

W. H. Reynolds

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JANUARY 1, 1930

No. 1

AN UNJUST CRITICISM

"He (J. D. Phillips) is at this time taking the side of the Christian Church and becoming one of their defenders as the following quotation from a letter received from Charles F. Reese shows:

As to my defending Baptist doctrine, well, well, well. Here is a statement from Charles F. Reese, that shows that Phillips has already signed up proposition to the effect, "shakin' 'em in." And he is getting his information it seems from Brother Reese's letter, not from the Bible, but from the preachers of the Christian Church. Here is a quotation from the letter written us by Brother Reese:

"I will write you a word or two and tell you what J. D. Phillips and Bob Musgraves have done out here in Somerton, Ariz., and you know they speak where the Bible speaks and the Bible alone. When Bob was out here in his last meeting, he took in a First Christian church member on his baptism and I got in behind them, and when Phillips came, he upheld them in the ungodly practice, and J. D. and I have signed up to debate the question.

"He will affirm that the First Christian church baptism is for the remission of sins and the Somerite Church of Christ is scriptural in shaking them in, so I will deny. What do you think of the one-cup preachers that will do that way? He is writing to all the first Christian preachers, so I aim to fix him when we meet."

I regret to have to expose a boy whose practice and religious conduct shows him so undependable.

Remarks.

The foregoing is from the pen of R. F. Duckworth in the Apostolic Way of Dec. 15, 1929. And I regret to have to expose the man that is not any more given to confining himself to the truth than is R. F. Duckworth. Brother Phillips is right on the stand he has taken on baptism and so is Brother Musgrave. And if the Apostolic Way will divide time with me, I will meet R. F. Duckworth in "The Truth" if he will sign where Chas. F. Reese does on this question. I have had some correspondence with Brother Reese on this matter and he is wrong, and he dare not attempt to defend his contention with me, either. And when Duckworth has to pervert the truth to try to screen himself from an exposure of his "slipping and sliding" from the New Testament pattern of work and worship, it is intolerable, and deserves rebuke.

In the same issue of the Way, D. L. Jacobs reports a meeting at El Dorado, Ark., saying, "Good

attendance at all services; thirteen additions, ten baptisms and three restored. Among these were six from the Baptists, one from the First Christian Church, and two from the Sunday School." "One" and "two" are "three." How about it Brother Duckworth? Why didn't you, if there is a house to be cleaned, begin cleaning at home, and not try to make it appear that the "boy" Phillips has side-stepped and that Musgrave had perverted the truth?

An Unjust Criticism

We invite criticism, but when it comes to an attack upon the truth, we arise to its defense. It is simply too bad that a man will get into such a strait that necessitates such a course in trying to defend himself. James says, "Lie not against the truth." Jas. 3:14.

Reese says, "If a man or woman that I baptized should join a sectarian church, they would depart from the faith and would have to be baptized again before they could be saved." Again: "When a man accepts the faith again, he will have to confess Christ, repent of his sins, and be baptized again."—Ib. Again: "John said the Spirit said for a man to repent and do his first works that had left his first love. Rev. 4:5. So faith is the first work, repentance and confession and baptism is the first works of a sinner, so he would have to do them again if he is saved."—Ib. (Letter of Nov. 6, 1929).

I had replied to him, stating that a man could be born but once, either physically or spiritually speaking. This he admitted, saying, "You said a man could not be born but one time; that's the truth."—Ib. Then in the face of this, he pens such stuff as the foregoing. And neither he nor any other living man can defend such teaching successfully. Now here is a chance to show that Phillips is "shakin' 'em in", if you feel equal to the task.—H. C. Harper.

OUR ATTITUDE

Sneads, Florida, Nov. 14, 1929

Dear Sister:

In answer to your letter, we beg to say that your subscription does not expire until Jan. 1, 1930. You mention the discussion pertaining to the Communion. We believe that the brethren do not understand this matter as well as they should. It is again the old question of Unity or Division. We have seen one division by putting in the ORGAN, and another division has been caused by putting in the Sunday School. And now we are face to face with another. Some want the individual cups; some will not use them, but use

two or more; and some will not use more than one. Would you commune where the individual cups are in use? We know you would not if you are now what you were when we visited among the brethren there. And others are just as conscientious in objecting to more than one. Shall we divide again? If so, there will logically be three parties. Is it right to have these divisions? You know it is not, for Jesus prayed that his disciples should all be one; and Paul severely condemns division, telling us that those who do not "endeavor" to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, do not walk "worthy of the vocation." Eph. ch. 4. This, then, becomes a serious matter. Had it not been possible for disciples of Christ to keep this UNITY, the Savior would not have prayed as he did, and Paul would not have condemned disciples for their division.

No, the blame is not all with the preachers. We know, though, that the temptation of the preachers to coddle the congregation in anything they are practicing is great, for they are depending on the churches for support, and therefore they wink at unscriptural practices instead of rebuking them, generally, and the churches generally think these practices are harmless or the preachers would condemn them; and so things rock on.

But this matter of making the effort, the "endeavor," to keep the unity of the Spirit devolves upon every disciple; and he does not walk worthy of his profession, but is under condemnation, if he does not endeavor to do this. What are you doing in this direction, sister? You, with the rest of us, can not escape this obligation as a Christian. We have taken the only course that we find possible in performing our obligation in this matter. Can we unite on the individual cups? We hear you say, "No," with a shudder, "the Bible is as silent as the grave on them." Can we unite for the "unity of the Spirit" on the use of "two or more?" No, for we hear others say the same thing about them that you said about the individual cups, and you know it is true. We have thought over this matter; studied over it; prayed over it; and wept over it. We are seeking to be free from condemnation in the course we take, and we can see on ground of unity but to all come to one cup to contain the one volume of the fruit of the vine as the Bible speaks on the subject. But if you or any one else can point out another course that will make it possible for all to commune, we shall be glad to consider it. What are you going to do in your "endeavor?" And if you do not "endeavor," you are under condemnation. The more you think of this question the more serious it becomes. Somebody is going to lose a crown over this matter, we fear. And we have put the question to ourself hundreds of times, yes, thousands of times, Is it I, Lord? Do nothing; say nothing, make no "endeavor" only leaves us under condemnation. We must "endeavor." And we pray you to tell us a better way than to try to bring all to "Where the Bible speaks," and that means to one cup for the fruit of the vine. This question will be settled at the Judgment: better get on the right side now. If you have light, let your readers have it. We

want to follow the dictates of the Spirit. We know of no other way to "endeavor" to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Thanking you for your inquiry, and hoping to hear from you again, I am Sincerely yours,
H. C. Harper.

THE WORK OF SATAN

Remember that it is the work of Satan when he "transforms himself into an angel of light" to make people who are "in the faith" believe that wrong is right.—Ira C. Moore in "Leader."

Remarks

Yes, it is true, Satan has many agents; and some of them are making "havoc" of the churches; deceiving them into believing that "wrong is right" by the devil's "cunning device"—"handling the word of God deceitfully." "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light."—And "his ministers are transformed (appear) as ministers of righteousness." 2. Cor. 11:14-15.

Some preachers are considered very "smart," and are referred to as "being leaders," "powerful preachers," (by some) when they "pervert the right ways of the Lord."

Moore once taught that it was "wrong" for women to teach in the public assembly, saying: "All the teaching in the Bible is opposed to the practice of women speaking in public." He now contends that "women have the 'right' to teach in the public assembly of the church."

But regardless of Moore's abominable presumption and assumptions to the contrary, the Bible still forbids women to "speak (teach) in the churches."

Therefore when Moore or any other man tries to make people who are "in the faith," believe that it is "right" for the sisters to violate the command of God by teaching in the public assembly; they are doing "the work of Satan" by trying to make them believe that "wrong is right." "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? (Acts 13:10).

Moore is bound to concede that any "departure from the teachings and example of the Apostles and first Christians, in doctrine, faith and practice, either by adding to or taking from the record of their doctrine, faith or worship" is "wrong." So then, when he advocates the "classes" "women teachers" or a "plurality of cups" in the communion, he is advocating departures "from the faith." All of these practices are "departures," therefore "wrong." If Moore cannot prove that the Apostles and first Christians, had the "classes," women "teaching in the assembly," and "individual cups" in communion,—and he can't—he is bound to admit that he is doing "the work of Satan" when he advocates any of these things. In a recent issue of the Leader, Moore virtually admits that he may be "wrong," on the "woman question." However, he boasts of a "feeling of

security and confidence" in the "correctness" of his present views on this question. Well, the devil was no doubt "confident" that he could cause the Son of God to yield; at least he had the "nerve" to try it; which is more commendable than it is to "play the coward" as Moore has been doing and hide behind a publisher who is not enough a "lover of the truth" to publish both sides of a question.

