to close unexpectedly.

Brother Harper is in a good meeting at Pike City, which began July 1 and will close July 14, when his meeting will begin at Healdton and continue for two weeks.

Madison Wright, 1816 Ocolea Ave., Columbus, Ohio.—In my tent meeting at Brookville, Penn., closed on July 1, with fourteen baptisms and three restored. My tent was badly torn in a storm at Newark, Ohio, and I have needed funds to repair it, and if any brother or church wishes to have fellowship with me in the gospel work to save the lost, donations may be sent to my address as given above. The judgment is coming. "What thou doest, do quickly." Let us work while it is day, for the night soon cometh when no man can work. Let us press the fight for the truth. I am with "The Truth" in the opposition to all humanisms. Let us help one another. I enjoy the fellowship of the saints of God. May God bless all the faithful.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—My meeting at Winters, Okla., closed with two baptisms. To God be all glory. I expect soon to be at New Salem, Texas, and while there I expect to attend Brother Harper's meeting at Graham, Texas.

on the rocks of digression? A sheep's clothing they put on to rob the church of its glory and the world goes hungering and thirsting for the GOSPEL.

If the school is not a Bible College, all the more why it should not be advertised in a religious journal and that preachers should not be giving their valuable time and money in going over the country in boosting a purely secular business in which some are trying to enrich themselves.

One has said: "It is as scriptural to write a gospel sermon and send it to others as it is to go and preach a gospel sermon to others."

This is true. And it is just as true as has been said in the Way itself, that "Religious journals should be free from worldly and secular advertising."

And since there are but two divine institutions—the family and the church—what would you think of a religious journal whose mission is declared to be to promote these two institutions that boosts another institution by continually advertising it?

Why should we be spending our money for college or other human institutions? Let us take the gospel to the unsaved.

L. I. GIBBS

A GOOD LETTER

To show our readers what we are accomplishing by sending out "The Truth," we are taking the liberty to publish the following letter received from a young Presbyterian minister in the State of Minnesota.

This gifted young man will, no doubt, be a regular Paul among us when he obeys the gospel of Christ as Paul did.

We intend to encourage him to enter the evangelistic field, and we shall be glad to encourage the churches to keep in touch with him and support him in spreading the glad tidings of salvation. And we hope the brethren who have made this work possible by donating to "The Truth Fund" will continue to help in this good work, and that others will become regular supporters of this good work.—Ed.

Box 235, Atwater, Minn.,
July 9th, 1928

Mr. H. C. Harper,
Heraldton, Okla.

My Dear Mr. Harper:

I am in receipt of your letter of July the 3rd and also a copy of your paper, "The Truth", for which I thank you very much. I read your letter with great joy, once to myself at the post office and once to mother upon coming home, and then I sat down and read aloud 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 that your excellent paper deserves to be called "The Truth."

The items you mention there have been matters of debate in my mind for some time, but that issue of your paper has settled them for mother and myself. With regard to the communion we can say that we never have had any blessing from a communion service where the individual cup system was used. There was no life, no spirit in it. As for baptism the common teaching on that subject is that it is an "outward sign of inward life" but the passages 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 interpretation. And as for the Sunday School, I have seen of late that it does more harm than good but was of the opinion (until I received your paper) that it was a universally accepted mode of teaching. I am with you, head, heart and soul on obliterating from the Christian program any doctrine, custom or practice not AUTHORIZED BY THE NEW TESTAMENT. O, how I thank God I have found out there are still some people in this pagan world who are interested in Primitive Christianity! Today has been the happiest day I have had for a long time!

I had begun to think that such primitive Christians could no longer be found and wished that I had been born in the days of the apostles, for my views seemed so out of place in this present wicked and formalistic world, I can feel the blessed spirit of primitive Christianity in your letter and in your paper and I thank God that I have found at last what I have so been yearning for of late. Oh, now we can say good-bye to lifeless CHURCHANITY. Good-bye to Ladies' Aids,

lemon-aids, and ice-cream socials. Good-bye to Sunday Schools and all the rest of the Ecclesiastical clap-trap invented by man. O, distant friend, 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 faithfully follow it. I am willing to do all that Christ commands me with regard to everything. There are no "ifs" or "buts" to this, my declaration of willingness to obey.

How I wish I could be where you are now and have some days and weeks of blessed fellowship in the Lord, but from what I have written above you are able to see that this is impossible just now. However, I anticipate that at a later date.

In the meantime I would joyfully welcome any suggestions you might care to make which would be of help to me in preparing for membership in the Church of Christ, because I am determined to take that step as soon as arrangements can be made and we are free to leave this place. Words cannot possibly depict the happiness mother and I feel in discovering the Church of Christ and finding at last what we believe to be "the genuine thing" in the line of primitive Christianity.

Wishing God's richest blessings on your work down in Oklahoma and awaiting in happy anticipation your reply, I am,

Very truly yours,
ALBERTA SORENSEN

P. S.—(Added sometime after writing the above) After writing this letter I have started to read "The Truth" over again. It is such manna to my soul it will bear several re-readings.

REPORT

I began my first meeting for the summer at Aspermont, Texas, where I found a church of faithful brothers and sisters in the Lord, and I can truly say as does the beloved John in one of his letters that I rejoice greatly to find these brethren walking in the truth. They worship God "in Spirit and in truth." They have no annexes to God's order—no Sunday School, but one teaching at a time, as Paul gave "the commandments of the Lord." I Cor. 14:31, 37. And they use one cup in the Communion, as Jesus did and as Paul gave it to the church at Corinth by the "commandments" of the Lord. I Cor. 10:16 and 11:25. They can read their practice from the Bible, and no other way is safe.

The next meeting was at Ada, Okla., where we established a church of eighteen, who began keeping house for the Lord just as the Apostles commanded. There are two faithful preachers now located in this city, Bro. J. W. Hoggett and Bro. G. B. Harrell, and the things they have heard and seen in Paul they teach, and nothing else is safe.

While at Ada I preached at three other congregations each of which uses one cup in the Communion service. It seems that the "two-or-more-cups" brethren are getting very shaky, for the churches are waking up to their duty in this matter and are demanding what

the Bible says as their guide instead of what the preacher says, even if he is one who opposes the Sunday School. And when they see what Bro. Frank Stark has done for Bro. R. M. Howard's defense of the cups, they will realize more than ever why the cups preachers are getting so scared and backing off from discussion of their practice, which is plainly seen not to be in the Bible.

I am now (July 1 to 15) at Loco, Okla., with four to be baptized. We had a great meeting here all day the fourth of July, preaching and dinner on the ground. Brother Harper, who publishes "The Truth," was with us and preached in the afternoon on "Walking by Faith," and I preached in the forenoon on "The Identity of the Church Known by Its Works." From here I go to Muddy for a meeting, and the first of August I go to Colter, near Elk City, Okla., for a meeting.

And from Colter I go to Sentinel, Okla., to begin a meeting for the brothers there August 16.

I find the brethren standing up for the Bible in opposition to the guesses, suppositions and think-so's of preachers, and they are coming to the support of "The Truth." It is becoming more manifest that when a brother says he stands for one cup and then throws in with those of cups without reproving them he is being watched and is put down as a fence-rider and "a double-minded man," who is unstable in all his ways, as James tells us. There is something wrong with such a man. He is not dependable. I have not much respect for a man who has no convictions, but drifts about with every wind of doctrine. Neither have I for the man who will not oppose a thing and yet says it is wrong. Jesus says he that is not for me is against me.

Brethren are getting busy in the fight. We have got the truth and they know it, for we stand ready to defend our practice by the Bible.

I expect to send in ten new subscribers to "The Truth," the only open forum on all Bible subjects. We can reach thousands with the paper that is standing (and whose editor has stood) for a "Thus Saith the Lord" for our faith and practice. Brethren, let us get behind Brother Harper and push the cause of truth before the people. If you can not get them to take it a year, get them to give you fifty cents and take it for six months. Are you interested in setting the truth of the Bible before the people? If so, lend a helping hand to the work. Yours in hope and prayer.—Bob Musgrove, Elk City, Okla.

Lafe, Ark. R. F. D. No. 1,
June 8th, 1928

In my remarks of June first, I notice two errors: First, reference was made to Bro. "Douglass Dunn" instead of Bro. "Douglass," as it appeared in "The Truth." Second, where I intended saying "we are not necessarily begging, when passing the "hat" the word "not" was omitted in "The Truth" & made it seem to be against my argument.

If Bro. Reese contends that when passing the "hat," & in so doing the occasional passing of a sinner is "begging," or "soliciting" money from him, I shall say when passing the "bread & cup" in communion, the occa-

sional passing of the same sinner, is "begging" him to partake of the communion.

Shall say that "sectarians resort to all kinds of shows & schemes of different nature, to get money from the "world" on which to carry their "church work," but "we" as a "peculiar people," contend that the "church" should pay its own bills, hence in passing the "hat," we are "not" begging for money to carry on the expense of the "church" any more than we are "begging" anyone when passing the emblems to commemorate the death & suffering of Christ.

What say you?

W. T. JONES.

NEWS AND NOTES

Jackson Howton, Blanket, Texas.—I have just received "The Truth," and read it through at one sitting, and wish for more. I hope to help you more; we need the paper twice a month now, and I hope and pray that God will put it into the hearts of the brethren to assist in getting it out. I admire the stand you are taking in keeping the churches to the Bible. My race on earth will soon be over, but "To die and be with Christ is gain."—Phil. 1:28. I am glad to know that we have one paper that is straight on the Bible. Others have been pulling to get me to help them, but they have been weighed in the balance of God and found wanting. A man that will acknowledge that a thing is right, just what the Bible teaches, and yet go with the other side that he says he can not defend, is not straight on the Bible, in my way of thinking.

The brethren from six congregations convened at Loco, Okla., on the fourth of July and had two good sermons, one in the forenoon by Bro. Bob Musgrove and one in the afternoon by Bro. Harper. Dinner for all was spread and everyone seemed to enjoy the occasion very much.

REPORT

My work here at Marion, Louisiana, is still going forward, and I thank you who have assisted me in the work of the kingdom of God's dear Son. I love the truth, and I delight to preach it to the people, and I hope that I may be able to keep preaching all the time. It makes me so sad to think so many will be lost, for they have not obeyed the Gospel of Christ.

I see that Brother Harper is having much discussion on the cup question and is trying to get all to take the Bible and go by it. We all know how the Bible reads: then why will we not all go by it? And I notice in the paper his debate with Brother Tucker on the wine question. Why not have this debate written so we all could read it? Why should any man flinch who wants the truth? Are some of us getting afraid of the truth like the Sunday School ones did? Will the church again go to ruin like the Sunday School brethren have gone? I like the stand of "The Truth," and I wish Brother Harper great success in his stand to keep the church to the Bible.

J. A. COMFIELD, RT. 1

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

AUGUST, 1928

THE CHURCH

Do you ask "What church?" There is but one true church, and that is the one built by Christ. (Matt. 16:18), and he is its head (Col. 1:18), that is, he has all authority to direct it. (Matt. 28:19).

Are you a member of this church? If not, why not? You will find stated in the Bible just what it takes to become a member of the true church, and in the March issue of "The Truth" we called attention to just what the Bible says will make one a member of the Church of Christ. Have you done these things, dear reader? Won't you examine the Bible on these things? We would be so glad to know that you will be saved. Jesus shows us plainly in the parable of the great supper that excuses will not be accepted. (Lk. 14 ch.) And when Adam made an excuse, God did not excuse him. So let us be very careful to do just what God says for us to do. We cannot escape our responsibility. O, let us be in earnest about this matter, which means so much to us, not only here, but in eternity. (Lk. 12:16-21). Why not obey the gospel now? For at the judgment it will be awful for those who have not obeyed the gospel (I Thes. 1:7). The church, his body (Eph. 5:23), has been established; the door has been opened, and no man shutteth. (Rev. 3:7). You are willing to examine about temporal things—land, cattle, grain, cotton, etc., then why not much more about the things of eternity? You say there are so many different churches that you cannot tell which one is right. You find but one in the Bible, dear reader—yes, just one, and there you will find just how to become a member of it. So do not let anyone deceive you. Just read for yourself. Jesus and his apostles have warned us. Just read Matt. 7 clear through; then read Col. 2. Yes, we are warned to shun false teachers. (I Tim. 4:1, 2; II Pet. 2:12; I John 4:1; II Cor. 11:13, 14, 15. Beware of the large crowds and the popular ways. It is the few that enter in at the strait gate (Matt. 7) You may say there are wicked men and hypocrites in the church. Are there not such where you now are out of the church?

And if others will not do right and be saved, why will you let these things stop you from duty and right? Is it simply because you want an excuse? Remember, excuses are not allowed. Do your duty, and show others the right way, and God will bless you. For at the end

of the world, Christ will come, and he will separate the good from the bad, and oh! the terrible end of the bad. (Matt. 25:31-46); But the supreme joys of the New Heaven and the New Earth will be for those who love and serve the Lord. (Rev. 21). Oh, how I wish all could feel that God loves us and wants us to come to a knowledge of the truth and be saved. (I Tim. 2:4.)

One says: "I want to feel that I am saved before I join the church." But the Bible teaches that the saved are the church—the called out, as the word translated church means. So do not talk about joining the church—the true church I mean: the one of which Christ is the head, after you are saved. The Lord saves, and when you are saved, you are one of the church; yes, you are then a member of the one body. The Lord saved; hence the Lord adds to the church. (Acts 2). You must be changed by faith (Rom. 10:10), by repentance (Acts 2, 38), by concession (Rom. 19:9, 19) and by Baptism. (Matt. 28:19; Mk. 16:16; Acts 2:38). Then you can go on your way rejoicing, too. Acts 8:39.)

God will save you only in his appointed way. Have you obeyed the gospel?—W. T. H.

THE WORD OF GOD

God, through his prophet, said to Israel of old, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast repected knowledge. I will also repect thee." Hosea 4:6. God had plainly told Israel that they must study his law and obey it. Lev. 26:3-5; Deut. 6:4-9. And when they failed to do this, he sent his prophet to warn them, saying: "Seek ye out the book of the Lord and read." Isa. 34:16. But they finally got so careless of this duty that they actually, like a school boy lost the "Book."

THE PLAN OF SALVATION

(Number VI)

Mr. Vanzandt cites Gal. 3:6-9, and says: "From this Scripture we see that Abraham was justified by faith and that God intended that the Gentiles should be justified in the same way—by faith.

Yes, Abraham was justified by faith; but "not by faith only" (Jas. 2:24). Abraham was not "justified" until his faith was "made perfect" by obedience. James plainly tells us that a faith that is not made perfect by obedience such as God requires, is a "dead" faith, and of no avail for "justification" (Jas. 2:15-25). Yes, he concludes that "a man"—any man, if you please—is justified "not by faith only." And Paul says: "Ye were the servants of sin: but God be thanked that ye obeyed from the heart that form of teaching which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness" (Rom. 6:17, 18). Yes, he says: "Therefore we were buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (v. 4).

But Mr. Vanzandt tells us: "They (the Gentiles) were fully saved from sin and then baptized with the Holy Spirit BEFORE they received water baptism."

I will simply say that Mr. Vanzandt would better not know so much than to know so much that isn't so! Where did he learn that they were saved before obedience in baptism? Not in the Bible, I am sure; for the angel said to Cornelius: "Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter. He will tell thee what thou oughtst to do—shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts 10:6; 11:17).

Now, what did Peter tell them? What were his instructions whereby they might be "saved"? Listen! "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Hence, this was "what they ought to do" to "be saved". And if they were saved before obedience in baptism, the angel of God falsified. But he did not. And since they were baptized "in the name of the Lord," they were baptized "unto the remission of sins"; for Jesus instituted the baptism which Peter declares to be "unto the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38), and he plainly tells us that God "put no difference between both us (Jews) and them (Gentiles), having purified their hearts by the faith" (Acts 15:9-H. & N. Inter. Tr.) Yes, *the faith*; just as Paul says: "But the faith having come, we are no longer under a tutor; for ye are sons of God through the faith of Jesus Christ. For as many as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (H. & N. and L. O. Tr, Gal. 3:25-27). And Paul was the apostle for the Gentiles; but it is said of him after he became a Christian, he "now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed" (Gal. 1:23). Hence, we know that he preached; and hence the Gentiles are saved on the same terms, or conditions, of forgiveness as are the Jews. In other words, the New Covenant commission applies to all. And Jesus says (Matt. 28:19,20): "Disciple all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." And we see in Acts 2:42 that they began to observe "the apostles' teaching" as soon as they were baptized. But as soon as one is saved, he is expected to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4, 17, 18). And since they begin this new activity as soon as they are baptized, it is evident that one is saved as soon as he is baptized. Again: If one is saved before baptism, he is same outside of the "name" of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. since there is but one way "into" this name—"be baptized." Again: One who is a "disciple" under this commission is a Christian, saved (Acts 11:26; Acts 20:7). But one becomes a disciple of Christ when baptized into His name (Matt. 28:19; I Cor. 1:13; Acts 19:5). Hence, one is not a Christian, saved, until he is baptized into His name.