Judas, too, was "confident" that he could betray his Master and get away with it. But "Judas by transgression fell,"—just as Ira C. Moore will "fall" if he ever bolsters up his courage (provided he has it) to the point where he is "confident" enough of the "correctness" of his views to divide space in the Leader with Bro. Harper in a written discussion of the "woman question," yes, or the "cup question" either. Like Judas of old, Moore, too, will have to go to his own place, which is among the digressives. Now, if there are any brethren in W. Va. or Ohio who really believe that Moore is able to defend his position on the above questions, please write me at once; for we want to prove that Moore is all "bluff" when it comes to debating these questions, with a real man instead of a man of straw. Now let the faithful friends of The Truth "stand firm" and lend a helping hand to those who are opposing and exposing the "deceitful workers." I know some who are trying to act "goody, goody," who try to take a neutral position on the controverted question. But listen, you "weak kneed" and "effeminate," the "neither-for-nor-against" attitude is "wrong," and you are doing "the work of Satan" by trying to make others "in the faith" believe that such a position is "right." Ira B. Kile.

"TO BREAK BREAD"—ACTS 20:7

This is a subject that is worth considering by every Christian that is seeking the truth, and if the Bible tells us how to break bread we should earnestly contend for that way, to the exclusion of all other ways. I should like to make a few observations on this for the consideration of the brethren.

If Christ did not eat of the bread (some claim he did not), I am willing to admit that he just broke it in two and gave to the disciples. If I can prove that Christ partook of the cup, I am sure every one will agree that he ate of the bread. All must admit that he was eating with the disciples at the time of the institution of the Communion, for it says, "As they were eating."

After he gave the bread of the Communion to the disciples, he said, "But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth ("From this time forward"—Webster) of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Matt. 26:29. This shows that he drank of the fruit of the vine after he gave them the Communion bread. Mark 14:25 reads about the same: "Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

Paul received from the Lord what he delivered on this, and he says, "The Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he break it, and said, This is my body which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup when he had supped (Notice, "when he had supped"), saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. II.

In the light of this, I am compelled to believe that Christ partook of the cup and the bread of the Communion.

But, says one, how could he partake in memory of his death? And I say, How could the disciples partake of it in memory of his death since he had not died? He was evidently instituting an ordinance, and giving the manner to observe it. How could he be baptized of John since John's baptism was "for the remission of sins," and he was without sin?

I know some read "is broken for you" instead of "is for you," but Christ's body was not broken into two pieces, nor any other number. The lamb, the Passover type—was not broken. Ex. 12:46; Num. 9:12. Of Christ it was prophesied "a bone of him shall not be broken." Ps. 34:20. And when they came to Jesus, they "break not his bones," says John. His side was pierced and nails were driven through his flesh. John 19:33-34.

Some say that the breaking consisted in the spirit leaving his body; but this is too fanciful to merit serious reply. One piece the spirit then, and one the body, I reckon. Is this the reason why they want to stop at just two pieces? There is nothing to it, I say. And if broken into two why not three? Yes, why not into individual pieces, as the sects do?

Paul says, "The bread which we break." 1 Cor. 10:16. Do we just break and lay it down or throw it away? No, we eat as we break. Christ broke. Did he not eat, too? We read, "When the disciples came together to break bread." Acts 20:7. Did they not eat also?

Some say they break the bread into two parts to show the Lord's death. But Paul says it is in the eating that we show his death," for as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he comes." 1 Cor. 11:26. The bread remains one, and "We are all partakers of that one bread," when properly, Scripturally, done. 1 Cor. 10:16. If the bread is broken other than in Communion, joint-participation, why?—Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.

THE COMMUNION

"The bread used was unleavened; for no other was found at the paschal feast. We should use the same (1 Cor. 10:16-22). It is a symbol of purity. He asks also for a single loaf to symbolize the unity of his spiritual body (1 Cor. 10:17). We should break but one. He used wine, "the fruit of the vine." We should employ no substitute. It must be wine, the juice of the grape, and not the manufactured article."—J. W. McGarvey, in "The Lord's Supper" by Brandt, p. 320.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL BREVITIES

We have recently been informed that J. N. Cowan has been in the State of Indiana causing disturbance over the cups question, and in his zeal in causing churches to go digressive and to stay digressive, he is now trying to get brethren to sign statements to the effect that I and others have communed with churches using two cups.

Let it be distinctly understood that I used to favor the use of more than one cup, opposing them only when their use caused trouble in the congregations; but since making my change, I do not commune where cups are used, be it "two or more" or "individual cups."

I have repented of having favored and practiced the use of cups, and other things that are wrong, and have made a full confession of such wrongs to the Christian community. And for Cowan to bring them up now is evidence of cowardice and inability to prove his cups to be of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

What of it if every one who now opposes the cups had communed where they were used? Would that make it right for Cowan to advocate them to the division of the church? Would that prove that the cups are of faith? Not by a long way.

There are other brethren whose influence Cowan is trying to destroy. Cowan is working a boom-crang, and will destroy himself with all right-thinking brethren.

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

"You (J. D. Phillips) preach that the Lord's cup must be distributed in one vessel, or container."—J. N. Cowan.

I preach no such thing, brother. I preach that "the Lord's cup" is the "vessel" or "container"—"POTERION, a cup, a drinking vessel"—(Thayer)—"a drinking-cup" (Berry)—"a drinking-cup, wine-cup" (Liddell and Scott)—"a drinking vessel, a cup" (Robinson)—"a drinking vessel" (Young)—and I have more sense than to preach that a cup "must be distributed in" a cup. You had as well talk about a gourd being "distributed in" a gourd as to talk about a "cup" being "distributed in" a "vessel or container." The cup is the "container." The thing you need to do is to learn the meaning of words.

"I believe the Lord's cup may be distributed in more than one vessel or container and am willing to so affirm."—J. N. Cowan.

All right. I am ready to deny. So write your proposition, sign it and send it to me; I will immediately sign it. And let us get the dates and places arranged. —J. D. Phillips.

When the Restoration Movement began and the effort was made to leave spiritual Babylon and get back to Jerusalem, not a single church would allow a mechanical instrument in the worship. A. Campbell would not preach where one was used. —James A. Allen in Gospel Advocate.

Neither did such churches have the Sunday School, the Cups, the Pastor, the Ladies' Bible Class, etc., my good brother. (See the Christian Baptist and the first few volumes of the Millennial Harbinger.)

But the Missionary Society and Sunday School came in, and they were soon followed by the organ and a disastrous division was the result. And there are brethren now who are following the digressives so closely that they are leading them a close chase on many innovations. Another division has been forced on the Body of Christ, caused by the Sunday School, and another by the cups. So it is time for us to begin again "to leave spiritual Babylon and get back to Jerusalem."

We need to restore the ancient order of things in religion, and this can be done if the preachers among us who respect the word of God will get busy and put the matter before the people and keep it there. So let us "be up an doing," and cease not to labor and pray for the peace and happiness of Zion, and God shall again make Jerusalem a praise in the earth.—J. D. P.

"Anything that progresses 'beyond that which is written' (1 Cor. 4:6) is too 'progressive' and leads to inevitable disaster and failure."—Editor James A. Allen in Gospel Advocate.

You are right, my dear brother. The digressives, left us, forming a faction to hasten the conversion of the "heathen," they said. But they made a miserable failure and disastrous end, and now they are recognized as a denomination among the "sister denominations" of our country. They are as truly in "Mystery Babylon" today as are the Methodists, Baptists, Catholics or any one else.

And the churches with which you fellowship, Bro. Allen, have become "to progressive" by "progressing 'beyond that which is written'" with their Pastor, their Cups, their Sunday School, their Ladies' Aid, their Ladies' Bible Class, their Christian Endeavor, etc. So they have gone into "Mystery Babylon" with the other digressives, and are as sure for "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" (2 Thess. 1:7-9) as the old digressives. Yes, "Bro. Bader, how about all of us standing together on the Book? We will meet you there." —James A. Allen, Editor of the Gospel Advocate

that advocates the Sunday School to Baden, who is with the organ party.

This is a good idea, brethren. Just all stand on the Book as we used to and be "standing together" for a "Thus saith the Lord" for our faith and practice. Let Bader lay aside the organ, Allen his Sunday School, the cups advocates, the cups, and let us "stand together on the Book," or let the one who advocates these things—all or any one of them—affirm in debate that a church can practice any one of them and "Speak where the Bible speaks." This will be fair to all, and show that you really want to "stand together on the Book." "Come now, and let us reason together." What do you say? "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—J. D. P.

A RETURN TO THE GOSPEL

"THE 'SIGNS OF THE TIMES,' The World's Prophetic Weekly, advocating a return to the simple gospel of Christ, and a preparation for his imminent appearing."—Signs of the Times (Adventist).

If it were a fact that the Signs of the Times is "advocating a return to the simple gospel of Christ"—"the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1:16)—"The Truth" would cease publication and join hands with them in their efforts, and we would "speak the same things and be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10), and we would be one even as the Father and the Son are one (John 17), and we could then realize the force of David's declaration,—"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!"—Psa. 133:1.

But "how can two walk together unless they be agreed?" asked a prophet of Israel. As a matter of truth, the Adventists are actually trying to bind upon us the Law that was "given by Moses" (John 1:17)—the Law that was "nailed to His cross" (Col. 2:14; Eph. 2:14-16). And Paul says if we seek justification by the Law we are fallen from grace. (Gal. 5). And that is why we are not with the Signs of the Times.

The "imminent appearing" of the Messiah has been the sugar-stock of Adventists ever since their beginning as a religious system. They are noted for their time-setting: Miller set the date—1844, for the second advent of Christ. And since that date, failed, they have set other dates—"1847, 1850, 1852, 1854, 1855, 1863, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1877, and so on till one is sick of counting. Learning nothing from the past, each time they are quite as confident as before."—Canright.

The Adventists rely upon Daniel's 2,300 year-day time limit (Dan. 8: 13, 14) as their evidence when they set a date. When one date fails, they hunt up another date in history from which to reckon the 2,300 years, and boldly declare that the second advent will be 2,300 years from that time, and they always choose the date that will jibe the

better with their prophetic schemes. A little study would have shown them that the 2,300 years did not reach to the second advent, for there is no hint at such a thing in the 8th Chapter of Daniel. And Alexander Campbell took up and reviewed in his paper, The Millennial Harbinger, Mr. Miller's articles on this matter. He showed that the 2,300 days (years) should be reckoned from the time the Medo-Persian kingdom was overthrown by the Greek or Macedonian kingdom, about the year 34 or 31 B. C., and hence it reaches even beyond the present hour.

When the 2,300 years of Dan. 8:13, 14 expire, the church will then be completely restored, for "Unto 2,300 days (years. See Ezek. 4:6); then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (Dan. 8:13). "The Sanstuary" is the church, and hence, it will be cleansed of its Catholic, Protestant and Mohammedan traditions, at the end of the 2,300 years.

The Adventists were wrong in their time-setting at the beginning of their history; they are wrong now; and we may expect them to continue in the wrong as long as they set dates. And their trying to bind the Law of Moses upon people of the Christian dispensation, is a worse error than their time-setting. Beware of the leaven of their teaching.—J. D. Phillips.

J. C. ROADY ANSWERS HIS OWN QUESTION

In a July, 1928, issue of the Apostolic Review, J. C. Roady, in replying to some things I said in the June, 1928, issue of The Truth, says, "James, who told you that the Review taught sect baptism?"

Well, I know of no better way of answering Bro. Roady's question than to give the following paragraph from the pen of J. C. Roady in the Nov. 22, 1921, issue of the Review. Here it is:

"Our meeting resulted in 10 making the confession and were baptized, and four came from the Baptists."

This is the answer to your question, Bro. Roady—you have answered it. So why ask me to answer it?

The only Scriptural baptism takes place after the candidate has confessed his faith in the Son of God (Mark 16:15, 16; Acts 8:36-38) and is for (Greek eis, "with a view to") the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). This is Scriptural baptism.

And since heresy is a tenet contrary to the teachings of the New Testament, anything differing from the teaching of the New Testament on baptism is sect baptism.

And since Baptists do not confess that Jesus Christ is the Son of God before their baptism and since they are baptized because of the remission of sins—the very opposite of what the N. T. teaches—their baptism is sect baptism. And hence the Review teaches sect baptism pure and simple.

And since Roady teaches that such baptism is Scriptural, in order to get them to take membership with the churches of Christ, he is teaching heresy—yes, rank heresy.

—Jas. D. Phillips.

"KNOWING THE TRUTH" IN DEC. 1 ISSUE
REVIEWED

Yes, Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Question: What is the truth on any given question? It is all that inspiration has to say on the subject.

Bro. Musgrave makes the following statement, which is timely and well founded: "If we want the truth, this will settle the question for us, but if we won't have what they say, we will very likely take what someone else says." I suppose he means by "they" the apostles and Christ.

We have some today who say that John's baptism is all right. Now, what will my good brother say to such a one? He tells him to read on: you have stopped too soon. You must learn to make proper divisions of the Word. You are right, my brother. Now, suppose you try this on your "cup" argument.

Matt. 26:27: "He took the cup and gave thanks." Question: Does the New Testament tell anywhere what the "cup" is? If it does not, he may be reasonably safe in his conclusion. We hear Christ in Matt. 26:28 say, "This is my blood of the New Testament." Also: Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25. This is the truth, or it is a falsehood. Christ is not the one who lied. Four times inspiration has said "this cup is an emblem of blood" and we all know that is the drink element of the Lord's supper, Musgrave and others to the contrary.

It is possible that Bro. Musgrave is wrong on this question since he and Christ do not agree.

Syllogism of Christ: 1. This cup is my blood of the New Testament; 2. The cup is the fruit of the vine. Conclusion: The fruit of the vine is the blood of Christ.

Syllogism of Musgrave: 1. This cup is my blood of the New Testament; 2. The cup is the container and its contents. Conclusion: The container and contents are the blood of Christ.

Which of the above do you accept? Bro. Musgrave will teach proper division of the Word on all other questions. Why not on this one?

Yours for the truth, T. H. Wiggs, Jr., Holdenville, Okla.

Remarks

If Brother Wiggs is using the cups because he thinks he can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and do so, he is to be commended for his effort to defend the practice.

When the spirit of digression once fully takes hold of the people, they will have what they want, no matter what the Bible says; and if it is for this reason that we were anxious to have the "cups question" discussed as early as possible before the spirit of digression set in strong enough to bias the judgment of the people. And the delay has already proven to be disastrous to the cause in some places. The cups advocates have been frantic with their "HUSH! HUSH!!" policy, as were the organ advocates and the S. S. advo-

cates on these issues when they came up. It will do us no good to have our own way now and then come to the judgment on the wrong side. "To-day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Heb. 3:8.

Now let us see about the brother's "review."

Does the N. T. tell what the "cup" is? Yes, and as plainly as it tells what baptism is. Inspiration says baptisma, and baptisma is immersion, a dipping; and inspiration says poterion, and poterion is a cup, a drinking vessel.

Yes, Christ says in Matt. 26:28, "This is my blood of the N. T." And he says the same thing in Mark 14:24; but in Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25, he says, "This cup is the N. T. in my blood." And he nowhere says, "this cup is an emblem of blood." This cup is the New Testament, is what inspiration says; and the N. T. is not "blood," nor is it an "emblem of blood." And we all know that, not the "cup," but what was in the cup, "the fruit of the vine," is the "drink element" of the communion.

You say in your second syllogism, "The cup is the fruit of the vine." But this is false. (See first syllogism in the reply of Phillips to Johnson in our issue of Dec. 15, 1929). "We drink the cup." Yes; but how can one drink the cup since it is a solid and to drink means to swallow a liquid? Let N. L. Clark answer. He says, "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark-Harper debate, 3d Aff.) This is true, hence "cup" in "drink this cup," or "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 10:21; 11:27) is used metonymically, and he does not drink the "cup" in fact, but he drinks what it contains. And this is all that is meant by such an expression; hence in this kind of metonymy, namely, "the container and the thing contained," both the cup and its contents are involved.

In the minor premise of the syllogism you assign to Bro. Musgrave, you say (Musgrave did not say it), "The cup is the container and its contents." This is not true. It is to say, The cup is the cup and its contents. In the communion as given by inspiration the container is the cup, and its contents is "the fruit of the vine." And both are involved when cup is used metonymically, as in "drink the cup of the Lord." 1 Cor. 10:21; 11:27. For "Metonymy is a figure of speech (a figure of rhetoric—Ed.) in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220.