Furthermore, Jesus says: "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:15, 16). This cannot mean future salvation; for we know that the Bible does not teach that every one who believes and is baptized shall be finally saved—one may "fall" (II Pet. 1:10) after he is baptized. There is but thing in reason it can mean, and that is, the one who believes the gospel of Christ and is baptized, shall be then "made free from sin" (Rom. 6:4, 17, 18) to "walk in newness of life."

And this is exactly what the Holy Spirit "testified" on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:38-42). Hence, we conclude without a shadow of a doubt that the Gentiles were not saved until they obeyed in baptism.

Mr. Vanzandt writes me that he has promised more articles than he expects to find time to write, but that he may find time to write one article "if the case demands it." And I think he will hardly find it worth while to try to patch up his theory, but I here again extend to him the opportunity, and rest the matter for the present.

A REPRINT

The following appeared in the Apostolic Way of April 15, 1923, two issues before Brother Teurman's death; and if the truth had not been smothered by a later mismanagement, this question would not now be bobbing up to disturb the churches.

A QUESTION

My Dear Brother Harper:

What do the Scriptures teach relative to the cup or cups to be used in the assembly on the Lord's Day? Please give me an answer through the Way. Make it as plain as you can.

ANSWER

I rather like the way you put the question, brother. What do the Scriptures teach? Had the Scriptures been followed, this subject never would have brought discord to the churches of Christ. There has been but one debate on this subject, so far as I remember—that between Bro. J. A. Stigers, of Summerville, Pa., and Bro. N. E. Kellems, of Chelsey, N. Dak. I can furnish a limited number of copies of this debate free to those who write me for it. (I distributed all I had.—Ed).

If it is not generally understood, I want it to be everywhere known that the Way has a standing challenge to meet any man on this issue.

J. W. McCarvey, among the digressives, wrote most convincingly against this innovation, but it went in just the same, as did the organ, over the protest of the brethren. David Lipscomb at first wrote against the unscriptural practice, but in his declining years he apologized for it; and it went into some of the churches at Nashville. Brother Rowe at first wrote against the innovation, but I have been told that he later withdrew his opposition to it. Most men like popularity more than the truth of the gospel. Yes, I say *most*, and I use the word advisedly.

The "sanitary" argument, I believe, has had the most weight with the people in leading them to condone the innovation. It is so detrimental to health for one person to drink after another, they say. Yes, in many cases DANGEROUS, they say.

And this same argument has been used with telling effect against immersion. And this plea for the use of the cups has recently given double weight against immersion. I have a pamphlet, recently put out by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, and here is the language relating to baptism: "Sprinkler—Suppose I admit that Jesus was plunged, would that prove that no other mode is valid? We know exactly how another ordinance, equally important and divine, was

administered by Jesus and the Apostles. Do you mean to say that unless all partake of the supper after the pattern set by the Savior, it is invalid?

"Immerser—By no means. None of now administer the Lord's Supper after the mode that Jesus did.

"Sprinkler—How do you then prove that the pattern in the one case is to be followed, and not in the other?"

And I say, Echo answers, HOW? One is in the mud as deep as the other is in the mire. Hence, Brother Rowe, when at first combating this departure from the New Testament practice, said: "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 and in this position the Standard is, of course, scripturally correct. But now, in case of this 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 in partaking of the cup.

"Immersion is right, or it is wrong; sprinkling is right, or it is wrong; and it should require no more time for the Standard to decide the question of scriptural department in the one case than in the other.

"The manner of participating in the Lord's Supper is stated in Holy Writ just as plainly as the "mode" of baptism. And the Standard has proven indifferent to its opportunity to rebuke something that is at variance with Scripture precedent."

But maybe the Christian Standard wants to be popular? And how about the Christian Leader now?

In the Firm Foundation, March 5, 1912, in answer to Bro. Holt on his "sanitary" argument, I submitted this from Dr. Porter, President of the Florida State Board of Health: "When someone says (it does not matter whether layman or professional man) that the common drinking cup is a prolific source of disease dissemination, the question naturally follows. How do you know? What is your proof? What diseases are thus transmitted from person to person? Simmered down to proof, there is none."

Dr. Porter says that he addressed a letter to Dr. Farrand, secretary of the National Society for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, and asked him if it is known to the Association that the use of the common drinking cup or the drinking of one person after another has been the means of spreading tuberculosis. And Dr. Farrand replied: "There is no definite proof. I fancy that the amount of infection through that agency is very slight."

Dr. Porter then adds: "There is a possibility of syphilitic infection being conveyed from the mucus particles in the mouth of a syphilis person to another with aphthous sores by using a glass or cup without being washed or rinsed, but the danger even in this case is so exceedingly slight that it is to our mind hardly worth considering."

And in this connection I now quote from an article in the Way of Sept. 1, 1913, by Dr. Trott. He says: "I will stake my professional reputation on the asser-

tion that *cultures* from the individual cup, made by a competent biologist, will reveal as many deadly germs as those made from the common cup. There is no need to argue over a matter susceptible of proof. Just go to work and give us the proof of the contention of the deadly danger of the common drinking cup before asking us to ignore the example set by our Lord and the Apostles and to accept this fad, for I brand it as neither more nor less than a religious fad."

Now let me quote from an answer to a question on this matter submitted to the Gospel Advocate: "I have never known anyone to contract disease by the use of the cup in the supper."

And if it could be shown that the use of cups is less likely to cause contamination from cultures, this is no excuse for setting aside a divine regulation. If you contend it is, I insist that we sprinkle instead of immerse. And if you cut loose from the divine standard, where will you go? Go to the digressives, who take one step after another from the Bible.

J. H. Garison, in the Christian Evangelist says: (Elsewhere in this issue of "The Truth" will be found this article).

Now suppose at this proposed "Conference" the representatives decide upon the "uniform method" of the Catholics—then what? Why, take it, of course. This is the way Catholics got it—from man. Then why not take the way of the Bible. All other ways—and they are many—are on the road to Rome.

Brother Trott has truly said: "If all they have ever said of the dangers of the common cup were true, I would still prefer to defy every germ that ever existed, rather than defy the Lord by refusing to follow his example."

McQuiddy says: "Any one who is frightened away from the observance of the Lord's Supper for fear of contracting disease, is more afraid of physical infirmity than he is of sin." (G. A., Dec. 21, 1922).

But says one: "The cup that is spoken of in the Bible refers to the contents of the cup."

This is not true. But if it were true, yet the *contents* of the cup could be used by metonymy for the *cup* without signifying that there is *one* container—a *cup*. There is no law of language that authorizes a person to say, "the cup", "this cup", or "a cup", as it is in the Bible, when referring to the contents of *cups*.

What does *ek* mean? It means *out of*. "They (Phillip and the eunuch came up *ek* (out of) the water."

"And having taken *the cup*, and having given thanks, he gave to them, saying, all drink *ek* (out of) it." Matt. 26:27. "And they all drank *ek* (out of) it". Mark 14:23. Here a literal cup is signified, together with its contents.

When people leave a "Thus saith the Lord" for their faith and practice, they get into deep water. They must go on, or return, or drown. That is, they must return again to the safe "rock" (Matt. 7:24), or keep on digressing in man's ways, or they perish as a people. One digression calls for another. The spirit (it is the spirit of unbelief in God's word—see Heb. Chapters 3 and 4) that begets one, begets them all.

Why not take God's word. As Bro. Rowe truly

says: "The manner of participating in the Lord's Supper is stated in Holy Writ." Then why not follow it?

In the Way of Feb. 1, 1922, I said, after Bro. Trott had reviewed Armstrong's tract on the use of cups: "And I here and now challenge J. N. Armstrong, Daniel Sommer, or any other man that will furnish a medium for the discussion, to meet us in a 'full and free discussion' of this issue, to be put in pamphlet form for free distribution, each writer to bear half the expense of publication," and I here repeat the challenge. (And I here make the same challenge for "The Truth" in 1928).

Bro. T. C. Hawley, Madena, Calif., has pamphlet on this subject, and he gives this notice: "This tract will be furnished free of cost in reasonable quantities to anyone who will distribute it."

This is an excellent tract. I have read it. Send for it. There is no possible defense for the use of "cups" except digressive arguments that will sustain every humanism in the church of Christ.

—H. C. HARPER.

Note: Brother N. E. Kellems, 2108 Olive St., Temple, Calif., may have a few copies of his debate with Bro. Stigers left. If so, by all means get it.—Ed.

REPORT

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., June 14.—I closed a meeting at Spencer, Ind., on the night of May 28th. Considering the time of the meeting, I think we had a good meeting. Had good crowds and interest throughout. Among the number baptized were four from the Baptist. They were baptized the same hour of the night.

Bro. James Douglas Phillips, of Everton, Ark. came by to spend the greater part of the meeting with me, but after two day's stay he contracted the flu, and was unable to attend the rest of the meeting. However, he made his home with Bro. Roy Fiscus, where I was making mine, and we had a nice visit. It was not my first time to meet Bro. Phillips, as I had the privilege of baptizing him some six years ago. I was delighted to have him with me in the meeting.

I go next to Shreveport, La., to begin a meeting the 24th of June, then to Atlanta, Texas, to begin there the second Lord's day in July.

Brethren, let us not forget to speak a word for The Truth, and secure a list of subs, wherever we go. There has been a small deficit this month, and we hope the brethren will not forget this and will send Sister Harper a donation immediately to get out the next issue. The paper has already done much good, as we all know. So don't put it off.

—HOMER L. KING.

HODGES-PHILLIPS DEBATE

The Scriptures teach that the Seventh Day of the week is the Lord's Day of Rev. 1:10, and the observance of the same is binding on all followers of Christ.

FOURTH AND LAST AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT

The word Christian is colloquial being given in de-

cision at Antioch. God, Christ nor any Apostle ever gave it as a proper name for God's people. The word is used only three times in the New Testament and never as an authoritative name by inspiration. First at Antioch by their enemies. Then at Agrippa—"Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian" and Peter's language—"If any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed."

Christ had no intention of establishing a new religion. He (Christ) said of the *Mosaic Law*, "Who-soever therefore shall break one of the least of these laws and shall *teach men so* shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven." Math. 5:18.

It is in this law of God which was given through Moses that we are taught to observe the Sabbath—Lord's Day, on which Christ put his stamp of approval.

Not once in the entire Bible did God ever admit the covenant was faulty on account of the nature of his laws. But the weakness of the flesh was invariably pointed out as the cause of his breaking the covenant with them. Had they been faithful no redeemer would have been necessary. God declares, "I change not," therefore we know his law is like himself, *unchangeable*.

The laws were not an experiment. God was their sole author. "I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts." Our proposition reads, "the scriptures teach." "The Scriptures" includes all the Old Testament and the New.

It is in the Law and prophets where we take our stand for unequivocal teachings in regard to which day of the seven is the Lord's Day. Not an iota of proof that God, Christ, or an apostle ever sanctioned any other day of the week as the Sabbath (except the other Sabbaths of the law).

The First day meetings were purely voluntary and followed the Sabbath. They were mainly business meetings where "collections" were made and other business matters attended to, that could not be done on the Sabbath.

tentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords." I am sorry you do not believe this.

In all this discussion, Mr. Hodges hasn't quoted one passage of scripture that says Christians should "observe" the Sabbath—not one! Therefore, he has failed, completely failed, to establish his proposition—he has! All the Scripture he has given that say anything about the Sabbath refer to God's covenant with Israel—*every one of them!* He hasn't quoted a Scripture that mentions the Sabbath as being binding on followers of Christ—not one! He has completely ignored most of my arguments—he has! He hasn't successfully met any of them—he hasn't! He ignored most of them—he did!

Remember, dear reader, that the Sabbath was a part of the law to Israel (Exod. 20:8). This law was "nailed to the cross" (Col. 2:14; Heb. 8:8-13). Therefore the Sabbath has been done away.

If we are "justified by the law" we are "fallen from

grace" (Gal. 5:4). The Sabbath was a part of "the law" (Exod. 20:8). Therefore, if we keep the Sabbath we are "fallen from grace."

JAMES DOUGLAS PHILLIPS,

FOURTH NEGATIVE

I can't see why he begins his article with a lot of false assumptions about "the name Christian," since it has nothing to do with the question under consideration. We are discussing the Sabbath question—not the name question. It looks remarkably strange that he would falsely assume that "the name Christian" was "given in derision" and then give Scripture references that kill his theory. Acts 11:26 says: "the disciples were called Christians." "Called" is from the Greek "*chrematizo*" and means a divine calling. Hence, the disciples were divinely called Christians.

Perhaps the worst error he made in this article is this: "Christ had no intention of establishing a new religion." If you want the truth about this matter just read the following: "I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18) "*He taketh away the first that he may establish the second*" (Heb. 10:9). "A new and living way which he (Christ,) dedicated for us" (Heb. 10:20). "I will make a new covenant . . . not according to the covenant . . . with their fathers" (Heb. 8:9). "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old" (Heb. 8:13). "The one new man (Church)" (Eph. 2:15).

His refusal to believe what God has said about the Old Covenant—the covenant with Israel—being done away in Christ (Eph. 2:14-16; Jer. 31:31-35; Col. 2:14) and that the "new and living way" has been established is the reason he is so badly confused about this matter. As I said in my first article, he makes no distinction between what God gave Israel by Moses and what he has given us by Jesus Christ (John 1:17).

He says he has "repeatedly shown" that "the curses" were all that were nailed to the cross. He should have said, "I have repeatedly asserted" this. He hasn't proved it. He thinks Gal. 3:13 proves his contention, but it doesn't. Had he read from the 10th to the 14th verse of Gal. 3, he would have learned that the "curses" were removed with the law—not that the law remained in force and the "curses" were removed. Just read this: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse." Hodges tries to do the works of the law, therefore he is under a curse! "Now, that no man is justified by the works of the law is evident: for, the righteous shall live by faith; and the law is not of faith (Gal. 3:10-14). Thus you see, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law" by taking the law out of the way.

He says I "don't quote 1 Tim. 5:15 correctly." Well it says of Christ that he is "the blessed and only po-

I have repeatedly shown what was nailed to the cross, namely the "curses" of the law. Bro. Phillips rightly quotes me when he says, "The law was not done away with but the curses were." Now listen! "*CHRIST hath redeemed us from the curses of the Law.*" Gal. 3:13.

Observing the Sabbath and all the other commands of God brought blessings, whereas their transgression

put the law-breakers under the curse of "*the law*"—condemnation. If your friend pays your fine in court he by that act sets you *free from the law*—from its condemnation. You are not made free to transgress; neither is the law abolished by this act. Christ has paid our fines to save us from the penalties of the law.

I said, "Jesus being a law giver in contradistinction to God's law given through Moses", is absurd. Why not quote me correctly?

Bro. Phillips does not quote 1st Tim. 6:15 correctly nor does he give the true sense. Here it is, "which in his times he shall shew who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords," I did not say this later quotation was absurd as Bro. Phillips asserts.

Yes, we are "delivered from the law"—its curse as above shown. Bro. Phillips says David was referring to the New Testament when he said the law was perfect and cites the perfect law of liberty mentioned in James 1:25. Had he read a little farther on he would have seen this, viz:

"If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, for whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Royal law is synonymous with God's—the Mosaic Law.

—ALBERT S. HODGES.

"INSTITUTIONS"

"I am persuaded that in addition to his (Brother Conner's) school work, he will, as he has always done, find or make, opportunities to assist in building up the church and spreading the cause of the kingdom through the institutions that the Lord bought and paid for with His own blood."

—R. F. D. in A. W., July 1st

"Institutions that the Lord bought," eh? And is "Littlefield College" you are boosting one of them? Straws, little things, truly show which way the wind is blowing. What next from the ones who speak where the Bible speaks, and are silent where the Bible is silent? Yes, there may yet be Campbellites it appears, for Campbell went into the college business, as I recollect it, but Campbell started the overthrow of New Testament Christianity, and the Disciples' Denomination is the outcome. How many and what "institutions" did Christ purchase? Now don't all speak at once.

Large Crowds Greet Evangelist Harper

The evangelistic meetings conducted by Evangelist Harper at the church of Christ in Sunrise Addition are being well attended, and the people who are attending are speaking in the highest terms of the Biblical sermons that they hear. There was baptizing last Thursday afternoon. There will be dinner on the ground next Sunday and preaching at 10:30 A. M., 3 P. M., and 8 P. M.

These meetings will continue all next week, and the public is urged to attend, and enjoy the meetings.

W. a. Fenter, Rt a.

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.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, SEPTEMBER, 1928

IS W. G. TUCKER A RELIGIOUS COWARD?

Several years ago Brother Tucker came out in the Apostolic Way, advocating fermented wine on the Lord's table. He was free to call those who would not do this heretics, and any teaching contrary to this, heresy; and he succeeded in inducing a few churches to follow his teaching. And when Bro. N. L. Clark came into Mississippi to hold meetings, Brother Tucker with a few followers "chased after him" for a debate on the matter, and when Clark would not meet him, they were very much "hoped up," it seems.

But now the table has been turned, it seems, for last year when Brother Harper went to Dallas, the brethren in Mississippi got him to meet Bro. Tucker near Brookhaven, Miss., in a three-day's debate on his fermented wine. And after that debate they signed the same proposition for a written discussion, as the brethren who supported Bro. Harper wanted it to distribute among the churches that were being disturbed over this question. But Bro. Tucker, it seems, cannot be induced to carry out his part of the agreement he has signed.