And we accept neither of your syllogisms. Now you try your hand on the second one given by Bro. Phillips in the issue of Dec. 1, or get some other man to do it. Here it is:

I. "The cup of the Lord," as used with the communion, is a metonymy.

II. It takes the cup and its contents to constitute this kind of metonymy.

III. Therefore, it takes the cup and its contents to constitute "the cup of the Lord," as used in the communion.—Ed.

THE

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA

QUERY

Please explain through "The Truth" the Bible teaching in regard to Melchizedek; also tell what the blood of the New Covenant is.—W.

He was king of Salem, which evidently was what was afterwards called Jerusalem, as is easily inferred from Psalm 76:2, being king and priest of God at the same time. We find him mentioned in Gen. 14:18-20 in connection with Abraham. In Psalms-110 he is mentioned as a priest (v. 4) whose "order" was to be continued by the "Lord" (v. 1), that is, by Christ, the "Son." And in dis-

J. D. Phillips, 136 S. 4th St., Montebello, Calif., Nov. 21: I closed a week's meeting at Somerton, Ariz., last Lord's Day with four baptisms, all heads of families, and two were influential members of the Baptist church in Somerton. They said they stayed up about all night the night before they confessed the Lord trying to justify themselves in Babylon, but such Scriptures as Mark 16:16; Matt. 28:19; John 3:5; Acts 2:38; Matt. 10:32, etc., were in their way; so they obeyed the gospel, and thus came out of Babylon. The Somerton church is an active one, and is as loyal as any I know. I shall return soon to hold them another meeting and to do some mission work in the surrounding communities.

We have the promise of the manuscript of the Smith-Trott debate on the cups, and those who want it should subscribe immediately. This is Hewitt Smith, of Brookhaven, Miss., indorsed by Clark, Cowan, and Johnson, meeting Dr. G. A. Trott, of Munday, Texas. Tell everybody about this.—Ed.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Nov. 22, 1929.—I closed a good meeting near Montreal, Mo., Nov. 17. The meeting continued for a period of two weeks with the very best of attendance and attention. Much interest was manifested throughout the two weeks, and the results were gratifying, considering the weather and the condition of the church. Eleven confessed their faith in Christ and one was restored. Several expressed themselves as being convinced that the innovations of men, that have been introduced into the simple worship of the New Testament, are wrong.

This congregation (known as Freedom), is, perhaps, one of the oldest in the state, having been established some seventy-five or more years ago. There are, at present, between seventy-five and a hundred who claim membership there, but on the account of no one having been trained to take the

lead, the congregation has almost died. However, there are hopes of a speedy resurrection. There are some mighty fine people in that congregation, I think. I expect to make another effort there next year. Let us keep the good work going, brethren.

WORDING OF A PROPOSITION

Proposition No. 1—

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 of the blood and body of Christ.

Proposition No. 2—

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 Lord's Supper.

I will affirm the first proposition if anyone will deny it. I will deny the last one if anybody will affirm it.

Let us get all the light on this question that can be had while it is up for discussion. The ancient order needs restoring as it has been lost for ages. Let us bring it back in name, form and design. Then and not until then, will we have peace and growth with the Christ life in the assembly.

Yours for truth and light,
Jas. T. White,
Lometa, Texas.

Remarks

We suppose Bro. White objects to the term "the Lord's Supper" for "the communion of the body and blood of Christ." But if the affirmant should define the term "the Lord's supper" as "the communion of the blood and body of Christ," Bro. White would be at his "row's end," for the affirmant is allowed to define the terms of his proposition. And since the proposition does not state the point at issue, we suggest that Brother White write another, or better still, it seems to us, write an article or two, and give us "the ancient order." We have stood for "Bible things by Bible names," in the restoration; and this is evidently right; so turn on the light, Brother White.—Ed.

GET THESE TRACTS, BRETHERN

Santa Paula, Cal.,
Dec. 10, 1929.

Dear Bro. Harper:

I enjoyed your recent issue on the cup question very much; I think that you did fine in handling the question.

The Pastor question is a very live issue down here. I hope to be able to write something on this question before long and will send it into you and you can publish it in the Truth if you think it worth while.

I received a very good response from your notice of my Tract "Building according to the Pattern" in your paper. I still have 100 or more that I would like to have out where some one would read them. I will still furnish these at three cents

apiece to cover postage to any one applying for them. This is a 95 page tract and beside handling the cup question quite fully it also handles other questions such as Church organization, Mutual Edification, Evangelization, Christian Priesthood and many other practice questions.

Yours Fraternally,
T. C. Hawley, Santa Paula, Calif.

"ON CONSIDERATIONS"

Dear Bro. Rowe:

I hope you will publish one more letter at once as I have been sick with the flu and bronchitis, and have not had an opportunity to answer Bro. Hutson in the paper of Oct. 29, and I am satisfied he is anxiously waiting my reply.

1. Bro. H. can not write in a Christian spirit, it seems, and join with those of us who want and will have nothing but the plain statement of the Bible and the practice of the early church on these questions. Why not? He misrepresents me, and I believe he did it knowingly, on the first question, "The Modern Pastor System," so I will ask Bro. H. in as plain words as I can command, "Do you endorse as Scriptural the modern practice of congregations "calling" a preacher, having him stay with them indefinitely, and manage the affairs of the church?"

2. He evades the question of appointing elders also. Did your "egotism" lead you to appoint those elders according to the teaching of the Spirit as recorded in Acts 14:25, or did you do it in your own new way? Now, brother, come out like a little man, and tell us just how you did it, and don't forget "chapter and verse." Remember, God is looking at, and listening to, you. No "strange fire," please.

3. As to the "cup," Bro. H. says they were using from two to six cups to distribute "the cup" in "the communion" long before he came into the church. No doubt, and they were using the organ in the worship before he came into the church, no doubt, but does that make it right? You find the authority for the one in the very next verse after the other; so now, brother, let me appeal to you. I am not writing this for the sake of argument, but in the name of Christ, who shall call both of us into his presence on these articles. Lay off all camouflage and evasion, and in the spirit of Christ, give us the teaching of the Holy Spirit or the practice of the early church for your practice.

We pray for our enemies, for those who "persecute us for righteousness' sake." May a loving Father help us to be satisfied with His way. Yours for the truth, E. A. Lowery, Rt. 5, Dayton, Tenn.

TRUTH FUND

Chas. T. Cook	\$30.00
S. A. Griffith	1.00
W. M. Hunter	1.00
T. B. Daniel	\$2.00
Job Musgrave	1.00

tes on these issues when they came up. It will do us no good to have our own way now and then come to the judgment on the wrong side. "To-day you will hear his voice, harden not your ears." Heb. 3:8.

Now let us see about the brother's "review."

Does the N. T. tell what the "cup" is? Yes, and so plainly as it tells what baptism is. Inspiration says baptisma, and baptisma is immersion, a dipping; and inspiration says poterion, and poterion is a cup, a drinking vessel.

Yes, Christ says in Matt. 26:28, "This is my blood of the N. T." And he says the same thing in Mark 14:24; but in Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25, he says, "This cup is the N. T. in my blood." And he nowhere says, "this cup is an emblem of blood." This cup is the New Testament, is what inspiration says; and the N. T. is not "blood," nor is it an emblem of blood." And we all know that, not the "cup," but what was in the cup, "the fruit of the vine," is the "drink element" of the communion.

Bro. White, in your second syllogism, "The cup is, especially his own household, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever."

Bro. Jas. T. White has made a good suggestion when he insisted upon us preachers getting out into the "out-of-the-way places" where there has been little or no preaching by gospel preachers, and thus give the great common people a chance to hear the good news of the Savior's undying love and mercy. He died for all, then were all dead, and need the life which he alone can give, eternal life.

Bro. White went to such a place and preached two or three Sundays and had large crowds and good results. And the writer wants to urge other preachers to do as Bro. White has done, and keep this up a few years and see how the truth will take hold of the hearts and lives of honest-hearted people. There are thousands who want the truth, people that are thirsting for the old Jerusalem Gospel preached by the Apostles of Jesus, and which is being preached to-day by a few faithful preachers.—W. T. Taylor, Rt. 1, De Leon, Texas.

H. C. Williams, Charleston, W. Va.—I have heard both Thad Hutson and Ita Moore, big guns of the Christian Leader, in their effort to prove the class system and women teachers and the cups, and since hearing both, I am ready to meet either of them in debate on these unscriptural doctrines, for which they can not produce any Bible proof. Don't you let up on these false doctrines and practices of the churches of Christ, Brother Harper: We must warn the people and declare the whole counsel of God. These leaders are positively ignorant, or they are bad at heart; and it seems to be the latter, for they persistently refuse to debate these doctrines and practices just as the organ digressives did. The Aimwell congregation is doing well now. I hope to do lots of preaching the coming year. Enclosed find subscriptions.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JANUARY 15, 1930

No. 2

QUERY

Please explain through "The Truth" the Bible teaching in regard to Melchizedek; also tell what the blood of the New Covenant is.—W.