The weakness of his contention is seen in the fact that its chief advocate, while ready to "chase Clark all over Mississippi for a debate," and to "challenge the whole world to meet" him and "thrash out the issue in debate," is to all appearances now "skulking around in the bush" to keep out of a debate. If not, let him come out in the open and meet the issue of his own making and the proposition written with his own hand. This we have a right to expect of him, and not to skulking around in the enemy's camp trying to stab Brother Harper in the back. Now meet the issue or acknowledge by your failure to do so that you cannot do it.—Jas. D. Phillips.

"THE TRUTH" OFTENER

(From a Letter)

"The Truth" has shown itself worthy of the support of all brethren who want to make a "Thus saith the Lord" for their faith and practice. It has already done much to stay the storm of digression from destroying the true church. Then why not have it come oftener? We need it, and the brethren surely will support it. Let us see that it soon becomes a more frequent visitor to our homes. Let us write Brother Harper, telling him that we are ready to support a semi-monthly. I am ready to do my part.—Tom E. Smith, Okla.

"THE TRUTH" TO BE MADE A SEMI-MONTHLY

Since the first appearance of "The Truth" in January 1928, there has been a demand for it to be issued semi-monthly. And this demand is growing. All who love the truth and want to see it prosper, say, "We want a semi-monthly paper." So Brother Harper has decided to issue the paper semi-monthly, beginning in January, 1929.

The paper can be issued *twice* each month and the subscription price remain at *one dollar* a year if *all* will help. And we believe they will. There are several ways in which the brethren can help.

1. Let all who can *renew* their subscriptions for *one, two, or three* years. This will show Brother Harper that you are interested and will help him to know whom to depend on. It will also put the paper in better condition financially.

2. Let every reader *secure* as many *subscriptions* as possible. If every reader would send in only *one subscription* each month, it would soon put the paper "on easy street," as we sometimes say. And that will enable Brother Harper to issue twice each month.

3. Let each reader make a *donation* to "The Truth Fund." This fund is carried for the purpose of maintaining and improving the paper. If the paper is published semi-monthly, *donations* must play a large part in bearing the expenses of publication. So remember that "The Truth Fund" is open at all times to donations.

When you consider the following facts, you will be convinced that "The Truth" is a high-class paper:

1. It carries no commercial advertising. It is devoted solely to the *restoration of Primitive Christianity*.

2. It boosts no schools nor any kind of human institution, but exalts the two divinely ordained institutions—the *home* and the *church*. It wants to see a *clean church* and a *clean ministry*.

3. It *condemns* all *innovations* that are disturbing the peace of God's people. It is fearless of no *man*. It fears *God*.

4. It has interested hundreds in the *one church* of our blessed Lord. Read the letter from Albert A. Sorenson—a young Presbyterian preacher—in the August number of "The Truth" and see for yourself what we are accomplishing by its publication.

5. Its publisher has been known by the brotherhood for years as an able, true, devoted, loyal servant of God. He said to me a short time ago, "I have never been called a digressive," and I know that is

true. So long as H. C. Harper controls the paper, you may rest assured that it will contend for a "Thus saith the Lord" for every doctrine and practice in the church.

Let all who can, *donate* to the paper so that it can be issued *twice each month* at the small price of \$1.00 *the year!* Donations must play a large part if the paper is published semi-monthly. So send Brother Harper a donation *now*, so he will know how to plan the publication another year.

—JAS. DOUGLAS PHILLIPS.

QUESTIONS

Brother Harper: Please answer through "The Truth" the following questions. I submitted these questions to The Apostolic Way about eight months ago, but have received no answer to them. Brother Duckworth:

1. If you were meeting with a church that uses a plurality of cups and would not change to one, what course would you pursue if you were conscientiously opposed to more than one, believing anything more to be displeasing to God?

2. If the one cup "meets a demand for common ground," as you say and as I believe, may it not in justice be said of those who advocate the use of more than one cup, "its advocates have forced brethren to bow to their judgment or get out," as you say of the Sunday School advocates?

—W. H. REYNOLDS.

ANSWER

1. Brother Rowe says in the Leader, "the common cup is right or it is wrong!" This is true. And if it is right, it can not be wrong. And if it is right, the brethren do wrong in asking me to defile my conscience in partaking with them in that which I believe to be wrong, even if they think such a practice is all right. See 14th Ch. of Romans.

2. Yes, since "the common cup" is right, it does furnish a common ground for unity; those who practice something else are responsible for any division or disfellowship that follows—and this is no light matter. And we wish to say in this connection that Brother Trott has expressed himself time and again for more than a year as being ready to meet Brother Cowan on this issue. In proof of this we submit the following:

1. Personally I would have preferred a full discussion in the Way.—Feb. 17, 1926. G. A. Trott. (This when refused to publish.—Ed.)

2. Now as to your discussion with Clark, I am glad to know that it is to come off and will gladly do everything I can to assist in a manifestation of the truth.—Feb. 5, 1926. G. A. Trott.

3. I stand strictly for the one cup and for the publication of the discussion between you and Clark.—Aug. 20, 1926. G. A. Trott.

4. I feel impelled to write to express my admiration for the way you handled Bro. Clark's arguments. It is true I had read it in advance of its publication, but getting it all together impressed me very much more. I can not see how anyone with a reasonably

good mind can fail to see how you refuted his every effort.—Sept. 22, 1926. G. A. Trott to Harper after meeting Clark.

5. I regret very much the division that is being caused by Bros. Clark, Johnson and Cowan over the cup. Nothing would please me better than to meet either of them in debate. Sept. 1, 1926. G. A. Trott.

6. J. N. Cowan, Robstown, Texas: Brother D. J. Whitten has been writing me somewhat on the cups, and I told him that those favoring the cups should select a man and we would select one, and have a written discussion in pamphlet form by two of the best men we could get. The brethren seem to look to you to defend the practice, so far as I have observed the course of things, and you have been advocating the cups.—(H. C. Harper, Nov. 20, 1927, to Cowan).

7. In regard to the proposed discussion, you may make any arrangements you desire. I have never had any reluctance to meet any man in defense of what I believe to be God's truth. Sept. 9, 1927. G. A. Trott.

8. Bro. Cowan and I corresponded briefly on the cup, but the subject was not gone into very deeply and consisted (on Cowan's part) mostly of queries and I should not wish it to be published as a discussion of the subject, though I am willing to engage in a written discussion with anyone at any time.—Jan 4, 1928. G. A. Trott.

9. In regard to the debate with Cowan I am ready at any time. Feb. 1, 1928. G. A. Trott.

10. In regard to the debate with Cowan I am always ready and always try to do my best when called on to defend the word of God. I have not sought any debate with Cowan, for I have hated to destroy his prestige, but have never refused to defend the truth nor ever allowed personal friendship to sway me in the least.—March 10, 1928. G. A. Trott.

11. I regret very much that Cowan has busied himself so greatly in the matter of the cup, but shall not flinch on account of the personal affection I have always had for him and if he is foolish and egotistical enough to meet the issue, I shall not spare him.—Mar. 14, 1928. G. A. Trott.

12. No one can regret more than I any dissention among us or more fully realize what encouragement it gives to our opposers, but trying to smother it is a poor way out, for it simply can't be done. The only way I see is to come out in the open and investigate it thoroughly in the light of God's word, cutting out the cuss from discussion. When it comes to a question of God's word (the most sacred thing on earth or in heaven to me) I know no man according to the flesh and have never yet flinched from meeting any man and my hope and prayer is that I never may.—April 21, 1928. G. A. Trott.

Now if Brother Cowan has "the arguments" to sustain his position, as he told me he has, and can trust Brother Trott to cut out the "cuss" from the discussion and will do so himself, we can have a good, brotherly, model discussion of this issue for all the brethren to read, for I am ready at any time to arrange the details and see that it is published and distributed to those who desire to read it, at a nominal cost.

Now don't talk about Sunday School "cowards" un-

til you get this matter off your hands. And you may get all the help all the "cups advocates" can give you to "make it as sure as you can."

A CORRECTION

In arranging of the copy in the August issue for the Hodges-Phillips debate there was a mistake. We shall not ask the printer to republish, for we now have on hand more copy than we can use in several months, but this is an excellent matter and we hope to clear the "copy" file all up as soon as we begin to publish semi-monthly.

So in reading the debate, read from the first down to the paragraph ending in the word "this". Then go to the "Fourth Negative," and begin at the paragraph near the bottom of first column, beginning with "have" and read to conclusion. Then for the negative, begin at "Fourth Negative," and read down to paragraph beginning "I have". Then go to paragraph in the "Fourth and Last Affirmative," beginning "tentate, the King of Kings," and read to close. We hope all our readers will appreciate the new type and the double column that our printer is now furnishing. We expect to be satisfied with nothing but the *best* for our readers and we thank the printers for the neat appearance of the paper.—Ed.

DENNIS-KARR DEBATE

Savannah, G., June 14, 1928.—Bro. J. A. Dennis, of Union City, Ga., met J.C. Karr, of Chicago, Ill., here on the following propositions: 1—The Scriptures teach that the First Day of the week is the day for Christian worship, and is known in the Bible as the "Lord's Day." Dennis affirms, Karr denies.

2. The Scriptures teach that the Sabbath of Exodus Twenty is the Lord's Day, and the day for Christian worship in this age. Karr affirms, Dennis denies.

To say that Brother Dennis had an easy task and gained a great victory for the truth is to put the matter mildly. We were delighted with the work of Brother Dennis.

Each proposition was discussed in two sessions of two hours each. Bro. Dennis led off with Jer. 31:31, showing that a New Covenant was to be made with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah, not according to that covenant made with their fathers when God led them out of the land of Egypt and he cited Ex. 34:27, 28 to show that the Ten Commandment Law containing the Sabbath-keeping commandment was the one made with their fathers when they were led out of Egypt. And he gave many more Scriptures just as plain and convincing in rebuttal of Mr. Karr's proposition, and Mr. Karr did not notice them at all in his replies. When asked why he did not answer the arguments of his opponent, Mr. Karr said, "well, he shot those to me so fast and so unexpectedly that I had no time to look them up."

All the time Bro. Denis was in the lead and on the covenants, Mr. Karr seemed to be trying to get in the lead and get away from the arguments put up to him

on the covenants; and when he got in the lead, he would ignore the arguments in rebuttal of his position that Bro. Dennis made on the covenants. He finally said that the New Covenant is a covenant yet to be made in the future, flatly contradicting Paul in Heb. VIII and IX. He also tried to show that the New Testament was not a covenant, but failed in this completely.

Finally on the last night he admitted his defeat by trying to have the propositions which he had already signed for a debate with Bro. Dennis next winter in Florida changed. In his last speech he admitted that he could not meet Bro. Dennis, saying that Bro. Dennis was more able as a debater than he was, as an excuse for his failure.

The discussion was so one-sided that their pastor said, "Well, it looks like you were having your own way here." To this Bro. Shelnett, who was ably moderating for Bro. Dennis, replied, "We wish you had a stronger man, one that would try to meet the issue." Bro. Dennis told them he was willing to meet any man in the United States of America on the issues here made, but they were as silent as the grave. And you could not blame them, for they realized that we had the truth on this proposition, and that error could not withstand truth in a fair field and no favors.

—A. C. KESSLER, Savannah, Ga.

WHY?

Why do some brethren, when they see they can't meet the arguments of another brother, stoop so low as to try to pick some flaw in the character of the one with whom they differ? This course, it seems to me, is very mean and wicked. And from such actions they plainly show they have not the truth and do not want it, but want to mislead someone. With them it seems to appear that if they can show that some one went wrong thirty or forty years ago, it proves the doctrine they advocate is right and the one they oppose is wrong. And if they can destroy him in any such underhand way, they feel satisfied to hold to a false doctrine they build on the brother's downfall. This is pure political mud-slinging, and those who resort to it will be condemned in the judgment if they do not quit it and repent. I have one case in mind where little Cleddie Wallace has tried thus to defend himself with Elder Trott. And in all that he said one could see that he was wounding the Truth of God and not a good brother, who has done more for the cause of Christ than little Cleddie will ever accomplish unless he changes his course. There is no spirit of Christ in such conduct, and all sensible Christians will frown down such a course from any one. The wisdom which is from above never leads one in this way. Such a spirit would crucify even our Savior. May the Lord forgive them.

With love for the cause we love dearer than life.

—H. C. WELCH.

"If more than one cup is used, I wish to know which one is 'the cup', and that is the one I wish to drink out of."—G. A. Trott.

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

SEPTEMBER 1928

A SEMI-MONTHLY

The brethren are urging us to publish twice a month. And this we hope to do by the beginning of the year, and if the brethren will work faithfully and send in subscriptions and donate liberally, we can do this and still maintain the paper at *one dollar a year*. This would permit the poor brethren to get the paper, and give those a chance to help spread the truth among the people and receive their reward "in the world to come." who are able to do more. What do you say?

NOTICE

Those who desire sample copies to hand out are requested to put in orders that will reach us for the 25th of each month so that they may be mailed with the general mailing. The stamp postage is much dearer, and we desire to save every cent possible to put into the paper. So please do this in future. We are anxious that the paper shall be handed out as much as possible. Some have done good in this that eternity alone will reveal. Let us now press forward and win the fight. Who will help?

"NO BIBLE ARGUMENT" FOR IT

"This is how I feel by the question of classes when teaching a multitude, or using literature in the teaching. It is a question I find not one passage for. No one should try to make one 'Bible argument' for it. I will never divide a congregation on such questions, nor have any part or lot in such destructive work."—J. W. Dunn, in F. F., July 30, 1928.

Remarks: Now carry the news to Ira C. Moore, of the Christian Leader, and maybe he will not try the impossible with J. D. Phillips at Charleston, W. Va., and call off the debate there. Why attempt the impossible? It has been said, "No one knows the Bible if the 'Dunn boys' don't."

APPRECIATES "THE TRUTH"

We think "The Truth" is the best paper in the brotherhood. Wife and I like it fine and will continue with it as long as it will be an open forum. We oppose all innovations.

Aubrey Baize, Plainview, Texas.

THE LOAF AND CUP

Brother Harper: "Do we eat the Lord's body, or do we eat bread and drink the cup in remembrance of the body and shed blood of Christ?"

Physical facts are unanswerable. We eat bread and we drink the fruit of the vine. This I think can be demonstrated by actual test. On the Lord's table, this bread is the body of Christ and the fruit of the vine is the blood of Christ.

We do not eat flesh and we do not drink blood, a proposition that can be demonstrated and is unanswerable.

Yet on the Lord's table, "This cup is the New Testament," and the fruit of the vine is the blood, and the bread is the body.

If this seems paradoxical, it is for want of the understanding of language.

SMITH-WIGGS DISCUSSION

The "cup" as mentioned in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper, is used in the literal sense. Tom E. Smith affirms, I. H. Wiggs, Jr., denies.

The "cup" in every case mentioned in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper, has direct reference to the fruit of the vine. I. H. Wiggs, Jr., affirms, Tom E. Smith denies.

Agreement: The discussion shall be carried on in "The Truth" and the Apostolic Way, and there shall be three articles to each on each proposition, and no article of the negative shall exceed in length the preceding article of the affirmative.

REPORT

I am just from Atlanta, Texas, where I spent from July 7 to 15 in a series of meetings with Bro. Homer L. King, directing the singing. It is a great pleasure to be with brethren like these at Atlanta, who are willing to abide by a "Thus saith the Lord" for their faith and practice.

I feel myself highly commended in being called upon to serve in Bro. King's meeting. He is a wonderful preacher. And I was glad to have the pleasure of being with Brother McBride of Cleburne, Texas, a few days at his old home at Chandler, Texas. He is truly a great teacher. I go from here to Marion, La., where I will begin a series of meetings July 22. I like "The Truth" fine. We need it oftener.—H. K. Tidwell, Houghton, La.

"OPEN FORUM"

I want to express my appreciation for the good paper you are giving us, Brother Harper. It is the only open forum, as far as I know. But it does not come often enough.—Bob Musgrave, Okla.

REPORT

Since last report to The Truth, I have held meetings at the following places: Athalia, Ohio; Brazil and Knightsville, Indiana; Sulphur, Okla., and am in one now at El Dorado, Arkansas, with eight baptisms.

The church at Athalia, Ohio, is an old congregation. Six were baptized and one restored during the meeting there. Some fine brethren there.

Leaving Athalia about the first of June, I went to Spencer, Indiana to visit Brother Homer King in his meeting there. I had the flu when I landed there and after the second day had to go to bed where I stayed for a week. Brother King and I had a very nice time together. We talked over the work of the brethren, the things now giving trouble in the church. Brother King and I are perfectly agreed on all the issues now before the church, each demanding a "Thus saith the Lord" for all doctrine and practice.

Leaving Spencer, I went to Brazil and began a meeting there the first Lord's day in June. Brother Joseph Miller, than whom there are no better men, started the church there several years ago. I was there two weeks and we were hindered much by rain. Considering everything, I think the Brazil church is the truest to the Book of any I have visited this year. They demand authority for what they teach and practice. And no preacher is wanted there unless he is true to the Book.

Leaving Brazil, I went to Knightsville for a half-week meeting. There are some of the best in the Knightsville church.