He was king of Salem, which evidently was what was afterwards called Jerusalem, as is easily inferred from Psalm 76:2, being king and priest of God at the same time. We find him mentioned in Gen. 14:18-20 in connection with Abraham. In Psalms 110 he is mentioned as a priest (v. 4) whose "order" was to be continued by the "Lord" (v. 1), that is, by Christ, the "Son." And in discussing the priesthood of Christ in connection with his office as King (Heb. 2:9, "crowned"), the writer of Hebrews has occasion to mention Christ's prototype, Melchizedek, in ch. 5:6; 6:20; 7:1-28, and continuing the subject of the kingship and priesthood of Christ in ch. 8.

Various conjectures have been indulged in as to identifying him with some person otherwise mentioned, as Shem, son of Noah; Christ; an angel; Enoch; and some even conjecturing the Holy Spirit. He was Melchizedek, and this is all we know, having a priesthood whose "order" was continued by Christ, who was to be "a priest upon his throne" (Zech. 6:13), being made "both Lord and Christ," God having raised him up to set upon the throne of David, as announced on the first Pentecost after his resurrection. (Acts 2), to "reign" until all enemies are put beneath his feet (1 Cor. 15:25), and then he will "deliver up the kingdom" to God (1 Cor. 15:24), the last enemy, death, being conquered. And since "if he were on earth, he should not be a priest" (Heb. 8:4), there can be no salvation (if he should come to earth to reign, as some say he will) after he should thus come, for there would be no High Priest over the house of God.

The blood of the New Covenant is the blood shed by Christ. Heb. 9:12; 23, 28.

FAIRNESS

I am enclosing you a little help to keep The Truth paper going. I may not agree with everything it advocates, but I do admire the fairness and willingness it holds out to the people to reason upon all vital questions pertaining to our soul's welfare.

I must confess that the logical arguments put forth in its columns have weakened my confidence in the use of two cups or more in the Communion service. But I need more light.

1. The Scriptures teach us that to present our bodies a living sacrifice wholly unto God is but

"our reasonable service." Rom. 12:1, And for the life of me, I can not see or believe it reasonable to hold seventy-five or one hundred members in attention till one person with one cup passes the wine to each member. It seems to me it would be out of reason, as much as to have one person discourse for one or two hours every time the church comes together; the quietness required would cause a strain so great upon the congregation, all would say unreasonable, therefore unscriptural, or out of reason. This fact alone keeps me from believing our Savior meant all must drink from the same cup in order to be valid service.

2. The wine is all we drink; and the only way given by inspiration that I have found, to drink the wine "unworthily" is to fail to drink "discerning the Lord's body."

3. No one drinks out of but one cup, no matter how many; and that cup is sanctified by the fruit of the vine.

4. The Apostle Paul, at Corinth, rebuked the brethren for their making a meal of the service, where they necessarily had more than one cup, in taking "before other his own supper," but no rebuke only for changing to a meal, thereby "not discerning the Lord's body."

Brotherly, A. J. Bond.

Remarks

1. "Our reasonable service" is to do what God directs to be done. The king of Israel once reasoned about as you do, saying, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem." 1 Kg. 12:28. But that did not make it right not to go. Your "convenience" or mine; or what you say is "reasonable" or what I may say is such, cuts no figure with what God says to do or not to do. This plea has been worn threadbare by those disobedient to what God says. It is more convenient for one to drink the wine. But does this justify such a practice? Ask the Catholics. It is more convenient, and not such a nervous strain, to sprinkle for baptism, and this has kept many "from believing our Savior meant that all must "be immersed; so you have lots of company in your opinion. If the assembly is too large to do what God requires, why not reduce it by having another meeting place, as was done in the primitive time?"

2. Can not one drink, "discerning the Lord's body," as well as one hundred? Yes. Then why not let one drink it all, as the Catholics do, if "not discerning the Lord's body" is the "only way" to drink "unworthily?" And why not have the individual cups since each can discern the Lord's body in drinking, if not to discern the Lord's body is the "only way" to drink "unworthily?" There

is no communion of the whole assembly without the use of the "common cup," if words mean anything.

2. Each drinks out of a separate cup. Yes, and by this practice "they" drink out of them. But the Bible says, "They all drank out of it." Mk. 14:23. ". . . drink out of the cup." 1 Cor. 11:28. But you have it: Drink out of the cups. You do not speak as the Bible speaks, brother.

4. Your conjecture about their having cups, you could not verify if your life depended on it; but one thing is certain: It was "his own supper," whatever he had. By the Lord's appointment it was: "The cup of blessing." 1 Cor. 10:16. "And they all drank out of it." Mk. 14:23.

And last; but by no means least, there is the obligation to endeavor to keep the Unity, as Paul says (Eph. 4:4), and as Christ prayed (Jn. 17).

The Savior's example in instituting the ordinance is admitted to be the use of one cup; and Paul received his account from the Lord, and throughout it is "cup," and not cups. And as in baptism and all other things, there is a ground of unity, and it is the use of one cup. If you do not drink so, just give the ground of unity. And this is no light matter, for one walks worthy of his vocation unless he endeavors to "keep the unity of the Spirit."—Ed.

A CRITICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT OF THE BIBLE

From The Apostolic Review of Dec. 17, 1929, We Have The Following:

Years ago I was in Winchester, Tenn., engaged in a meeting. One rainy night, when only thirty or forty persons were present, I ventured to preach on "The Right Divisions of the New Testament," as indicated by the commissions of our Savior and as set forth in Matthew tenth chapter, Matthew twenty-eighth, and Mark sixteenth and Luke twenty-third, also in Second Timothy fourth chapter. After the meeting was ended and I was walking with Doctor Grisard and several others toward the doctor's drug store, he stopped, and, pointing to the meeting house we had left, he made a speech in about these words: "We have had David Lipscomb, Doctor Brents, J. A. Harding, all the Sewells and old Bro. Floyd in that house, but not one of them informed us that we are not under the world-wide commission of our Savior, but that we are under Paul's commission to Timothy." Then I began to understand that the leaders in the Southland are not critical and comprehensive students of the Bible. Thus far I have not seen in the writings of any one of them that he understood the right divisions of the Bible, the divorce question, the Spirit question, the tithing question, the missionary question, the stewardship question, nor the question of civil governments, nor the question of honor in dispute.

I have thought that I should soon begin a review of the literature of the disciple brotherhood,

though I almost hesitate to undertake such a task because I am convinced that the Gospel age will soon be ended, and I don't suppose that any of my writings will be in demand in the Millennial age. The converted Jews will then be supreme as teachers among mankind, and their headquarters will be in "the beloved city." (Rev. 20:9). Yet I think that some one should try to show that the advocates and defenders of religiosecular colleges are not the best advocates and defenders of the Bible. Daniel Sommer.

Remarks

Now if this Critical and Comprehensive Student of the Bible will condescend to give us a little information, we beg to sit at his feet and learn of him if he can get the consent of his mind to cross the Mason and Dixon line, for as the Darkey said, "He su do think lots ob his self."

Let us see: "The Gospel Age," "the Millennial Age," "the Converted Jews," "headquarters in the beloved City," "the world-wide Commission," "Paul's Commission to Timothy," "the Spirit question," "tithing question," "Missionary question," "divorce question," "civil government question," "stewardship question."

"Gospel age will soon be ended." What do you mean by "Gospel age"? Is it the time when conversion to God is possible? "Soon"—In a little time; shortly; before long—Webster. Is the period of 1000 years soon?

Is your guess any nearer the truth than was Bro. Milligan's? He said: "If, then, to A. D. 632 we add, according to the year-day theory, 1260, 1290, and 1335 years, we have given 1892, 1922, and 1976 as three important epochs in the future of the Israelites. And hence it is probable that the first refers to the time of their return to Palestine, the second to their conversion to Christ, and the third to the conversion of the world through their agency." Scheme of Redemption, p. 533.

What are the facts today? Let us take a look at them:

"How many Jews are there in the world? There are about 13,000,000 Jews in the entire world. More than 4,000,000 live in Russia, and 2,000,000 in Poland. New York with its 1,750,000 Jews has the largest Jewish population of any city in the world. The Jewish population of the entire United States is nearly 4,000,000. There are only about 160,000 Jews in Palestine."—The Question Box in The Pathfinder of Dec. 21, 1929.