From Knightsville, I went to Sulphur, Okla., and was there a week and a half. The Sulphur brethren are not as aggressive as they should be. Too much of the brethren's time is spent in "striving about words to no profit" which is condemned. While there we were happily surprised by a visit from Brethren Bob Musgrave and H. C. Harper. This was my first time to meet either of these brethren. Brother Harper preached, followed by a talk by Brother Musgrave and myself. The subject was "Unity" based on Eph. 4. While the Sulphur meeting was in progress, Brother Riffe and I visited Brother Harper in his meeting at Healdton. I preached on Dan. 2:31-45. Brother Musgrave was there, too. He and Brother Harper followed me with fine talks. We all plead for a return to "the old paths, the good way" (Jer. 6:16). I was greatly strengthened by being with these good brethren.

Leaving Sulphur, I went to Paul's Valley to stay one night with old friends I had not seen for years. And as the S. S. Brethren insisted that I preach that night, I gladly embraced the opportunity. We had a good crowd and I preached on "The Great Apostasy", emphasizing a return to the Primitive doctrine and practice in the churches. They seemed to enjoy it.

Leaving Sulphur I came to El Dorado, Ark., where I am now in a good meeting. Eight have been baptized and sectarians are learning the truth. The Sunday School folks drove the brethren out of their meeting house some time ago. The brethren found a nice

little house the Methodists were offering for sale for \$1,200.00. So they bought. They have had a steady growth ever since. The Sunday School church has gone dead as all such churches should go dead. There was hardly a respectable member left after the faithful brethren were driven out of their own property. I anticipate for the church here a steady growth. No digressive preacher need come here.

I go to Leipsic, Indiana, for a meeting next week.

—James Douglas Phillips.

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

REPORT

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., July 19, 1928.—I closed a meeting the 6th inst. with the faithful brethren of Shreveport, La. This was my third meeting with these good people, and I enjoyed my stay with them very much. I made my home with Brother A. D. King, and to say that I had a good home is putting it mildly.

Bro. Ben J. Elston, of Deridder, La., attended the first half of the meeting and assisted in a personal way. It was the first time I had ever met him, and he impressed me as being a well informed man.

Bro. Tucker of Shreveport, was in attendance the last few days of the meeting, and I was glad to have him with me.

The results of the meeting were, one baptized and one restored, and we trust the church made stronger.

I went from here to Atlanta, Texas, and began a meeting with the loyal brethren, which closed the 15th inst. without visible results. We had splendid crowds and attention throughout. At times the house would not hold the people, and we trust that the good seed was sown in the hearts of some that will bring forth fruit to His name. I am to return for another effort with them next year.

Brother H. K. Tidwell of Houghton, La., was with us in this meeting and led the singing to the delight of all. Brother Tidwell is a singing teacher and led the singing in my meeting at Atlanta, Texas, and any church wanting a series of lessons in vocal music would do well to write Bro. Tidwell for information as to such work. Brother Tidwell is also a good preacher and is out in meetings or teaching singing all the time.

By the time this reaches the readers of "The Truth," I expect to be in a meeting in Ottumwa, Ia. Pray for me and mine.

—HOMER L. KING.

TRUE TO THE BIBLE

I think "The Truth" is the only paper true to the Bible we now have published in the Brotherhood. We hope to soon come out at least twice a month. We need it to scatter among the churches to wake them out of digression and it is fine, I find, to hand out to the world. Brethren, write to Brother Harper, and see whether we cannot have the paper twice a month next year.—G. B. Harrel, Okla.

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.

Definition of Terms: The terms of this proposition are so simple that I think only two of them need defining, namely: "The first day of the week" and "Christians." By the former term, I mean the day commonly called "Sunday." By the latter, I mean followers of Christ, the ones who have been made free from "the law of sin and death." (Rom. 8:2).

John was "in the Spirit on the Lord's day." (Rev. 1:10). But what day is that? "The first day of the week," for—

1. "The first day of the week" is the resurrection day of our Lord (Mark 16:9). Christ is "the first-fruits of them that slept." (1 Cor. 15:20). This is the antitype. Of the type it is said, "on the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it"—the "first-fruits of the Harvest." (Lev. 23:10,11). Christ, "the first-fruits of them that slept," arose from the dead "on the morrow after the Sabbath," the "first day of the week." Hence, the "morrow after the Sabbath" is the Lord's day.

2. The "Lord's day" and the "Lord's Supper" are terms peculiar to New Testament Greek, they being institutions that came into existence through the teaching of Christ, *the Lord* (Phil 2:11). The word "Lord's" in each case is in Greek *Kuriakos*, meaning something pertaining to Christ. Hence Robinson says:

"*Kuriakos*—pertaining to the Lord, to the Lord Jesus Christ: e. g. *Kuriakos deipnon*, the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:20). *Kuriake hemera*, the Lord's day. (Rev. 1:10).

3. It was on the first day of the week, "the Lord's day," that Christ, *the Lord*, met with His disciples after His resurrection and pronounced His benediction upon them (John 20:19-26). Why did he meet with them on this day? Because it is *the "Lord's day," the resurrection day.*

Christians must meet for worship on the first day of the week, or the Lord's day, for,

1. Christ met with His disciples on that day (John 20). He made this promise: "Where two or three are assembled in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:20). Though He is in Heaven, He is in spirit with us when we assemble in His name. And as He met with his disciples on the first day of the week and Peter exhorts us to "follow in His steps" (1 Pet. 1:21), we must meet on this day.

2. Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul discoursed unto them." (Acts 20:7). Thus we see that the disciples came together to worship. This was on the first day of the week.

3. Paul met with those disciples (Acts 20:7), thus setting an example for us to follow, for he says, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." (1 Cor. 11:1). Since Christ met with His disciples "to

break bread" on "the first day of the week", and since he requires us to follow him as he followed Christ, there is no escape from the conclusion that we are required to meet on the first day of the week for worship.

4. "Upon the first day of the week," when ye come together. (1 Cor. 16:2). Thus Paul instructed the Corinthians about what they were to do when assembled "upon the first day of the week," showing that they were required to assemble on that day. He gave the same orders to the Galatian churches. (1 Cor. 16:1).

Thus we have established our proposition, that "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."

—James Douglas Phillips.

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

FIRST NEGATIVE

Our first indictment against the First Day of the week being Lord's day is the fact that our Lord was not raised from the dead on that day.

In support of this contention we present to the reader's mind the fact that at every visit to the tomb on the first of the week, it was found empty, JESUS WAS RISEN. (Past tense). His resurrection was so near the first day that it was easy for tradition to appoint that day. All Bible scholars know that days in Bible times began and ended at sunset. The first visit to the tomb was "in the end of Sabbath," (Matt. 28:1) and the tomb was empty, as it was at each subsequent visit. No significance is given any day because of the resurrection of Christ, but if any should, it should be to the Seventh Day on which he really arose from the dead.

The purely voluntary meetings on the first of the week should not be considered a substitute for the weekly Sabbath, which disciples of Christ observed as all know. It is a well known fact that the early disciples were leading a communistic life on account of their persecutions at the hands of their Jewish brethren. "For fear of the Jews" is given as a reason for their assembly on the first of the week, John 20:19. We do not deny they assembled on the first of the week but where is the text requiring this meeting for worship? True worship is in order every day but doubly so on the Seventh day, "My Holy Day" as the Lord God declares. (Isa. 58:13).

It was necessary in their communistic life to have these meetings each week to look after the business of the church—get their supplies and make distribution as all had need, Acts 2:45. This was unlawful on the Sabbath but when the sun sat at the end of the Sabbath they came together for a business meeting. Of course it was proper and right to worship at these meetings and to partake of the Lord's Supper as no detailed instruction was given in regard to the memorial supper. Only as "often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew forth the Lord's death till he comes."

Brother Phillips makes a flourish of words about Christ being "antitype" of Lev. 23:11. This is far-fetched indeed since the term "type" and "antitype"

are not in the Bible being words coined to force on the world the theory that these sacrifices pointed to Christ and I challenge Brother Phillips to show one text in the Old Testament that any of these sacrifices were "types" or "pointed" to Christ.

If we are to be exact in commemorating the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week, we should meet on what is now called Saturday night as the first day of the week begins at sunset Sabbath (Saturday). Every Sunday observer who works after sunset Saturday desecrates his so-called Lord's day by so doing.

Bible students know that italicised words of the Bible are supplied words and we are at liberty to leave them out. Every time the first day is mentioned, the "day" is in italics, and leaving it out these texts would read "on the first of the week", which would be any day from Sabbath till Wednesday. What would our brother's proposition amount to if this supplied word "day" was stricken from it? He is building his argument on a supplied word and this fact alone refutes all his theory of First Day sacredness.

Brother Phillips quotes John 20:26 as a "first day meeting", which is impossible since, if verse 19 is a first day gathering, then "eight days" after would be on Monday that this meeting took place.

This whole First Day observance is a Catholic institution and not based on scripture at all. The Pope, as Vicar of Christ, claims this right to appoint feast days for the church, and it did not matter with him whether the event celebrated fell on that day or not. Christmas is another example of how the Pope appoints days that have no connection with the event celebrated.

—Albert S. Hodges,

321 W. Bumham St., Battle Creek, Mich.

NEWS AND NOTES

G. B. Harrell, Ada, Okla.—Arrived home June 13th from a series of meetings near Pleasanton, Texas. Had large crowds and good interest throughout and much good was accomplished in many ways. Two obeyed the gospel, and the brethren were much encouraged. I have meetings engaged to keep me busy until November, for which I am very thankful as I want to be kept busy in the vineyard of the Lord. Glad that I have been able to send you in some subscriptions for "The Truth", as I realize it is doing much good in getting the truth before the people. We shall start a mission meeting in Ada in June with Bob Musgrave, of Elk City, Okla., leading in the preaching, and we hope to be able to establish a true congregation in Ada.

Jas. Douglas Phillips, 439 N. Drury Ave., Kansas City Mo., June 2, 1928—I closed a two week's meeting May 29 at Athelia, Ohio, with five baptisms and one restored. The last issue of "The Truth" was simply fine.

H. C. Welch, Harptree, Sask., Canada.—We are trying to do some real missionary work in this destitute field by the assistance of one brother here. May God bless you in your stand for "the old paths," and don't be discouraged when some depart from "the good way." The Lord said some would depart from the truth and

go in their own way. In your prayers remember us.

J. Y. Morgan, New Castle, Texas.—We would be glad to see "The Truth" remain an eight-page paper, but would like it twice a month. Enclosed find check for subscriptions.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.—Am just in from a preaching tour of four weeks. My next meeting will be at Menard and Fort McKavett, Texas. Send me samples of "The Truth" there. The paper is doing good and brethren are getting their eyes open.

James Douglas Phillips, Kansas City, Mo.—the last issue of "The Truth" is the best of all. I wish the paper could come out oftener. We need it, and I think the brethren will see that it does come out oftener very soon. They speak highly of it wherever I go.

Elbert E. Jenkins, Rush, Texas.—Am sending you an article for "The Truth." I am preaching some. We like the paper very much and wish you success.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

"Dr. Trott has had his say a number of times on the cup question and he has not changed from the statements as published by me from him in the Apostolic Way, and we are agreed on this question." (R. F. Duckworth, Aug. 15, 1927).

"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. F. Duckworth, Sept. 2, 1925).

"You will note that Duckworth seems in perfect accord with me in one of his letters, but a change seems to have come over the spirit of his dreams later." (G. A. Trott, Oct. 27, 1925).

Yet, "We agreed on this question," are we? Not by a long way.

"Dr. Trott and I are the only editors of the Apostolic Way. By insistence he has agreed to continue as first page editor." (R. F. Duckworth to Tom E. Smith, Aug. 15, 1927).

More "bunk." Listen, "I resolved when I resigned from the Way that I would appear no more in the role of editor of any paper. I will be glad to write (as a contributor) for the paper you are about to start and also continue to do so for the Apostolic Way. I wish you success and shall subscribe myself and send any subscriptions I can." (G. A. Trott to H. C. Harper, Aug. 15, 1927).

NOTICE BRETHREN

Brother Harper lacked \$26.00 getting enough subs and donations to pay for the publication of the June issue of The Truth. He paid this. Let's make it up. Let each reader send Brother Harper a donation. Do this now, please. The paper can't be published without the support of the brethren. So let us do all we can to keep it going. Send your donation or sub to The Truth, Box 26, Sneads, Florida.

—Jas. Douglas Phillips.

COPY

Healdton, Okla., July 21, 1928

Mr. J. N. Cowan,
Robstown, Texas.

Dear Brother Cowan:

I have a letter from Brother Baize, Plainview, Tex., in which he tells me that he has a letter from you in which you tell him that you are now ready to defend your position on the cups. If this is true, will you please write your proposition or take any one of the propositions we offered to Bro. J. P. Watson, copy here enclosed? State the number of articles you wish and the number of words to the article, and we shall be glad to give the discussion to the people. I am enclosing copy that you may see that Dr. Trott is ready to meet you. You can address me here until August 15th.

Your brother in Christ,
H. C. HARPER.

1. The Scriptures authorize more than one container in the distribution of the wine used in the Lord's Supper. (Clark's Aff.)

2. "The cup", as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27, and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. (Cowan's Aff.)

3. The word "cup" is used figuratively in every instance where it refers to the Lord's Supper. (Watson's Aff.)

4. When conditions are such that prudence suggests the use of more than one cup in a congregation, to use as many cups as sound judgment through prudence may suggest is in perfect harmony with every inspired Scripture on the subject of the sacred communion. (Watson's Aff.)

In regard to the proposed discussion (with Cowan) you may make any arrangements you desire. I have never had any reluctance to meet any man in defense of what I believe to be God's truth. I have no interest in life that compares with the propagation of the truth.—G. A. Trott, 9-9-27.

Bro. Cowan and I corresponded briefly on the cup, but the subject was not gone into very deeply and consisted (on Cowan's part) mostly of queries and I would not wish it to be published as a discussion of the subject, though I am willing to engage in a written discussion with any one at any time.—G. A. Trott, 1-4-28.

As to the debate with Cowan, I am ready at any time.—G. A. Trott, 2-10-28.

I regret very much that Cowan has busied himself so greatly in matters of the cup, but shall not flinch on account of the personal affection I have had for him and if he is foolish and egotistical enough to meet the issue, I shall not spare him.—G. A. Trott, 3-14-28.

I am enclosing a short article and in regard to the debate with Cowan am always ready and always try to do my best when called on to defend the word of God. I have not sought any debate with Cowan, for I have hated to destroy his prestige, but have never refused to defend the truth nor even allowed personal friendship to sway me in the least.—G. A. Trott, 3-10-28.

FOLLOWING PAUL

Paul says, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." I Cor. 2:1. In this scripture the Apostle calls upon Christians to follow him. As this applied to them then, it now applies to us. His desire is that we now serve the Lord as he served him, that we now follow Christ as he followed him.

For many years Paul's life had been governed by the law of Moses. He shared with his Jewish brethren a misconception of Christ. He even went about the country persecuting the followers of Christ. And even when they were put to death, he gave his voice against them. In fact, it seems that he was their chief opponent in and around Jerusalem. But the very first time he heard and knew the voice of Jesus, he earnestly and sincerely called out, "What shall I do, Lord?"

Let us consider well this point and ever be ready to give up error in exchange for truth, as Paul did. It made a better man of Paul to do so, and if he lost anything that was worthwhile, or ever regretted the exchange, he never has mentioned it in all his writings. He was strictly honest.

If we today would strictly follow Paul we should at any time gladly give up any error we have practiced for the truth. And if all in the church of Christ now would do this, there would be no division, for the truth does not cause division. But we cling to errors and try to make some excuse for them, as did the great King Saul. And some today instead of following Paul are trying to direct their ways themselves. Some are unwilling to exchange error for truth; some are evidently dishonest.

Just think of the debates that are being repeated by brethren in the church of Christ in Texas and other places. Why is this? Two well-informed men seeking the truth with *honest hearts* and can not find it? There is something radically wrong here. Can you even think of Paul and Peter or Paul and Barnabas repeating their discussion of differences for years? You can read where Paul says, "A heretic after the first and second admonition reject."

I think if we would follow the Apostle's instructions right here, it would not be many years until the professional, conceited, dishonest debater would be out of a job, and churches in general would have a time of rejoicing. I am not opposed to debating only with those who by their fruits have proven themselves to be dishonest.

Let us strive to follow in the footsteps of him who said, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

—H. C. WELCH, Harptree, Sask., Can.

"The thing that puzzles me about Clark is why he rejects 'pride, style, vain show, extreme notions of hygiene, etc.' as motivating impulses which vitiate the worship, but calmly advocates convenience as being an all-sufficient excuse. I simply can't see why he is so blind."—G. A. Trott.

A. W. Denton, R. A.

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.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, OCTOBER 1928

Are You Honest?

I use the above heading as a question to the brethren that are contending for one container, as they call it, one cup. Then why ask men to affirm the negative? The brethren, as far as I know, do not believe the Scriptures teach or say anything about a container. It is easy for one to follow anyone with arguments and fool some people. This should be the question discussed: The Scriptures teach that the "cup" spoken of by the Savior and the Apostles is a container. No more than I know, I can convince any brother or sister that is reasonable and wants to be right, that the "cup" is not a container. I would be ashamed to cause strife and division over a word like that (cup). See II Tim. 2:14.