We should like to have the Critical Bible Student to prove that the Jews will—either "soon" or late—ever nationalize in Palestine "with their headquarters in 'the beloved city.'" We shall be glad to publish his proof of this, or that the Jews, as a nation, will ever be converted.

If "The converted Jews will then be supreme as teachers among mankind," will they be under the "world-wide commission," under the "commission to Timothy," or under one yet to be given? A little light, please.

If your so-called "commission to Timothy" was not "world-wide," what were its limits?—Ed.

DIVISION

Division is a dividing or separating of parts or things, and is an Old Testament doctrine, as well as New Testament teaching. God said to Moses, "And I will put a division between my people and thy people, by tomorrow shall this sign be." Exod. 8:23. Thus we see that division was taught and practiced under the Old Testament or law. Christ, looking forward to His doctrine, gives the following, "Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, nay, but rather division." Lk. 12:51. Mt. 10:34. This teaching is confirmed in Acts 20:29:30. "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock, and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." In the fact of this teaching, some have declared that this world will finally be a place of purity, unity, peace, and happiness. God nor Christ does not so teach. We read, "Man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward. Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble." Job. 5:7. 14:1. Jesus was born of a woman. Gal. 4:4 Lk. 2:7. And being born of a woman, therefore he was of "few days and full of trouble" on this earth. "He was despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, and as one from whom men hide their face; he was despised, and we esteemed him not." Isa. 53:3. "I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother's house." Ps. 69:8. This world not being full of purity, unity, peace, and happiness, while such a perfect and sinless person as Christ lived here, should we sinful mortals now, or ever, expect it to be such a place? But back to the point. Division is both commanded and forbidden by the scriptures as the following shows, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned, and turn away from them." Ro. 16:17. We learn from the above if divisions is caused contrary to the doctrine of Christ it is wrong or forbidden, but if believing, teaching, and obeying the doctrine of our Lord, causes divisions (which it will) then it is right. We are told, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If anyone cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting, for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works." 2 Jno. 1:9-11. From the foregoing it is evidenced that division is right, if caused by the word of God, but wrong if not according to the word. God did not predestinate that there should be division, but He and His Son could and did foresee that some people would disobey their commandments and thus cause division. Jesus gives the above teaching in Mt. 10:34. "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth, I came not to send peace, but a sword." A sword is a sign of division and when used will separate or divide things. Verses 35:36 informs us this

division will be visible. "That the son will be against his father, the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." This prediction is being fulfilled every day, and will continue to be until the end. The most of families are divided religiously and otherwise. The most of the congregations are divided. Hence, "A man's foes shall be they of his own household." There may be five in a family or house, "Three against two and two against three, etc." See Lk. 12:52:53. This might safely be said of congregations, at least division exists in just about all of them. "So then let us follow after the things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another." Ro. 14:19. It is God's will "that there be no divisions among His people." 1 Cor. 1:10. It is also His will that there be divisions. Paul speaks of some "holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof, from these also turn away." 2 Tim. 3:5. 1 Tim. 1:20. Notice 2 Cor. 6:17. Rev. 18:4. Many other scriptures might be cited but these will suffice. When "hearing and doing the will of God" causes divisions the sooner it comes the better it will be for the cause of our Redeemer. Much more could be said along this line but enough now.

—Joseph Miller, 1004 N. Lambert St., Brazil, Ind.

THE TRUTH FUND

R. H. Peel	\$1.00
J. S. Bedingfield	1.00
L. I. Ooley	1.50
S. A. Griffith	1.00
John T. Chambers	9.00
Herschel Massie	1.00
Isaac Smith	1.00
Anny Bell	1.00
A. J. Bond	5.00
G. W. McCain	.50
J. Y. Morgan, et al	4.00
R. A. Fiscus	\$1.00

Otis F. Young, Bloomington, Ind.—I closed a ten days' meeting at Spencer, Indiana, Dec. 1. Zero weather prevailed and there was snow, yet the crowds grew larger and the interest increased, the greatest interest being manifested the last night. They invited me to return again the fourth Lord's day in January, 1930. While there were no additions, we feel that much good was accomplished. I am getting better known among the people and I expect to extend my efforts farther and farther into the field of gospel labor with a desire for a return to primitive Christianity, a "Thus saith the Lord" in all things. This will please the Lord, our King.

Find enclosed \$2.00, one for renewal of my subscription and one for The Truth Fund. It is the soundest paper in the brotherhood. A. A. Patterson.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

COME OUT OF BABYLON

"Come out of her, my people, that you have no fellowship with her in her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues."—Rev. 18:4.

We are publishing the following article from the pen of Bro. Campbell because it contains valuable information that we all need to know; and because it sets forth the purpose of "The Restoration Message," that is, it outlines, to a great extent, the teaching we wish to do thru the paper. Many innovations have been introduced since Campbell's day, which are not mentioned in this article. Of course, we shall have to fight them, in order to "speak as the oracles of God."

I find the saints are yet in Babylon. Many, very many are conscious of it, and are desirous of coming out of her that they may not partake of her plagues. But they are beset with difficulties. They have lost not the copies of the law of their King, as did their types, the Jews, in the literal Babylon; but they have lost the sense, or rather have been preached out of the sense of the law, and many are even preached out of their common sense. They are sensible of this. But this is not all. There are too many Sanballats and Tobiahs, and too few Nehemiahs and Ezras. The captives, too, are so much attached to the chains that bind them and so much wedded to the manners of the Babylonians, their captivators, that they are, in many instances, unwilling to hazard the dangers and to encounter the reproaches incident to an attempt to return to Jerusalem. I labor incessantly to convince and to persuade the people who fear God, both out of the law, prophets, psalms, and apostolic writings, that such are their character and circumstances, and to induce them to return. It happens in this case as it did when the gospel was first promulged—some believe the things that are spoken, and some believe them not. The number of believers is, indeed, very considerable. But when they think of repairing the breaches, and rebuilding the temple, some Sanballat says, "Will they revive the stones out of the heaps of the rubbish which are burned?" And, to scandalize them, some Tobiah adds his scoff, saying, "Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall". However, many of the people "have a mind to work," and the wall will be reared. Out of Baby-

lon they will—they must come; for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it. And should we never see the day, we will die in the full assurance of faith that the saints will separate themselves from the strangers, and renounce allegiance to their spoilers and captivators. Many of those friendly to a return, are attempting to persuade their communities to arise in the mass and to march in one phalanx, and flatter themselves that they may succeed. However much we do desire such an event, we cannot reasonably expect it; for such an event never happened. No community, either political or religious, ever was reformed in the mass. No people ever, all at once, returned from any apostasy. Even when God's typical people were brought back out of Babylon, of the whole nation, but forty two thousand three hundred and sixty at first returned.

I have been often interrogated on the subject of a model or a precedent for the restoration of the ancient order of things. Some seem to think that the New Testament ought to furnish an example of the sort, or some directions for the accomplishment of an object so important. It does, indeed, in some sense, though not in the way which some desire. It teaches us how Jews and Pagans were converted to the faith, and how both people were consociated into one community. It teaches us upon what principles they became one, and for what ends and uses they maintained the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. It exhibits to us what they did in their congregations; but it does not; because it could not, afford a model of a people returning from a long and grievous apostasy. The Christian communities had not then apostatized, and consequently no example of a return could be afforded. Until Rome was built there were not great roads leading thither, nor groups of people returning thence. For this reason the New Testament could not afford a model such as we want. But it fortells this apostasy; its rise, progress, and termination: it exhibits the thing in emblems, and in sacred symbols teaches us how to come out of **THE MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT**. It imperiously commands a return to Jerusalem; and, in general principles, ordains the way. If, then, we only remember whence we are fallen, we may reform. We may return to the Lord. But it does more than all this. It not only minutely describes the apostasy, and characterizes the **Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition**; but it leads us, in the way of symbols, to understand where we are, and how to return. It tells us plainly that we may find, in the history of the Jews, our own history, and a remedy for all our grievances. To illustrate this point, I cannot do better than to present you the outlines of an oration delivered on this subject. It was the first time that I based a public speech on the writings of Nehemiah; and I must (as they say, John Bunyan was wont to do) write down the discourse after it was pronounced, or give the items and outlines of an extemporaneous address:-

The outlines of an Oration, based upon the 4th and 6th chapters of Nehemiah, the 2nd

chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, and the 17th and 18th chapters of the Revelation.

After reading the above portions of the sacred writings, a few general remarks were made on the character of the inspired books, and particularly on the peculiar method which God had adopted in communicating instruction to men. The utility of the adoption of types or emblems, in communicating instruction, was next exhibited. The natural world, considered as a volume of natural types; and the sacred history of the Jewish people a volume of spiritual types. After these introductory observations, the Jewish scriptures were examined on the subject of types. From this examination it was found,

1st. That there were persons and things originally designed as types; and also that persons and things not originally designed as types, were in the New Testament, by the inspired commentators on the Old Testament, adopted as types, and used as such for the illustration of the Christian doctrine. Of the former sort were the priests under the law, the altars, sacrifices, tabernacle, its vessels, the temple, etc. Of the latter kind were Adam, the deluge, Sarai, Isaac, Hagar, Ishmael, Etc.

2nd. By connecting the two Testaments, or the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, it was found that certain persons, in certain respects, were types of Jesus Christ; that his being called the second Adam, a priest after the order of Melchisedec, a Mediator such as Moses, Etc., were proofs and illustrations that he was considered the anti-type of many types. But this was not all. On the authority of the infallible commentator, Paul, it appeared that there were not only types of Christ in the Jewish scriptures, but that there were types of the christian people, their worship, and circumstances: and indeed that the history of the church was all found in type in the history of the Jews. In illustration and confirmation of this, the following particulars were noticed:

1. That all the same names which are in the Christian scriptures appropriated to the christian assembly or church, were first appropriated to the Jewish people in the mass. Such were the terms called, **elected, redeemed, bought, purchased, ransomed, chosen, a peculiar people, a holy nation, a kingdom of priests, my people, my beloved, my children, spouse, bride, saved Etc.**

2. That all the christian ordinances and worship were typified; such as the Lord's day, by the morrow after the Sabbath, when the first ripe sheaf was waved, christian immersion, by their being immersed once into Moses in the cloud and in the sea; their frequently eating the manna and drinking the water from the rock, an ensample or type of our participation of the emblems in the Lord's supper; their sprinkled altar, a type of our sprinkled consciences; their lautron, (Greek) or laver or bath for cleansing the priests, a type of our bath of regeneration; their first tabernacle, or holy place, a type of the christian church; their common priests, a type of christians: and their high priest a type of Jesus; their thank offerings,

of our praises; and their sin offerings, of the sacrifice of our great High Priest. Incidents in their history were also shown to be types of incidents in our history. Such as their being called out of Egypt; their receiving of a law afterwards; their journey through the wilderness; their river Jordan; their promise of a rest in Canaan: their entrance into it; their city Jerusalem; their Mount Zion; their captivity in Babylon, and their deliverance thence. Other incidents were taken notice of; such as the rebellion of some of them; their falling in the wilderness; their chastisements; their reformations; the special government under which they lived; the rewards and punishments. The authority of the christian apostles was adduced in support of these facts; such as Paul's comments in the 10th of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians; his letter to the Hebrews everywhere.

These remarks and illustrations were merely introductory to the portions of scripture read. We then proceeded to demonstrate the fact that the captivity of Israel was in all its prominent features a type of the present state of the christian world. This was proved,

1st. From the fact that Paul declares twice in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians that these things (which happened to them) were **tupoi**, types to us. Chap x. 6. "Now these things have become types or examples to us." And verse 11. "Now all these things happened to them as, **tupoi**, types or examples, and are written for our admonition upon whom the end of the ages are come."

2nd. From the fact that John in the Revelation transfers the very name of the People, or city of captivity of the Jews—I say, he transfers that name to the city of our captivity and to the state in which we are, and calls our spoilers and captivators, "Babylon the Great." There is a spiritual Sodom, Egypt, and Babylon. See Revelations, chapters XI. and XVII.

3d. From an analysis of the 2d chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians. This led to an exposition of the more prominent features of the countenance of the **Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition**. That he was not a political, but a politico-ecclesiastical personage, was shown from his sitting not on a civil tribunal, but in the temple of God, and from the term **MYSTERY** in capitals upon his forehead. That his impious assumption of the character of God, consisted essentially in his claiming dominion over the faith or consciences of men, and a homage from men due to God alone.

In speaking of the Woman of Sin, viz. the **Mother of Harlots**, as well as of the **Man of Sin**, we did not confine neither him nor her to the walls or Papal Rome; but very briefly it was remarked, that although "the Mother of Harlots" might live in the great city, yet her daughters had married and left her; in plain English, that every council ecclesiastical which assumed the right of dominion over the faith and conscience, and claimed titles of homage, such as Reverend, Etc., or any attribute of power or honor which belonged to God

alone, was a legitimate descendant, daughter, or grand daughter of the woman on whose forehead was written "Mystery Babylon, the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of the Earth," cautiously avoiding offence, as some of her progeny were present. I went on to demonstrate from our own experience and observation, independent of the sacred testimonies, that we were now in Babylon. Waving all advantages which might have been derived from the "time, and times, and the dividing of time;" the three years and a half, the "forty-two months," the "1260 days," the accordant emblems of 1260 years; their commencement and termination—waving a hundred minor evidences likewise of the fact, the attention of the audience was confined to three obvious proofs, viz.

1st. The confusion of religious speech now existing is analogous to the confusion of speech at Babel, and the confounding or mixing the language of Canaan with the language of Ashdod during the captivity; our creeds, systems, sermons, and scholastic terms, mingled with some biblical terms, terminating in an almost general ignorance of the sacred writings, and an impossibility of understanding the holy oracles, were just noticed illustrative of the exact analogy between us and the Jews while in Babylon.

2nd. The almost total deprivation of the consolations of the christian religion, apparent in our private capacities and in our public meetings, in our individual experience, and in our social interviews; the melancholy and gloom; the prayers and feelings of the religious, expressed in the 137th psalm; in short, all the grand characteristics of our state, as respects the enjoyments of the religion we profess in its public institutions, and in its personal and family benefits, are exactly and correspondent to the state of the Jews during their captivity. An appeal was here made to the experience and the prayers of the pious, based on the first six verses of the 137th psalm.

3rd. The intercommunity with the world, the mingling of religion and politics, the alliance of church and state either in the European forms or by the more specious incorporations of these United States, the almost general conformity to the world in all its frivolities, in the gratification of all those appetites, passions, and propensities, purely animal, so common amongst christians; the great neglect, the very general neglect of the christian education of the youth, and the consequent irreligion and evil morals of many of the children of christian parents, are similar to the intermarriages between the Babylonians and the Israelites, and the almost universal assimilation of the children of those unauthorized marriages to the children of Chaldea. Thus, from the confusion of religious speech, the absence of the christian institutions, and the enjoyments dependent on their observance, and the deterioration of christian morals by an almost exact conformity to the course of this world, being the antitypes of the confusion of the Hebrew language in Chaldea, the absence of the temple and its worship, and the amalgamation of the Hebrews and the

Babylonians by marriage and familiarity, was argued the fact that we are yet in Babylon agreeable to the scripture declarations and evidences before mentioned.

Having found ourselves in Babylon; having seen the almost exact agreement of the types and the antitypes, we are led to inquire why the Jews were carried captive into Babylon, that we might in the analogy find a proof or evidence of the reasons assigned in the New Testament why Christians are in spiritual Babylon. We found that the Jews had broken God's covenant with them as a nation, by which he had engaged to be their King and protector, and that in consequence he had permitted their temple to be burned, their city to be laid waste, their land to be turned into a desert, and themselves to be slaves to Pagan sovereigns. And so with the antitype. The Christians have departed from the new covenant. The threatenings of Jesus Christ to the seven churches in Asia have been executed. The Lord Jesus has been disregarded as king, and his institutes forsaken. Other church covenants have been formed; other authorities have been acknowledged; other law-givers have been obeyed, and other apostles than those sent by Jesus, have been enthroned in our hearts. Therefore are we in Babylon.

Their return is a type of ours, else the system of types is defective and fails of perfection.—Cyrus made a proclamation; liberty was granted by the state in which they were enslaved. The civil powers now are relenting, and our government has given us the liberty and acknowledged our right to be governed in our consciences by the Great King. The proclamation by Cyrus was not more friendly to the return of the Jews to their own land and laws than is the constitution and laws of these United States. The time has arrived that the return should be commenced.

But the doctrine of the types of the New Testament agree—

1st. The Jews confessed their sins. See Nehemiah IX. 6. They said, "O Lord, many years did you forbear our fathers, and testified against them, but your Spirit in your prophets, (as he has to us by his spirit in the apostles,) yet would they not give ear." "Neither have our kings, our princes, our priests, nor our fathers kept your law, nor hearkened to your commandments and your testimonies wherewith you did testify against them."

2nd. But they did not only confess their sins. They personally reformed; they reformed their family discipline; they returned to the Lord with all their heart.