Then I see brethren boasting how they are gaining on those things, which I know they are not, in this country.

Yes, Brother Harper and I have been friends and still are friends and have stood together for what we believe to be the truth. This is one time, however, I am sure he is wrong, and I would like to straighten him out on this question. If he wants to affirm the above question, I will indorse Brother Howard to follow him. Now what say you?

Brethren contend that each congregation must have its own cup. The Lord's cup supplies all the congregations. To defend your position you holler sprinkling for baptism. If I believed like you do, I would make the same argument that if it takes the cup and the fruit of the vine to make the Lord's cup, I would say it takes both sprinkling and burial to make baptism.

Some are complaining about the Apostolic Way not publishing both sides of any Scriptural question. I am sure Bro. Duckworth does make mistakes and Bro. Harper will too, in publishing the papers, and if we were in their place, we would make more. There are so many unscriptural things come up it would be a disgusting paper to publish all of them. Now, study and see if you are one of them before you complain. Brethren, I am for peace and harmony. By all means let us be honest to each other.

T. H. Evans, Elk City, Okla.

Report

I closed a two week's meeting with the brethren at Marion, Ohio, with three baptized and one took membership, and the truth prevailed.
Aug. 16, 1928.

J. MADISON WRIGHT,
2816 Ocoola Av., Columbus, Ohio.

Remarks

Yes, "let us be honest." Then why accuse us of asking anyone to affirm a negative when we have never done so? Just point out where we have if you can. Our faith and practice cannot be questioned, for we can read it from the Bible, and we have been willing to affirm it. The question of doubt has come over the practice of the use of cups, and those who cling to the practice should affirm it. And I say with Bro. Trott, "the one who affirms his faith and practice should affirm *the Scriptures teach it.*"

I said to Bro. Clark. "My contention is for the use of one cup. This I will affirm is Scriptural, is authorized by the Scriptures, or that a church of Christ can use one cup and speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent."

This, he would not deny. He then offered to affirm, "In the observance of the Lord's Supper, disciples of Christ are at liberty to use more than one cup in distributing the fruit of the vine."

I replied, "Insert 'the Scriptures authorize' after 'supper' and strike out 'are at liberty' and we accept your proposition." He then affirmed, "The Scriptures authorize the use of more than one container in the distribution of the wine of the Lord's supper." And this we debated. One brother says, "I believe Bro. Clark is able to make his defense stronger than he made it in his discussion with you by using more space." But I said to Bro. Clark, "I am willing to grant you another full 800-word article, and if that does not suffice, I am willing to grant you more. In fact, I will agree to finish the discussion in half the space you take." So it was not space that he lacked.

Now what did I offer to Cowan? I said, "I will affirm the N. T. Scriptures authorize the use of one communion cup." July 13, 1925.

He replied, "So will I. No issue here. Will you affirm that the one communion cup is the literal vessel, or container that contains the fruit of the vine? I will deny." July 13, 1925.

I said, "I will affirm—The New Testament Scriptures authorize the use of one (literal) communion cup." July 16, 1925.

He said, "I will affirm the same thing." July 30, 1925.

I replied, "Very well, then, there is no issue on what I teach and practice." Aug. 15, 1925.

Again 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

(Continued on page 2)

Remarks

(Continued from page 1)

communion service." And I said, "If you prefer to lead, omit 'one' and add 's' to 'cup'." Sept. 2, 1925.

He replied, "I will affirm that a church of Christ can speak, etc., and use only fermented wine in the communion. Please apply your objections to this proposition to the one you sent, and you will see where you stand." Sept. 11, 1925. And he said, "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." Sept. 30, 1925.

This concedes that my practice is Scriptural, as any one can see; and I said, "You refuse to affirm: 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. If I now understand you, you will neither lead nor follow." Sept. 20, 1925. And I said, "Now, if you believe that a church of Christ can use *cups*, 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." Oct. 15, 1925. He said (9-11-25), "Cite the passage where Paul or Christ used the expression, 'the cup' and did not mean the fruit of the vine, and it sufficeth." I replied, "All right. Matt. 26:27 will do." See Thayer, p. 533). He replied, "As long as I have you tied on the 'cup' being used by meton. in Luk. 22:20 and Matt. 26:27, there is no use to waste time on 'ek'." And he said, "I will affirm, that '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 he said, "You most assuredly will have to deny this proposition, or else give up your contention on this passage." Oct. 10, 1925.

I replied, "You say, 'I do not think that I misunderstand Thayer.' But I know you do. You either knowingly or ignorantly (I attribute it to the latter) misrepresent Thayer. Thayer uses the superior 'b' in his second citation. You have 'tied' yourself here, not Harper. I accept your proposition, namely: 'the cup' as used by Christ in Matt. 26-27 and 'the fruit of the vine' are one and the same. H. C. Harper denies." October 25, 1925. And here it was that Cowan quit me cold.

I then wrote Dr. Trott, and on Nov. 8, 1925, he said, "I believe that Clark and Cowan can both be gotten to see their error. Of course since it has been started (much to my regret) it will have to be settled and settled right. If the proposition be true that 'the cup' means only the contents of the cup, then I am ready to join the Sunday School advocates. Why? Because, when the assembly is spoken of, it is the individuals who compose it that the writer has in mind and not the institution in which they are included. In other words the members constitute the contents of the assembly, therefore they may be divided into a dozen or more

classes and still be just the one assembly. The Sunday School folks have not seen this yet, but they will before long and hammer us with it unmercifully."

And on Sept. 1, 1926, he said, "I regret very much the division that is being caused by Bros. Clark, Johnson and Cowan over the cups. Nothing would please me better than to meet either of them in debate."

I then proposed to Bro. Trott that he meet Cowan, not only for the benefit of present condition of the church, but for the benefit of future generations also." And I wrote Cowan: "You say you are not afraid to discuss the question from the point of argument, but are trying to exercise good judgment as to the handling of the question. Perhaps so; and so were the organ advocates; and so have the S. S. advocates—especially Showalter—been exercising the same 'good judgment' as to the handling of the Sunday School question. If you think your arguments will stand, is not the church entitled to them, and that, too, before lines are drawn that will cause party and prejudice to bias judgment?"

And Bro. Trott wrote me (Sept. 9, 1927), saying, "In regard to the proposed discussion, you may make any arrangements you desire. I have never had any reluctance to meet any man in defense of what I believe to be God's truth."

And again on Feb. 1, 1928, he said, "In regard to the debate with Cowan, I am ready at any time."

And on March 10, 1928, he said, "In regard to the debate with Cowan, I am always ready and always try to do my best when called on to defend the word of God." And he said, "Bro. Cowan and I corresponded briefly on the cup, but the subject was not gone into very deeply and consisted (on Cowan's part) mostly of queries and I should not wish it to be published as a discussion of the subject, though I am willing to engage in a written discussion with any one at any time."

On April 21, 1928, he said, "No one can regret more than I do any dissention among us, but trying to smother it is a poor way out, for it simply can't be done. The only way I see is to come out in the open and investigate it thoroughly in the light of God's word."

And on Oct. 10, 1925, he said, "I would feel that we are doomed to failure without you. The brethren everywhere, as far as I know, regard you, as I do, as the strongest writer we have. There are just two courses to pursue, either ignore Clark's 'bust' or else let him take Cowan's place (it had been planned for Cowan to engage me) and go on with the discussion. If more than one cup is used, I wish to know which one is 'the cup' and that is the one I wish to drink from."

And he said, "The propaganda by Clark and Cowan has certainly been a surprise to me." Aug. 20, 1926.

On March 10, 1928, he said, "I have not sought any debate with Cowan, for I have hated to destroy his prestige, but never have refused to defend the truth nor allowed personal friendship to sway me in the least." And on March 14, 1928, he said, "I regret very much that Cowan has busied himself so greatly in the matter of the cup, but shall not flinch on account of the personal affection I have always had for him and if he is foolish and egotistical enough to meet the issue, I shall not spare him."

On Sept. 2, 1925, Duckworth wrote Clark, saying, "I wish that you and Trott would investigate, through private correspondence, the cup question. I insisted upon Harper and Cowan undertaking such an investigation which they are now doing. "But as soon as I signed Cowan's proposition, he quit me; and Trott wrote me, Oct. 27, 1925, saying, "Bro. D. sent me a copy of a letter that he wrote Clark, asking him to write me, but C. never wrote nor, so far as I know, never paid any attention to it. I was astonished and hurt when I read Clark's article in the Way." And he said "You will note that Duckworth seems in perfect accord with me in one of his letters, but a change seems to have come over the spirit of his dreams, later."

And on Feb. 5, 1926, Trott said, "I have written Duckworth that he is wrong about having control over the articles of the other editors. I am of the opinion that things may yet be adjusted. As to your discussion with Clark; I am glad to know that it is to come off and will gladly do anything I can to assist in a manifestation of the truth, though I am confident that you need no assistance."

On July 2, 1926, he wrote, "I am still sure that either you or I have the right to insist on the publication of anything which we deem advisable."

But Duckworth wrote, "Since the 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."

This was a violation of our written contract with him. And when Bro. Teurman attempted such a policy Bro. Trott wrote: "I am a little puzzled over Bro. Teurman's refusal to print any article from us. I cannot get it into my head that he has authority to censor either your articles or mine." And when he saw that he was "wrong", he got right, but not so with the present publisher, who butted right on in the "wrong".

And now, Bro. Evans, I suggest that you "have all the brethren write" Cowan, as was suggested of Showalter in trying to get him to meet the S. S. issue in a written debate, and see whether Cowan will face the issue of the use of the cups any better than S. faced the Sunday School issue with Dr. Trott.

"We can use either, and speak where the Bible speaks, and I insist that the same may apply to the 'cup' as used by the Savior," he says.

So I suppose he will not, in the face of this, deny that our practice is Scriptural. And I now insist that he meet Trott on the use of the cups. If we can use them, and "speak where the Bible speaks," it is his duty to the church to show it. And if he can not do it, it is his duty to quit disturbing the churches over his contention. Now, get the brethren to write him, and get him to take hold of the matter. As to Howard I am at your service, and the sooner the better.

EDITOR.

Correction

In my article in the July issue it should have read "at this time", after "publish it."—L. I. Gibbs, Los Angeles, Calif.

Why Change God's Command?

Baptism is a plain command. Matt. 28:19; Mk. 16:15. "Teach all nations baptizing them." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

They were to teach them and baptize only the believers. Hence to baptize infants or infidels is to change God's command.

We find that baptism requires a burial. Rom. 6:1-4; Col. 2:12. Hence to sprinkle or pour for baptism is to change God's command.

Water is the element. "They went down into the water both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." Acts 8:38.

The churches were commanded to "each one of you lay by him" on the first day of every week. Where is the money to be laid by? In the kingdom, where the "Lord's table" is, at which we eat and drink. Then why pass a hat, or basket, or plate for it? The Lord's way is always right, no matter whether it suits our "convenience" or not.

In the communion we have "the bread" and "the cup", just "one bread" and one cup. I Cor. 10:16. Christ "took the cup"—a cup with the "fruit of the vine" in it. Matt. 26:27. And he commanded them all to "drink from it." "And they all drank from it." Mk. 14:23. So we see that when he said for them to "divide it among yourselves," they all drank from the cup he gave them, and not from cups. When we have cups and fill them with the fruit of the vine, they are no longer "the cup." It is not our "convenience" to be consulted when we baptize, nor is it when we commune. But custom says use cups, yes, and custom says use sprinkling. The true church denounces such foolishness and stands for the word of the Lord. If we leave the divine pattern, we are branded with the mark of the beast spoken of in the Book of Revelation. Brethren, be careful.

—Chas. F. Reese, Yuma, Ariz.

Remember the Semi-Monthly

Remember brethren, that "The Truth" becomes a semi-monthly paper in January 1929. And remember too, that *donations* and the *subscription price* are the paper's only means of existence. Hence, we urge all who can to *renew* their subscriptions as soon as possible, *secure* new subscribers, and send in donations to "The Truth Fund" as often as possible. Let us get behind the paper, brethren, and push the work.

The enemy is doing all in his power to cause the truth to cease to prosper. Yet, "when the enemy cometh in as a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him," says David (Psa. 59:19).

"The Truth" is devoted solely to the restoration message. When we begin to issue semi-monthly, donations must bear part of the expenses of publication. So send in your donations, brethren. Work for the semi-monthly in every way you can. A semi-monthly at only \$1.00 a year is the thing we need. Write Brother Harper, and tell him what you will do to help.

—James Douglas Phillips.

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

OCTOBER, 1928

Lockney, Texas, Aug. 1, 1928.

Mr. Azie Simpson,
Graham, Texas.

Dear Brother in Christ—

I have been informed that Brother H. C. Harper is to hold a meeting for the Church of Christ at Graham some time in August of this year. Knowing his position on the 'cup' question, and that he is editor of a paper which has for its chief object the agitation of the "one container idea; and knowing that he cannot consistently work for his paper without saying something about this question; and knowing too that some things have been said in his paper about me to the effect that I had signed a proposition and would not debate the same, I hereby authorize you to inform Brother Harper, or any one interested, that I will debate the proposition with him at Graham at any time to be agreed upon by us (Harper and Cowan) I shall expect him to affirm half the time, and if we cannot agree on a proposition for him to affirm, I will meet him without a proposition, allowing him to pursue any course he desires. This letter is not restricted to any certain ones, but is for anyone to see that so desires. It can be read publicly or privately as the case demands.

(Signed)

J. N. COWAN.

THE PROPOSITION

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:28 and the "fruit of the vine" are one and the same thing.

(Signed)

J. N. COWAN, Affirms.

Graham, Texas, August 27, 1928

J. N. Cowan,
Robstown, Texas.

Dear Brother:

A letter was handed to me, which you had written to Bro. Simpson here at Graham, in which you state the following proposition, and sign your name as affirmant, namely: "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Matt. 26:28, and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same thing." But the joker in the matter is this: The word "cup" is not used by Christ or anyone else in Matt. 26:28, and your proposition is therefore, a mess of nonsense. What do you mean by such action?

Your brother in Christ,

H. C. HARPER.

Oklahoma City, Sept. 13, 1928

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Fla.

Dear Brother:

Your letter of Aug. 27, 1928, is before me, and in reply will say that I am not surprised at the turn you took with reference to the matter of discussion at Graham, Texas. You have made your strongest effort in criticizing me for citing the wrong verse in the proposition sent. I did the same thing with Brother Frank Stark, and he was fair enough to mark the verse right, considering that I had made a mistake in the citation. I believe you know that I intended the proposition to be the same one that I have signed to debate and which you have published, which cites verse 27 instead of verse 28.

I am not persuaded that a discussion through "The Truth" is the right thing to do at present, for reasons I do not care to state in this letter; but I have decided to attend to you brethren on this question in oral discussion at every place where there is trouble or contention over the matter. That is why I wrote Brother Simpson the letter to which you refer. Rather than accept my proposition at Graham, you have chosen to criticize a small mistake in the citation of a passage of scripture, thereby slipping out of the discussion.

The word "cup" is not used by Christ or any one else in Matt. 26:28. (Harper). I wonder if the equivalent is used? Are you going on record as saying the word "this" in verse 28 does not refer to the cup?

I am here giving you a sample of the criticisms you have made of me, "and your proposition is, therefore, a mess of nonsense." (Harper). Now, I fail to find the word "nonsense" in any dictionary at my command and I wonder what you mean by such a mess of nonsense. I can find the word "nonsense", but I failed to find the word "nonsense".

Of course I know what you meant, and that you hit the wrong key on the typewriter. I shall never be small enough to wriggle out of discussion on the ground of such errors.

In case you publish this letter, please do not do me as you have before, and just publish a part of it, and as you have done Trott and others.

Trusting this will explain what I meant by my letter to Brother Simpson, I beg to remain your Brother in Christ.

J. N. COWAN.

Next address will be Fort Smith, Ark., Gen. Del., from September 15 to October 15.

Sneads, Fla., Sept. 18, 1928.

J. N. Cowan,
Fort Smith, Ark.

Dear Brother Cowan:

Your epistle of the 13th instant is at hand, and I beg to tell you that you are mistaken when you say: "I believe you knew that I intended the proposition to be the same one I have signed to debate and which you have published, which cites verse 27 instead of verse 28." As a matter of truth I believed, and said so to others, that you had done so to make a flourish of wanting to meet me, and had written a bogus proposition to carry out this design.

When you say or intimate that I have ever criti-

cized your spelling, punctuation, or composition, you falsify, and I challenge you to prove the charge. If you want a hole to crawl out, choose one that is clean.

I suppose you know "The Truth" is born. But from the way you express yourself, I judge that you think it is too small to merit notice. And from your actions it seems that Dr. Trott is beneath your notice, too.

But I see that we have the assurance that when you get ready and are "persuaded" you intend to do something. Well, I have been waiting for you to get into that notion since 1925. So when you are fully "persuaded" just get me word. Now, don't you feel small when you accuse me of "slipping out of the discussion?" I suppose you think, from the tone of your letter, that I would hide in the weeds if I were to get sight of you.

You had your flunkies to come into my meeting in a "burly" manner with the evident design of causing trouble that you might have something to shoot off your mouth about. The witnesses are there, and it is nothing to your credit either.

"The Truth" is not the only paper that publishes letters or parts of letters, but none are quite so rich and to the point, perhaps.

You have not been small enough to wiggle out of this discussion, for you have been too much of a dodger to wiggle in.

Trusting that this will make it clear to you as to what I meant when I signed the proposition you wrote and signed and sent to me in 1925, I am

Yours for truth and fairness,

H. C. HARPER.

P. S.—I will have you know, my brother, that the "chief object" of "The Truth" is to oppose every innovation that sets aside the New Testament order, and this includes the cups. And if you will read our correspondence, you will find that I have not been lacking in affirmative propositions for you to sign. If "The Truth" hurts you, keep on fighting it as you and others have been doing—"Every kick is a boost," as Brother Teurman was won't to say when he started the Way.—Harper.

NOTICE

Now, if there is any place where arrangements will be made for this debate, let us know, and I will debate with Brother Cowan by the day, by the week, by the month, or by the year. Doctor Trott has given his endorsement for me to meet him.

PROPOSITION

The word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27, and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same thing."

J. N. Cowan, affirms.

H. C. Harper, denies.

Investigation

There has been some investigation concerning the number of cups that may be used in observing the Lord's supper. Some say that we are permitted to use as many cups as we please. They say that the word cup means the fruit of the vine, and has no reference

to a material cup. If that were true, it would not justify us in using more than one cup, because CUP is always used in the singular, and there could be but one body of liquid in one cup, and no one could or can handle the fruit of the vine in a liquid form and drink it, without a container, and the Holy Spirit named the CUP as the container. Paul says in I Cor. 11:26 and 28, "Drink the cup," and also "Drink out of the cup." This makes it clear that when he said by metonymy "Drink the cup," he meant to drink the fruit of the vine out of the cup, speaking literally in verse 28 and by metonymy in verse 26.

"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 suggests it."—William's Rhetoric.

Every use of the word cup in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's supper is either literal or by metonymy. And when used by metonymy, the word cup calls to mind or presents to the mind the contents, not by naming IT, but by naming the solid that holds it. Hence every use of the cup by metonymy includes both "the cup and its contents. (See Webster).

Cup is not the name of a liquid, and never was the name of a liquid; it is the name of a solid.

Jesus had only one physical body, hence he appointed only "the loaf"—one loaf"—(I Cor. 10:16) to commemorate that body. He shed only one volume of blood, and he authorized but one cup, "the cup," containing one volume of the fruit of the vine, for the communion in his blood. I Cor. 10:16. If we use more than one cup or more than one loaf, we spoil the likeness and destroy the communion.

The pharisees said that if one swore by the temple, it was nothing but if one swore by the gold of the temple, he was a debtor. But Jesus called them blind guides and fools for not seeing that both were sanctified. They also said it was nothing to swear by the altar, but it was wrong to swear by the gift of the altar; and Jesus called them blind and fools for claiming the gift greater than the altar, for God appointed both. And Jesus taught that one was as sacred as the other.

Jesus appointed the "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" for the contents of the cup in the communion. One is as sacred as the other. And "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

"To poterion tes eulogias, the cup of blessing. I Cor. 10:16 (see eulogia, 4)." "Eulogia, consecration: to poterion tes eulogias, the consecrated cup (for that this is the meaning is evident from the explanatory adjunct) I Cor. 10:16."—Thayer. And I Cor. 10:16 is a passage he gives containing the literal use of CUP.

I would rather undertake to defend instrumental music and the class system than the cups.

In Acts 2:42 mention is made of "breaking bread", as constituting a part of the worship, and in verse 64 we are told where this took place, "breaking bread from house to house." It would be of no benefit to us to inform us where they ate their food.

—A. J. Jernigan.

Meetings and Announcements

I began a meeting at Anton, Texas, and from there to Mickey for a short stay. Then I go to Artesia, N. M., where I begin a meeting Sept. 16, and hold two meetings in this part of New Mexico.

I realize more and more as I see how things are going that we need the paper, "The Truth", and need it twice a month, and I am doing all I can to induce the brothers to get behind it, for I am sure it will stay with the Bible as long as Brother Harper publishes it. And I can truthfully say that I am succeeding in this good work for New Testament doctrine and practice. Many who did not know thought that this paper was started for spite, but they now see the need of it, and are changing their minds awful fast. I have been receiving letters from the brothers in Texas, California, Arkansas, Mississippi and other states, who have lately received copies of "The Truth" and they speak of it in the highest commendation. And I am always ready to give it my full indorsement when anyone asks about it. It stands against all innovations upon the Bible order of faith and practice from A to Z. And the brother who wants to read his faith and practice in the Bible will appreciate the help "The Truth" is giving such brothers. It is our machine gun and those who cannot read their faith and practice in the Bible are now dreading it.

We need the paper oftener, and the brothers who have been blessed in temporal things should send donations to Brother Harper and make it possible for him to start the first of next year with a semi-monthly of "The Truth", a real Gospel paper, full of Gospel truth to the church and to those out of Christ. And the brothers should renew their subscriptions promptly and send in good lists of subscribers so that the funds will be on hand without fail to begin with next year. It is the wonder of some that the paper has paid its way while others have been complaining for lack of support. But this is not strange, for the brothers are more and more coming to its support. Now do your part brother for our work will soon end.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

Change Address From Gunter

I expect to move, the Lord willing, to Deming, New Mexico, soon. I am to do mission work near there. These brethren expect to have a private school for our children. I closed a good meeting near Woodson, Texas, August 25. Nine were baptized. I am now preaching in open-air meeting in Gunter. Crowds are large and expect the attendance to increase. I have enjoyed all I have gotten to read of "The Truth". I would like to see all of the papers have a large circulation, provided they hold up the truth and nothing but the truth. May we work and pray that peace may be restored in the church, and that this peace may be founded upon the truth and nothing but the truth. I hate the spirit of vain strife and malice. I am in the fight for all that I can do for good.—D. J. Whitten.

I want to help make "The Truth" a semi-monthly.—T. E. Smith, Jr., Miss.

Items

Syllogism 1.—We must be purchased with the blood of Christ to share in the eternal reward.

The church of Christ has been purchased with his blood. Acts 20:28.

Therefore we must be members of the church of Christ in order to share in the eternal reward.

Syllogism 2.—The blood of Christ is the cleansing element.

The blood is in the body, and the body of Christ is the church.

Therefore, we must be in the body, the church, in order to be cleansed.

CHURCHES BUILT UP.—The apostles received the command to go into all the world and preach the gospel, and as a consequence thousands were added to the church, the saved. Therefore it was necessary to prepare workers to carry on the work after them. We have no idea as to the number of workers thus prepared, but we do have letters which show that young men were prepared for preaching the gospel, to "Preach the Word." And this shows that this should be done, that is, the inspired word should be preached, for it is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, it thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all other works. It thus enables us to render acceptable service unto God at all times by following it. And it is up to us to prove ourselves worthy and faithful in preaching and teaching this generation: What about it, brother? Do we realize our glorious privilege and great responsibility? Let us realize that when we read the inspired word that God is talking to us by the Spirit. Let every member of the body do his part and there will be no schism in the body. It is through the church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be manifest in the world. Are we ready to begin the work? Are we interested in saving the people—Americans, Mexicans, Negroes, Chinese, etc., all nations? Who will help?

How can they preach except they be sent? Rom. Ch. 10. We have men ready for the task. Will the churches get behind them and back them and let them report to the church that sent them? How can we call ourselves "faithful" unless we do our duty? What will the Lord say when he reckons with us as his servants? In humbleness, in sincerity, in love, I hope to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance of these things. And may the Lord give you understanding.—W. T. Taylor, Burnett, Texas.

Notice

A brother who has just taken his stand with us wants the complete files of "The Truth", every issue from the first. And if any brethren have on hand a copy or copies that they will spare, and will please mail them to the office at Sneads, Florida, we shall make him up a file. And if any copies remain, we shall be glad to return any when requested to do so if not needed for this file, or we will send them to others who are asking for samples. We should like to complete this file as soon as possible.—Ed.

The Truth—A Semi-monthly

I have just recently been informed that Bro. Harper contemplates making a semi-monthly of The Truth by January 1, 1929, provided the brethren want it and are willing to give of their means, time and influence to that end.

I believe that the paper would more than double its influence by appearing twice each month, and I am very much in favor of the change; but I also realize that the change will mean that the expenses of publishing the paper will be greatly increased. This will mean that Bro. Harper will be called upon to give more of his time to publishing the paper, and he will need the hearty co-operation of the friends of the paper, by sending donations and nice lists of subscriptions to the office to meet the increase in cost and time of making the change. The subscription price of the paper is now comparatively low, but you will be gladly surprised to learn that it is the desire of the publisher to make the change without raising the price. This, of course, will depend upon the response of the friends of the paper to help bear the burden of sacrifice the publisher must make. I, for one, am ready to shoulder my part of it. What say you, brother? Write Bro. Harper what you are willing to do.

Yours for "The Truth",
HOMER L. KING.

Phillips-Moore Debate

Brother Ira C. Moore and I will debate the propositions announced on Page 1, of the June issue of The Truth, at South Charleston, W. Va., Nov. 12-15 (it may last four days longer). We expect to give our hearers the best that we can do. We expect a great crowd. And we want you with us, too. Brother Moore is the senior editor of the *Christian Leader*, the author of several tracts, has had a great many debates some of which are in book form, and we expect him to make as strong a fight as the opposition can make on the points at issue. The class and women teacher questions will be discussed. For information about rooms, etc., write C. H. Williams, Charleston, W. Va., Box 1025. Bro. H. C. Harper, editor of The Truth, has promised to moderate for me if he can attend. You should by all means meet him while here if you can. Come and bring your Sunday School friends with you, and let us have an honest investigation of these matters that are disturbing the churches, and if we cannot find these things sanctioned in the Bible, let us drop them, that we may be one in Christ.

JAMES DOUGLAS PHILLIPS.

Report

I am back from Canada where I went to hold some mission meetings. I received very little support but I hope to hold some meetings and catch up financially. I want to be busy in the Master's work, for He has done so much for us. I shall be glad to arrange some meetings now, and do all I can to spread the message of salvation to dying men and women. Please write me at Gunter, Texas.

—D. J. Whitten.

Report

I preached at Roosevelt, Kimble Co., the last Lord's day in May; then near Leakey, Real Co., for ten days, covering the first two Lord's days in June. Then I held a ten days' meeting, including the first two Lord's days in July near Menard. Then I preached three nights at Cleo, Kimble Co., and spent two weeks preaching at Junction through three Lord's days. From there I went to Fort McKavett and preached two nights. This is the place I met Cowan last December in debate. Bro. Schromshire lived there then, but he has moved to Arkansas. The brethren there do not believe in Cowan's "cups."

"The Truth" is sure needed and it is making itself felt by those who are opposing the truth of the Bible. We need it twice a month now, and I shall do all I can to get the brethren to donate so it can be kept at the same price of one dollar a year and all the brethren can read it. And if we now begin sending in funds we can have everything ready by the first of January.

I am open for fall and winter work now, and if you want nothing but the Bible, I shall be glad to preach. If you want that kind, let me know. Let us get busy now and support "The Truth". Others have had to miss some issues and some advertise pills, etc., but "The Truth" has not missed an issue, in fact it put out one supplement. Long live "The Truth" and long live its editor to tell of the glad tidings of salvation.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

Report

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.—Since last report I have held meetings at Shreveport, La.; Atlanta, Texas; Ottumwa, Iowa, and am at this date (Aug. 13) in a mission near Bloomfield, Iowa.

The meeting at Shreveport resulted in one baptized and one restored. The meeting at Atlanta closed without visible results, but we had splendid crowds and the best attention throughout. At Ottumwa, the meeting resulted in three baptized, one restored and one confession of faults; and we trust that the brethren at each place were strengthened.

I expect to continue here until the 26th inst., then go via home to begin a meeting early in September at Ellettsville, Ind.

A Request

The Truth: Please give me some information about the wine question, and the number of cups. We brethren are honest, and want to do the Lord's will, we have been reading all we can get on these things, for we want to be right.

—J.A.C.

We are having a reprint of Brother Watson's article on wine for the benefit of our readers who were not in touch with the paper when that article appeared. And we are yet hoping that Brother Tucker will come up to our signed agreement for a written discussion of this question. As to the use of the cups, Bro. Smith and Bro. Wiggs are now discussing that, and we expect to let them have the forum until they finish.

Report from Ottumwa, Iowa

Bro. Homer L. King of Lebanon, Mo., held us a meeting, beginning July 22, closing August 7, with three additions and two restorations.

The churches at Ottumwa, Ia., Hartwick, Ia., and Sunny Side Chapel near Montezuma, Ia., supported Bro. King in a mission meeting held in a tent near the home of Bro. Ed. Swindler, northeast of Bloomfield, Ia. Late harvest and nearby fairs kept down the attendance. There was one addition and one restoration, also much good seed sown which we hope to harvest later. Bro. King has a kind, yet very forceful way of presenting the gospel. We hope to have him with us again.

Tuesday, August 21, Bro. King came back to Ottumwa for a special afternoon meeting at which a former Presbyterian pastor from Atwater, Minnesota, Mr. Albert A. Sorenson, obeyed the Gospel.

Lord's Day morning, August 26, worship was suspended at the mission point and all came to Ottumwa, at which time a large number of the members again renewed their covenant with the Lord by coming forward and confessing they had been neglecting some of their Christian duties.

We look forward with pleasure to Bro. King's return to Sunny Side chapel this coming October.

—ALBERT T. LaREW,
140 S. Adella St., Attumwa, Ia.

Commendation

I want to say a word to the brothers who have not yet heard Brother Jas. D. Phillips, of 439 North Drewry Ave., Kansas City, Mo., in a meeting. He is a Gospel preacher, well qualified, humble and true to the Bible. And although but a young man, he is one of the ablest I have ever heard. He believes we should read our faith and practice in the Bible, and he is not afraid to take a stand and defend it if called in question. Just write him if you want a meeting. He is in the field all the time, and can give you references if you desire to know about his work.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

"The Truth"

"The Truth" will do a good work here, once it is known and I shall do all I can to advance its circulation. We are with you, brethren, and we can use all the extra copies you are able to send us. We find it better to scatter among the people than any tracts we have ever tried. It certainly does make the truth stand out in a way that cannot be resisted by honest people. Now let us have it twice a month. We are ready to do our part. It has already done more good than many are aware of. Don't be afraid to hand it out brethren, and don't forget to ask them to subscribe for it and read it regularly.—Ira B. Kile W, Va.

I closed my meeting at Loco, Okla., July 15, with five baptisms. I am now in a good meeting at Muddy Creek, Okla. To God be all the praise.

—BOB MUSGRAVE.

W. G. Roberts Crossed

I received a paper from Bro. Roberts, of Mattoon, Ill., in which he had an article showing how he knocked out a brother on instrumental music in the worship of God. I then asked Roberts why he was not as straight on the word of God in regard to sect baptism. He said they had received the right baptism, but had joined the wrong church. I called on him to show from the Bible that one who was baptized right, that is, as the Scriptures direct, was not added by the Lord to the right church. He did not reply to this. I then asked him if he would baptize a person on the confession that the Baptists require? And then informed him if he would not, this would kill his practice of receiving them into the fellowship as Christians. And if his practice of baptism for remission of sins is Scriptural and the Baptist practice of baptism *because of* remission of sins is Scriptural, we then have two kinds of Scriptural baptism. He said there are thirty designs of baptism. I ask him if a baptism *because of* remission of sins is one of the thirty. Now let him answer if he dares. He said no one ever understood the designs of baptism when baptized. I told him they understood that they were to be baptized *for the remission of sins*, when they were baptized on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, for Peter preached it that way, and they gladly received his word. Let Brother Roberts stick to the word of God and he will not have such a hard time crossing himself. I think men sin in upholding any unscriptural practice.—J. A. Comfield.

Report

Shreveport, La., July 8, 1928.—Bro. Homer L. King of Lebanon, Mo., closed a two week's meeting here with the church of Christ at Velva Street last Friday night with one baptized and one confessed wrongs. The meeting was well attended and we hope much good will result.

Bro. King did his work well, and we appreciate his efforts.

—H. H. MONTGOMERY.

It is refreshing to see the advocates of the CUPS resorting to Common Sense, and Discretion, and Prudence—the arguments (?) used by all digressives—for the heretical practice of using the CUPS, for this shows the people that they have no Bible for their practice, and they are dividing the church by their human "expedient" under the plea of a time saver. It is amusing to see them make a statement, trying to make something out of nothing and catch themselves—see "Cup, container." "Cups, containers." But what they need to find is cups, container, or containers cup.—Bob Musgrave.

"Good to Better"

We are always glad to get "The Truth. It is going from good to better. The only objection we have is it does not come often enough.—H. C. Welch, Canada.

W. H. Reynolds, Rt 2.

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

SNEADS, FLORIDA, NOVEMBER, 1928

CALL A MEETING

Yes, call a meeting at once to decide what we shall practice. Where? Yes, where? Not at Sneads; not at Dallas; not at Littlefield; but to the Bible, and let every member of the church of Christ attend. Yes, "Seek ye out the Book of the Lord, and read. No one of these shall fail; none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath gathered them." Isa. 35:16.

Why go elsewhere for a meeting to stop "division among us?" Follow "the Book," and division will disappear, the Unity of the Spirit will be with us in the bond of peace on the sure Foundation, the truth. Eph. 4:3.

The Spirit will teach you this, as it has ever taught those that take his word. Yes, it will bring to our remembrance all things that Jesus taught for us of unity. Jno. 17 and 14. This Spirit will guide us into all truth, but we must speak as the Spirit gave utterance. The Spirit will give us the commandments of the Lord. All will then speak the same thing. Such a meeting will furnish the church a guide by divine authority. Then why lead up to "preachers' meetings" with other foolish things, things not of God? Everything pertaining to life and godliness we have. All we now need is men that will follow "the book" and speak as the Oracles of God. Why leave the Bible in an attempt to get to the Bible? Have we not had enough of just such sad experiences? Will we never learn?

Meeting on the Bible and holding the preachers to the Bible will bring us back that "joy and happiness" we should have. Yes, the wounds in our Lord's body, the church, will be quickly healed, and love will flow from heart to heart.

I received a lovely invitation to come to a meeting. It assured me that a black cloud of division was rising and spreading out like the wings of a foul bird about to devour us. Yes, thunder and darts of lightning are flashing throughout the country again. And why? And will a meeting at any place but at the Word of God stop it? No, a thousand times, No.

As one says, "Human nature is ever the same." True, and when the S. S. brothers saw the black clouds of division appearing, did they take refuge under the Rock of Ages, the Word of God? No, they called preachers' meeting and devised and discussed, but followed their own ways. Watch, and again I say, Watch. Will you go with us to meet where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent and leave your "untaught questions that gender strife" to the messengers of Satan, or will you go to the conference at Littlefield? You can not put the New Patch upon an old garment without making a bad matter worse. Now be warned, my dear brothers. Why should we

be so foolish? Will we never learn anything? Watch ye therefore. What I say to one, I say to all—Watch. Yours for a "meeting" with the Bible every day with every one and every place under the sun. I am sad. May God stay the day of this evil and forgive those who know not what they do.

—Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

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.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Hodges turns his batteries on the resurrection of Christ and asserts that He arose from the dead, not on the first day of the week, as the Bible says, but on the Sabbath; and then refutes his own assertion by saying, "Every time the first day of the week is mentioned, the 'day' is in italics, and leaving it out, these texts would read, on the first of the week, which would be any time from Saturday until Wednesday."

He feels the force of my argument for the first day of the week being the Lord's day, but he fails to refuse it. John says, "The same day at evening, being the first of the week (John 20: 19) making the 'day' the first 'day' of the week and not "an indefinite time from Saturday till Wednesday." And here "day" is not in italics, either. And if he knows how to count, "after eight days again" (V. 26) brings us to the eighth day, or the first, going in the cycle of the 7's.

And Mark plainly says: "Now, when Jesus was risen early on the first day of the week," making it the early part of that day. Thayer in his Lexicon of the New Testament Greek says, "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, 12."

Can Mr. Hodges find a Greek scholar who dares to dispute this? He can not. Why do our translators use the word "day" here? Because it is required to express the thought of the Greek text. I know it is hard on his doctrine, but it the truth we want.

He is mistaken again when he says, "For fear of the Jews is given as a reason for their assembly on the first of the week," for this phrase modifies "were shut" (bolted), telling why the doors were bolted; and the marvel was that Jesus could come in.

He says, "We do not deny that they assembled on the first of the week," and he tells us, "Of course it was proper and right to worship at these meetings and partake of the Lord's Supper." Yes,

and he will admit before this debate is over that Jesus arose from the dead on the first DAY of the week, and that, too, early on that day, or he will fight the plain truth.

But he wants "the texts requiring this meeting for worship" on the first day of the week. Why, then, did he not attend to the arguments I made? Yes, WHY? They say, "None so blind as those who will not see." Did I not give the "orders" of Paul in 1 Cor. 16:1-2? I did, and he has not touched this. Did I not give the approved examples of Acts 20:7; Rev. 1:10; John 20:19-26? I did. They got the blessing, hence they were there in his name" (Matt. 18:29), or by his appointment. And we are to "follow in his steps (1 Pet. 2:21), and after the apostles (1 Cor. 11:1). And he cannot meet this.

I showed that the "LORD'S DAY" and the "LORD'S SUPPER" are both New Testament institutions in distinction from the Old Testament. He has not touched this.

He is wrong in saying, "The term 'type' and 'anti-type' are not in the Bible." Yes, wrong all the time, for we have *tupos*, *type*, and *anti-tupos*, *anti-type*, as any good lexicon will show. And Christ is declared to be the "first-fruits" of them that are to rise, making His resurrection to occur "on the morrow after the Sabbath." And this argument can not be met by any man.

Mr. Hodges has made a flat failure.
James Douglas Phillips,
439 N. Drury Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Greek scholars gave us our present versions of Scripture and they made it plain that at each visit to the tomb it was EMPTY. Jesus was risen. It is immaterial whether Jesus arose on the first day or the seventh day since God did not specify the observance of any day in honor of the event.

What the disciples DID should not be considered law, for they did some unwise things and Christ upbraided them for believing what the prophets had spoken and yet not having a better understanding. "Oh fools and slow of heart." Luke 24:25. And after Pentecost it was years before they grasped the words Jesus had told them, viz. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel unto every creature." It took a special revelation to convince Peter to carry out the Master's instructions. Brother Phillips is asked to produce one text in the Bible where the Word "type" or "anti-type" is used—barring the marginal reading in 1st Cor. 10:11, where the wicked murmurers were "types" or examples and as Paul says "To the intent that we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted." V. 6.

It is a wicked perversion to apply this text to the offerings made under the law. Come on, Brother Phillips, with your proof that "types" and "anti-types" are Bible terms, relative to the sacrifices or pointing to Christ. Please give chapter and verse or admit it is not there. Paul's "orders" on which Bro. Phillips bases his faith for First Day sacredness is concerning the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem and NOT for worship as he asserts. No true Sabbath observer will make the Seventh Day a time for gathering to-

gether food, clothing or money for any purpose. But how appropriate to make it the first day of the week.

"The examples" Brother Phillips introduces as proof to assemble on the First Day of the week, are concerning the sufferings of Christ. Read his proof texts, viz. 1st Peter 2:21 and 1st Cor. 11:1, and be convinced that Brother Phillips has made the wrong application here. "Christ" also suffered, leaving us an example that we should follow his footsteps." Brother Phillips urges that they "got the blessings" on the first day of the week, therefore that day must be set apart to assemble on. If such were the case ALL days must be recognized as "LORD'S DAYS," for people have been BLESSED on every day of the week.

Keep in mind that EVERY VISIT to the tomb on the first of the week found it EMPTY, JESUS WAS RISEN.

Here are the statements at each visit. Matt. 28:1-6. (This visit was in the end of the Sabbath).

"He is not here, he is risen." (Mark's statement).

"He is risen; He is not here." (Mark 16:6).
Luke says: "He is not here BUT IS RISEN." (Luke 24:6).

John, according to his own and Peter's visit (John 20:2-8) says he outran Peter and came to the tomb first but did not enter. Peter being bolder, entered and found the linen burial cloths. Then went in that other disciple (John) and he saw and believed—that "JESUS WAS RISEN."

Here I have shown that every visit to the tomb from the "end of the Sabbath" forward into the week, found the sepulchre empty, thus entirely annihilating my opponent's contention and his excuses for calling the first day of the week "Lord's Day."

We want a "thus saith the Lord," and not bluster.

—Albert S. Hodges

THE CHRISTIAN RACE

This race should concern man above everything else. Nothing has ever entered the heart of mortal man that is of more importance to his well-being. There is a race and it is either for good or for ill to men. And as we fellow travelers to eternity must hinge our eternal destiny on the way we run this race. The Bible, the Book Divine, tells us there is only one way that is right. There are two places to which we may run—Heaven or Hell, one the place of eternal joy; the other the place of eternal punishment.

With these truths of God's word before men and women it would seem that they would be very anxious to run the race in a sure and safe manner, and especially so since we run this way but once.

In order to run any race we must have a starting place, and we should start right. And when we enter the race, we must comply with the rules.

Paul says, "Let us run with patience the race." Now the rules to be complied with to enter the race are: Belief in Christ (Acts 16:32); repentance of sin (Acts 2:38); confession of Christ

(Rom. 10; 9,10); be baptized (Acts 2:38). When we have complied with these commands from the heart, we are then made free from sin (Rom. 6:18). We are now delivered from the Power of Darkness and translated in the Kingdom of God's dear Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins (Col. 1:12,13).

Jesus says, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32. God's word is truth, Jesus tells us.

Now we are ready to run the Christian race, and Paul says, "And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is not crowned except he strive lawfully." 2 Tim. 2:5. I would to God that all should be careful, yes, very careful here. Jesus says, "Teaching them (those baptized) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," Matt. 28:20. My heart's desire is to see each brother and sister full of the spirit of Christ, ready to do what the Lord has said for us to do and not to go beyond the things which are written. 1 Cor. 4:6.

May the Lord help us to see the sufferings of Christ, who died that we might live. And may we all be up and doing, busy about our Master's work, as Paul says, "Always abounding in the work of the Lord," 1 Cor. 15:48, for the night cometh when no man can work. (To be continued).

—Elbert E. Jenkins, Rusk, Texas, Rt. 2

The people need the truth. Let us see that they get it.

ITEMS

The Church of Christ—This is a divine institution, one purchased by the blood of Christ himself, Acts 20:28; Eph. 5:23; Col. 1:12, 13. And this is the only institution through which salvation is offered to the world. Christ is its head and supreme ruler. Eph. 1:22. He is King (Col. 1:13), and the New Testament is his law. By it every religious act is to be measured as to whether it is of God or of man. And every religious act or work for which we can not find a divine precept or divine example is to be rejected. The things commanded we must do; the things for which we do not have divine authority by way of command or approved example, we are to reject, for if they are brought in, they will lead to envy and division.

Divisions—In our efforts to maintain these principles, divisions have been produced in many congregations, and two houses of worship have been erected. The evangelist is a proclaimer of the Word, not a trouble settler. And if the evangelist assumes work that has been divinely appointed for the elders of the congregation to do, endless troubles and many times more divisions will follow. Then let the evangelist pursue his appointed work and leave the rulership of the church to the elders, where God placed it.

I know a church that seems to be dying for the want of the gospel. It seems that most of the evangelists that have been there have had the idea that they should fix things or conditions. Now if they would quit that and preach the word and melt the stony hearts of the hearers, God's

word would not return unto him void. Then preach it, and leave results with God. If brethren will "Let the word of Christ dwell in" them richly, and let the love of God rule in their hearts, troubles will soon dwindle down and vanish.

More Meetings—The elders should not be satisfied with just one meeting a year, as has become the custom with some of them. Let them "sound out the word" to the regions beyond; and not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn by failing to support the herald of the good news. We have the truth and the men to get it scattered abroad, so why not keep the preachers out in the harvest, which is now ripe? If "they that sow sparingly, shall reap sparingly," we should learn to sow more of our carnal things that we may reap more and then have more to support the preaching of the unsearchable riches of Christ. Ye ask and receive not, says James, because ye bestow it upon your lusts. May the good and loving Lord Jesus help us to be rich in good works.

Buy a New Ford?—Brethren, what are you going to do about such conditions? Buy a new Ford? Ride out for pleasure? Go on a visit, and neglect the assembling? Think it over. The judgment is coming and soon some of us will have seen our last opportunity to "rescue the perishing"—mayhap a son, a daughter, a husband, a wife, a father, a mother, a brother, a sister, a lost soul whoever it be. And what about your stewardship? Can it truthfully be said, Well done, of you? Always-always-always—yes, Paul says, "Always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." 1 Cor. 15:48.

—W. T. Taylor, Burnett, Texas.

DEPARTED

I was called to Elmore City, Okla., Wednesday, Oct. 10, to conduct the funeral of Bro. John Johnson, sixteen, son of Bro. and Sister George Johnson, of Eloa, Okla. Brother John was a Christian, having begun his activities as a Christian last August, and was making a very useful worker in the cause of the Master. This made it easy to speak words of comfort and hope to the bereaved ones, as they were God-fearing people and fully realized what Paul meant in giving words of consolation concerning those who have departed. 1 Thes. 4:13-18. If I can have it truthfully said of me when I quit the walks of men that I was a Christian, I will be satisfied. Such a life is a good recommendation in this world, and it will carry us safely through the dark hour of death and assure us of a happy home in the life beyond.

Brother and sister Johnson are true Christians and they are bringing up their children in the way they should go; and how sweet it must seem when you realize that you must give a child up, to know it is prepared to go and enjoy the better world! Rev. 21:1-5. And may God help fathers and mothers to realize the responsibility that is resting upon them in caring for their children. We all must go, sooner or later. Then be prepared—Tom. E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.

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

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

SEPTEMBER, 1928

STATEMENT

Friends and brethren are making it possible to put out "The Truth" twice a month next year, and the subscription price will be kept at one dollar the year. Now let the subs. roll in. And all who subscribe after the date of this issue of the paper for one year will be credited to January 1, 1930. Forward, now, for the truth of God and the salvation of humanity.

Every subscriber a subscription getter! All who renew for a year will be credited up to January 1, 1930, so renew now, and help us to avoid the rush of clerical work at the close of the year.

Remember, twice a month every month of 1929 for \$1.00. We thank you, one and all, for making this possible. Now to the work with joy. The harvest is white—the harvest truly is plentiful. "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into the harvest."

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

C. T. S. Did Judas Iscariot partake of the Lord's Supper, or did he go out just after the feast of the Passover and before the Lord's Supper was taken? (Answer)—He did not partake of the Lord's Supper. The expression in the common version of John 13:2 would indicate the Passover was concluded and that whatever took place after that would have to be related to the Lord's Supper. But the words "being ended" are from a word that sometimes means "taking place", and evidently means this in the present instance. So we understand it means while the supper was taking place, or in course of the supper, etc. Thus, the sop given to Judas (in verse 30) was from the Passover; and immediately after he went out, and was not there when the Lord's Supper was instituted. E. M. Zerr, in Review, Sept. 25, 1928. But Sommer in the Review of Jan. 26, 1926, says there were "thirteen present." Read it now:

H. C. Harper quotes "there must be factions among you" and immediately starts one to fulfill that scripture. One of his is that there must be just one cup for the audience, when, to be technical (real technical) we must have one cup for just as many as there were there the night the example was set, and if there are 26 disciples present two cups, and so on. I never could see where the cup had any connection at all with the example that night, save a medium for passing it from one to the other. If some one had held a cup to catch the blood that flowed from His side,

there might have been some place for the cup to enter in as meaning something. But as it is the cup enters in only as a container—nothing more or less. And if Harper insists that because there was one cup used that night we must use one cup, then we should tell him that thirteen being present meant something too, and there must be one cup for every thirteen present. He'll laugh at that, of course; who wouldn't? But it's as good as his, which doesn't make it very good at that.

Yes, the Greek indicates "taking place," that is, "while they were at supper." L.O. tr. What supper? The Passover supper? No. There are four suppers mentioned where Jesus was present: One six days before the Passover where Mary anoints the feet of Jesus (John 12:1-6); another two days before the Passover (Mt. 26:6-16; Mk. 14: 1-11; Lk. 22:1-6; John 13:1-30), where Mary anoints the head of Jesus, Judas is pointed out by Jesus giving him a "sop," Judas goes out in the night to bargain with the priests for the betrayal of Jesus; another, the Passover (Mt. 26:17-25; Mk. 14:12-21; Lk. 22:7-18, where Judas is pointed out as the betrayer as "he that dipped his hand with me in the dish," and "the twelve" are present; another immediately after the Passover, "the Lord's supper," as Paul calls it (1 Cor. 11:20; Mt. 26:26-30; Mk. 14:22-26; Lk. 22:19-22, and Judas is there, Lk. 22:21).

I wonder whether Sommer can see that there was "one cup" for all, making it common, hence a communion? And the same language shows that the church at Corinth had one cup, "the cup," and "one loaf," "the loaf," making it common, hence, "communion." 1 Cor. 10:16. Can Sommer see this? Well, if he can not, there are others that can. But if he would prefer to keep up his "faction" by continuing "to go beyond the things which are written". (1 Cor. 4:6), as the Corinthians were doing, "there must be factions among" us today "that they that are approved may be made manifest" among us. 1 Cor. 11:19. And the one who goes "beyond the things which are written," is the factionist, too. And he is **carneal**, and needs to clean up to be saved. And this will be no laughing matter when the test comes.

KICKING UP TROUBLE

The Devil's making up trouble;
He's working awful hard
So don't go to sleep,
But stay on your guard.

He'll take a little from,
Or he'll add a little to;
And either way he goes
He always gets a few.

I tell you, my brother,
It's time now to think
He'll try you on his CUPS
To see if you will drink.

There's "the cup of the Lord,"
But the Devil has two;
And I'll take the Lord's,
But what about YOU?

—E. F. Morgan, New Castle, Tex.

REPORT

My meeting at Stonington, near Leipsic, Indiana, was a failure, so far as I can tell. They have used class preachers there most of the time in the past, and it has just about ruined them.

My next meeting was at Pleasant Grove, near Lyons, Indiana. It lasted three weeks and resulted in nineteen baptisms and the church greatly strengthened. Brother Homer L. King and Brother Lee Prather (preachers) visited me several days in the meeting. Brother King preached once for me. We may hold a meeting together there in December.

I went from Lyons to Unionville to visit Brother King in his meeting there. I was with him six days. I preached one night on: "Why We Oppose Innovations in Religion." The next two nights we put on "double-headers." We both preached. I think this a very good plan. I wish Brother King and I could work together in meetings for a year here in this northern country. The cause has been so greatly injured by jealousy among preachers that it is a fine thing for two preachers to work together, thus demonstrating to the brethren what co-operation can do.

I am now in a meeting at Antioch, near Greenup, Illinois. The church here is in a deplorable condition. Marvin W. Kelly came here last year, under promise to say nothing about classes, women teachers, etc. But before he left he decided that, to remain loyal to the Review, he would say something about it. So he had the brethren to put up a "question box" and invited questions to be put in it for his answer. Some one asked the question: "Is 1 Cor. 14 binding on the church today?" He then opened up on his class hobby and came near dividing the church. The church hasn't prospered any since. But this further demonstrates what that class of preachers will do for a church. Better remember Paul's charge: "He that is a heretic, after the first and second admonitions reject." Titus 3:10, and quit getting such preachers.

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

NOTICE

The Lord willing, I shall begin a meeting at Charleston, W. Va., on the 28th of Oct., and continue until the Moore-Phillips discussion on the Sunday School issue, which begins in Charleston on the 12th of Nov. And after that I shall be engaged in meetings in the North until the 15th of May, 1929. I shall be glad to meet as many of the brethren as possible on this trip, and may be able to "wedge in" a few short meetings between my regular appointments. Mail addressed to me at Sneads, Fla., will always reach me.—H. C. Harper.

THE TRUTH FUND

J. B. Watson	-----	\$1.00
Homer L. King	-----	2.00
A Brother	-----	2.00
Herman N. Stewart	-----	1.00

Now make us up a good list of subs. for the semi-monthly, \$1.00 a year.

CHANGED SITUATION

How any man can fail to become enthusiastic about the "Declaration and Addresses" of the Campbells when he considers the state of religion in 1809, I can not understand. No wonder good men were sick at heart—warring sects, clashing creeds. No wonder they sought refuge in the motto: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

But many changes have come since then. For thirty years I have been a member of ministerial associations, and I have received nothing but courtesy from these brethren. Happily, what changes have been wrought in the minds of ministers and policies since that time. The age of controversy is happily past, and we are busy getting the will of God done on earth as it is in heaven. —Christian-Evangelist.

Yes, the age of controversy passes for any people when they leave the Bible for their faith and practice. And since "misery loves company," they huddle together in "ministerial associations" and "throw kisses" at one another, and sigh, "How sweet-spited!" So went the organ faction from the church of Christ years ago into denominationalism. And lo, another faction with their Sunday School, their "incipient Missionary Society," their "Young Peoples' Meetings," their "our Pastor," their fine church buildings, and their "communion sets" where there is no communion at all—yes, another faction, as we see, is following towards denominationalism. Their age of "controversy," it seems, is already passed, and as one of their own number has recently remarked, "History will repeat itself."

STILL PREACH THE SAME

When I moved to Elk City four years ago, I found a church of faithful brothers and sisters, worshipping the Lord, as I thought, according to his word, and I still think so. They had no Sunday School; no instruments of music in the worship; no foot-washing in the worship; no cups in the worship to drink the fruit of the vine from. And I certainly did rejoice; and I prayed to God, and thanked him for this church.

I preached on the Sunday School, showing from the Bible why we did not have a Sunday School—not because it is not popular—not because the Bible can not be taught in it; but because it is not an apostolic practice. Was I wrong? If so, I am guilty before God.

I preached on instrumental music in the worship, showing why we did not have it—not because it is not popular—not because we do not like such music; but because it is not an apostolic practice. Was I wrong? If so, I am guilty?

I preached on foot-washing as a church ordinance, showing from the Bible why we do not do it that way—not because we do not wash feet: Christ washed the disciples' feet: Mary washed Christ's feet; but because it is not an apostolic practice in the church. Was I wrong? If so, I am guilty.

I preached on the cups, showing why we did not use two or more or one for each—not because such use is not popular—not because we do

not like such a practice if we had our way about it; but because it is not an apostolic practice. Was I wrong? If so, I am guilty. I am STILL PREACHING just as I did then; and I still rejoice in such a church. And I am thoroughly convinced that such a church will meet the approval of God, and in the end he will say well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joys of thy Lord. With a prayer for unity and that love may abound among the brethren, I stand for a Thus saith the Lord.

—Bob Musgrave.

NEWS AND NOTES

J. Madison Wright, 2816 Osceola Ave., Columbus, Ohio—Sept. 27th. I closed a three-weeks' meeting with the Myrtle Chapel church of Christ near Hampton, Va., where Bro. J. J. Smith holds the fort. Nine were baptized.

May God bless the Florida storm-sufferers, and may this calamity awaken the people as never before to realize the frailty of man and the uncertainty of life. And may those left seek salvation for the place where storms never come. And may the Christians left work as never before to the glory of God. When Christians are spending more for shows, ball games, dances, bathing beaches, etc., of worldly lust than they are giving in having the Gospel preached everywhere. May they awaken to righteousness, and go to work for the salvation of souls in real earnest.

D. L. Jacobs, El Dorado, Ark.—Bro. Paul S. Knight held a meeting here, beginning the 20th of October. A good meeting. Bro. Jas. D. Phillips, of Kansas City, Mo., held a meeting here this summer with eight baptisms. We received our first issue of "The Truth" in Sept., and like it fine.

T. H. Wiggs, Jr., Holdenville, Okla.—Please put my name on your subscription list for "The Truth." You have a good, clean paper so far, and I earnestly pray that it may remain so.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas—I have been busy this summer in meetings. God to see "The Truth" coming to the front. Some who predicted its sudden death are beginning to "sit up and take notice." Shall do all I can to make it a semi-monthly.

James L. Smith, Tecumseh, Okla.—By chance I just got hold of a copy of "The Truth," just what I have been longing for. I did not know there was such a paper anywhere. It takes the truth to make us stand in the Great Judgment. Here is a dollar for my subscription one year. Keep us to the Bible, brother, and God will bless your work.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.—I have had some good meetings this summer. Bro. Walter Shelnett and I were in meetings together at the Pence church and near Mt. Carmel in Randolph Co. Sister Hansard is very anxious for a meeting near her home, and I hope the brethren will see that this meeting is held as soon as possible. I have a crop to gather now.

J. P. Watson, Cookeville, Tenn.—I am home again (Sept. 24) after a four weeks' trip in Detroit, Mich., where I held a meeting of two weeks' duration, including three Lords' days. And while there were no additions to the church, yet there was much good done in the way of building up the brotherhood in spirituality.

A. J. Jernigan, Altus, Okla.—I have been visiting the brethren in Elk City. We have one of the finest congregations there in the state, I think. And they have had a steady growth in numbers.

E. H. Henderson, Bismarck, Ill.—Enclosed find one dollar for "The Truth." Am looking forward with interest to the Moore-Phillips debate. Moore is scared already, judging from the tone of last article in the Leader. The S. S. folks drew off about half of our membership recently, and started a new congregation with classes, women teachers, and the cups.

C. H. James, Roswell, New Mexico.—Give me credit for "The Truth" one year. I hope to be able to be a regular subscriber as long as the paper continues in the truth as it now is doing. We need it very much.

"Baptize—L. D. M., Fayetteville, Tenn.—The word baptize came into the English from the Old French baptizer, from the Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptizo, from bapto, dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkling is not to be associated with it."—*The Literary Digest*, March 7, 1925, "The Lexicographer's Easy Chair."

"The element of humanity that will not fight for a principle for fear of creating discord is a drag on progress. To adopt the attitude of "sh-sh-shush! when a vital principle is involved, is as futile as it is cowardly." The Presbyterian. "Trying to smother it (the controversy over the cups) is a poor way out. It simply can't be done."—G. A. Trott.

M. F. Gray, Hartshorne, Okla.—I received a copy of "The Truth" from some one and I want to continue to receive it. I like the paper fine. I think we need more true gospel papers. Subscription enclosed.

H. R. Stringer, Bogue Chitto, Miss.—I highly favor making "The Truth" a semi-monthly, and shall help in every way I can. If every one who takes "The Truth" would get another subscriber or pay a subscription for some friend, we could soon double the list. I should like to see at least one good article in each issue on first principles, or what one must do to be saved, and at least one on the duties of Christians. I received the sample copies and shall hand some out and send some to places I think they are greatly needed. The people need to be aroused to thinking on the Bible, and I find this to be one of the best ways to get them at it. Hold to the Bible, brethren, and let us demand that the preachers preach it more.

ANOTHER PROMISE

"While in a meeting here a year ago, Tucker said he started back and you backed out from debate with him two times."—From Marion, La., Sept. 5, 1928.

"In reading a letter from Bro. W. G. Tucker to a certain brother on the wine question, I noticed the following: 'I have had two oral debates on the subject, One with Bynum Black who had not studied the subject, and could do nothing but lie and pervert. The second was with H. C. Harper who tried to meet the issue by reasoning from the standpoint of scientific experiments which made it impossible, according to his contention, to use grape juice unless it was boiling hot. When he saw the predicament he got himself into, he then went to perverting and misrepresenting Scripture. Even denied that Paul in I Cor. 11 had any reference to the Lord's Supper. He is now raring for a written discussion, and as soon as conditions with me get where I can I shall engage him. W. G. T.'" So reads another letter, date Aug. 27, 1928.

Remarks

As to I Cor. 11, Harper denied that "his own supper," taken by each, was "the Lord's supper," and any man of sense knows this is true, Tucker to the contrary notwithstanding.

As to taking it "boiling hot," as Tucker contended, any boy who has been through his course in hygiene in the common school, knows this is not true, much less one who has read up on fermentation. And Harper's "predicament" existed only in the fertile imagination of one who had not studied the subject, and found out that he had not, and was just wiggling around to try to satisfy his supporters.

As to starting "back," he may have done so, for all I know; but as to "backing out," it was Tucker, not Harper. The correspondence shows this. When Tucker and his supporters learned that we intended to have the debate taken by a reporter and printed, they wrote that they would not indorse Tucker for it and that "Tucker would not stand" for it, and so did not come. This can be verified by the letter I have.

As to perverting Scripture—well, that's a poor way to account for his failure. Just be fair, and say you simply did not have the truth.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

"I am asked to state the expediency of the individual cup as to sanitation. This certainly is the most expedient thing in it. Modern hygienists tell us diseases, the foulest of them are communicated through the mouth and great care should be taken to avoid these tragedies. As to the contention for the one cup, the "cup" is the contents and not the container, and when the contention arose about the individual cups many protested who had used two cups for years. Two hundred can be used with the same authority as two. A congregation of 800 people could not be served expediently with one cup and congregations often reach that size. Only the ultra-conservative objects."—M. S. Mason, in *Christian Worker*.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.—I have decided to move to La Grange, Ga., where my family can have better opportunities for work, and the brethren there want me to evangelize in and around La Grange. This is a cotton-mill town, and we shall have many opportunities to preach the Gospel among the people who labor in the mills, and to the city and surrounding country. Bro. Dennis and Bro. Shelnett have been keeping up the work there since the death of Brother Clarence Teurman, who sacrificed much to start the work there. We want to help make "The Truth" a semi-monthly. We are glad to know that the subscription will remain one dollar a year, so all can take it.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Missouri, Oct. 9, 1928—I closed a meeting with the loyal brethren near Ellettsville, Ind., September 16. The results were two baptized (both from the Baptists), and seemingly the church strengthened. From here I went to Lyons, Ind., to visit and to hear Bro. James D. Phillips in a good meeting there, for a few days, which I enjoyed very much. Bro. Phillips is a power, considering his youth. From Lyons, I went to Unionville, Ind., and closed the meeting there Oct. 4, which resulted in two baptized. This was my fourth meeting with these good people within a period of two years, and it is certainly a pleasure to labor with such people. I am now in a meeting at Spencer, Ind. Expect to close here the 14th inst.; go via home to Montezuma, Iowa, to begin there the 20th inst.; then back to Ind. for some more meetings. Let us keep the good work going, brethren.

Jas. D. Phillips, Greenup, Ill.—The October issue of "The Truth" is the best one out.

"The only way I see is to come out in the open and investigate it (the question of the use of cups) thoroughly in the light of God's word."—G. A. Trott.

Fred Hogland, Melrose, N. Mex.—Enclosed you will find one dollar for which please send me "The Truth" one year.

The Smith-Wiggs discussion on the cups fails since the Way refuses its columns for the discussion as announced.—Ed.

Others are begging: we are working and praying.

REPORT

I spent the spring and summer in Canada, farming and preaching. I learned to love the brethren there, and I shall never forget the kindness of Bro. Oswald S. Hodges and Bro. F. J. Lidbury, and if any preacher has occasion to go to their locality to preach the Gospel of the Son of God he need not worry about support. Bro. Hodges is spending more for the spread of the Gospel than any hundred other men I know. May God continue to bless them.

I am now located at Doole, Texas, Star Route, and can hold meeting if brethren will notify me here.—H. C. Welch.

If it is true, as Brother Mason says, that "sanitation" is "the most expedient thing in" in the use of individual cup practice, it has a poor "expedient."

And if "Modern hygienists" are your authority for this thing, why not go to the "Man of Sin" and "Son of Perdition," the Pope of Rome, for your authority on baptism. He changed the form or action on account of some who, he said, were not physically able to be immersed. And if it is right to change the Lord's plan and way in the communion service on account of "Modern hygiene," it is also right to change the Scriptural action of Baptism for the same reason. If not, why not?

"Two hundred can be used with the same authority as two." Yes, but who said it was right to use "two?" Yes, who?

"Only the ultra-conservative objects." F. L. Rowe used to think that it was "Only the ultra" digressives who favored the use of individual cups. Perhaps Brother Mason thought so, too. But now they try to console their readers by, "Only the ultra-conservative objects."

"A cup," "this cup," "the cup," and "that cup," can't be made to mean "two cups," "two hundred cups," and "800 cups." No, not as long as cup means cup. Neither can there be "individual communion" so long as communion means communion.

The Greek noun *hairesis* means choice, option, sentiment. This is Young's definition. Thayer more fully defines it, thus: "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 Scriptures, heresy." And that fits Mason's case exactly. He has an "opinion," a "chosen course of thought and action" that has caused him to teach that the use of more than one cup is all right. So he is teaching heresy—yes, sir—rank heresy.

—Jas. Douglas Phillips.

IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH

There is much confusion in the minds of the people as to the church Christ built. It is worthy of notice that all forms of speech used in the Bible to designate the church are in the singular number, for example Kingdom of Heaven, Kingdom of God, Kingdom of God's dear Son, Church of God, House of God, House-hold of Faith, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth, the Temple of God, one Body, my Church, as Christ called it. Just one in the whole world that is recognized by Him. He purchased it with his blood. (Acts 20), and He is its head (Eph. and Col.)

Paul tells us in Eph. 4, there is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

And in Rom. 12:4-5, he says, for as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office (work), so we, being many; are one Body in Christ, and everyone members one of another.

Again in 1 Cor. 12:13, he says for by one spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles and have all been made to drink into one Spirit, for the Body is not one member, but many. And he tells us: But are they many members, but one Body. And he tells us in Col. 1:18, this Body is the Church, of which he is the Head and Savior.

He said to Peter before his death (Matt. 16:18), "I will build my Church." And we find that this was fulfilled on the Pentecost after He returned to God, as Peter points to this as the "beginning" in Acts, Chapter 15. Christ was at that time made Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body.

Therefore all other institutions claiming to be the church of the living God and which claim their existence prior to that time, cannot be the Church of Christ because He is not the Head of them. How, then, we ask, does it come about that we have different kinds of Presbyterians, different kinds of Baptists, different kinds of Methodists, all claiming to be churches of God; but not a single one of them dating farther back than the fifteenth century?

And any church that had an existence before the death of Christ, can not be the one Christ built, because we are told by Paul that Christ was not made head over the Church until He arose from the dead, having shed his blood by which he PURCHASED the Church. Hence they are not his. I hope to continue these lessons on the church.

—G. B. Harrell,
Box 652, Ada, Okla.

"THE TRUTH" A SEMI-MONTHLY

We have been emphasizing the necessity of making The Truth a semi-monthly, and still keep the subscription price at the small sum of one dollar per year and in order to accomplish this, we must get behind the paper with both our influence and means, by sending in donations and subscriptions to The Truth office.

We desire to see the paper filled with good things concerning Christ and His Kingdom; "Shunning not to declare the whole counsel of God"; making a plea for a return to the "Old Paths"; being governed by "the law and the testimony" in the work and worship of the Church; kept free from worldly advertisements and excessive and unnecessary begging; and remain an open forum on all Bible questions. And so long as the publisher and paper adhere to these principles, we pledge our hearty co-operation and support, and we urge all who can conscientiously acquiesce in these principles to do likewise.

Brethren, don't forget the subscriptions and donations. The time is short, let us be ready for the semi-monthly. What do you say?

—James D. Phillips,

—Homer L. King.

Send in a list of subscribers for the semi-monthly, \$1.00 a year.