3rd. They gave the people the law in its original import.

4th. And they solemnly engaged, as a society, to walk in God's law which was given by their lawgiver, and "to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our God, and his judgments and his statutes." See Nehemiah X. 29. Let us go and do likewise, as respects our King, his laws, commandments and statutes.

We were then led to consider the parts of Nehemiah read, as typical of the difficulties, re-

proaches, and opposition which must be encountered by those who undertake to rebuild the city and the temple.

Such were the outlines of an oration designed to show that the ancient order of things must be restored, and that the way is marked out, not only in the apostolic writings and prophecies, but also fully exhibited in the typical people.—These outlines you may consider and fill up at your leisure. But should you neglect this, remember the command of the Lord our King. "Come, out of her, my people, that you may not be partakers of her sins, and that you may not receive of her plagues."—Alexander Campbell, in "Christian Baptist."

"THE RENOVATION"

By J. D. Phillips

"Indeed I say unto you, That in the RENOVATION, when the SON OF MAN shall sit on the throne of his glory; you, my FOLLOWERS, shall also sit on Twelve Thrones, judging the TWELVE Tribes of ISRAEL."—Matt. 19:28.

The careful reader will observe that I have departed from the King James Version, and used the Emphatic Diaglott. I did this because the Diaglott is a better translation of the Greek word *paliggenesia* translated "regeneration" in common version.

The Greek word translated "regeneration" here means *renovation*, and hence Berry says of it, "*Paliggenesia*, . . . a renovation of all things, Matt. 19:28."—Berry Lexicon, page 74.

The "regeneration," or "renovation," in Matt. 19:28, is almost universally understood by critics and commentators to mean the bringing in of a better order of things; a new creation. They are evidently correct.

Hence, the "renovation" here spoken of is, without doubt, the establishment of the Church, or Kingdom of the Messiah, on the great Pentecost—the one following the resurrection of the Messiah.

When the Lord was crucified, the veil of the Temple was torn in two, thus indicating that the Jewish institution was abolished, and that the Christian institution was about to be ushered in. Paul said the law of Moses, the constitution of the Jewish Church, was nailed to the Cross of our adorable Redeemer; and that "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second."—Col. 2:14; Heb. 6, 7, 8, 9 c.

On the day of Pentecost, A. D. 30 or 33, the Kingdom of the Messiah was established; the Law went forth from Zion, and the Word of Jehovah from Jerusalem; the Holy Spirit came in tongues of lambent fire and inspired the Apostles with Heaven's revelation to Adam's lost and fallen race; Reformation and Immersion were first preached in the Redeemer's name; the first-fruits of the harvest of the Lord were translated from the power and dominion of darkness, by a birth of water and the Holy Spirit, into the Messiah's Kingdom, and the way of Redemption was opened up to the world.

Then it was that the King—the Messiah—was made "both Lord and Messiah" (Acts 2:33), and 3,000 Jews recognized him as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of lords."—1 Tim. 6:15. And on this day the twelve apostles were seated on twelve thrones where they, even now, judge the twelve tribes of the sons of spiritual Israel. And hence, John represents them by twelve stars in the crown of the hat of the holy woman, the church of God, giving her light and guidance and protection against the sons of disobedience.

Hence Jesus is now King on the throne of his divine glory, and his holy apostles are even now with him on their twelve thrones, judging the Israel of God by the word of God.

In Matt. 16:16-19, Jesus promised his disciples that he would build his church upon the rock foundation that he is—the Messiah, the Son of the Living God, and he promised them that he would give to them the keys of the Kingdom of the Heavens, and that whatsoever they would bind on earth would be bound in Heaven.

Faith, repentance, confession, and baptism for the remission of sins, are bound both in Heaven and on earth as the only divine plan of redemption for poor fallen and undone sinners, and unless they do these things, they shall be eternally lost. Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16; Luke 24:46,47; Matt. 10:32; John 3:5; Acts 2:38.

The observance of the Lord's Supper on the Lord's day, with "the loaf" and "the cup" is bound in Heaven and on earth, for the disciples of Christ, and this must be done by us, or we shall be eternally lost.

Many other things are bound upon us, and let us see that we do them, leaving nothing undone.

TWO DEBATES

I have recently signed propositions for two debates—one with Bro. W. G. Riggs, and one with Bro. Chas. F. Reese.

The debate with Bro. Riggs will be on the Sunday School question. It will be held somewhere in Los Angeles. A debate on this question is badly needed in Southern Calif. There has been but one debate on this question in this State. Bro. Riggs is a good man, and we hope to have a clean, dignified discussion of the question. We may debate the cups question, too.

The debate with Bro. Reese will be held either at Yuma or Somerton, Ariz., and the baptism question, an issue of Bro. Reese's own making, will be discussed. He takes the position that when a Christian comes out of digression, he must be rebaptized, even though his first baptism is for the remission of sins.

We shall announce the time and places of these debates in our issue for Feb. 1st.—J. D. Phillips.

TURNING ON THE LIGHT

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

"You (J. D. Phillips) don't want a Bible de-

bate, utterly refused and so did Brother Harper".
—Alva Johnson in the A. W.

Bro. Harper replied to Johnson, saying, "I know that Brother Phillips will quit his work, as will I, any time to meet Johnson or Cowan, or any other man the cups advocates will put up, in oral or written debate."

And I say, Amen. And The Truth is open to them, as it has been for two years, and we welcome them to our columns, and insist that they get all the help the cups advocates are able to give them to "Make it as sure as ye (they) can."

Cowan and Johnson, with Duckworth and Conner, have ordered 100 debates on the class system of teaching, and we now order the same number on the cups question. Have they the courage to meet us? We soon shall see. But if you will allow me a guess I will guess that they will do as Alexander Campbell said of N. L. Rice, the champion of Presbyterianism, namely, "He will neither lead nor follow."

Are you doing your part in the work of raising that 1000 subscriptions for The Truth? If you are not, get busy, please.

Have you been notified that your sub. has expired? If so, have you renewed? If not, will you do it soon so that you will not miss a copy?

"Were the whole realm of nature mine, That were a gift far too small:

Love so amazing, so divine Requires my strength, my life, my all."

J. D. Phillips.

THEY SAY

The Truth gets better all the time. Glad you are compelling the cups advocates to stand up and be measured by the measuring reed. Hope they can soon see how short they are, and then not turn away and forget what manner of men they are (Jas. 1;24), and keep on their short clothes, exposing their nakedness in the sight of God and all honest-hearted Christians by clinging to things they can not defend by the Bible, as so many others have done; but repent, and come back to the Bible way. Baptized a young man and his wife last Lord's day (Dec. 22), and we are looking forward to a good meeting in the spring. It sure would be a pleasure to have you and family with us. The church here is getting along fine, since everybody is satisfied with the Bible Way.—John T. Chambers.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Dec. 19, 1929.—During the meeting at Freedom, near Montreal, Mo., some of the people from Sunny Side Church attended the meeting, and heard me preach on the use of instrumental music and other innovations in the worship. It seems that some of them must have been convinced that these things are wrong, for they came some forty miles to see me about assisting in a meeting at Sunny Side, where said innovations are used. I consented to go if they would lay aside the innovations. To this they

agreed. (The ones who came to see me.) But when I, in company with Bro. C. H. Lee, went to begin the meeting, we found that some (about five men and their wives) had organized against us, objecting to our preaching in the house, stating that the house belonged to the Christian Church. However, the name, "Church of Christ," was in plain letters over the rostrum. As some three-fourths of the ones holding membership there and apparently all of those who were not members insisted that we go ahead and use the house, we started the meeting, but on account of bad weather, the meeting was postponed until some future time. I feel certain that much good can be accomplished in a meeting there, and that at least three-fourths of the members will "come out from among them," and take their stand for the Bible way. Bro. Lee and I plan to return just as soon as the weather will permit.

If all our papers were as loyal to the Will of God as you are, we would be a united people. I know of no other one that stands up unflinchingly for a "Thus saith the Lord" as you do. Me thinks that nearly all the other editors are afraid to stand out fearlessly for "Where the Bible speaks." And many preachers are not one whit behind them, and that is the reason for the shameful confusion that is among us today and increasing. May the Lord bless and strengthen you for the year's work.—Dr. W. W. Stone.

(Yes, we are not afraid to take a "stand." At the close of the Johnson-Phillips discussion of the cups at Sentinel, Okla., when Johnson promised to give me an answer at the close of that debate whether he would meet me at Elk City, Okla., on the same proposition we had recently discussed at Roswell, N. Mex., where he said he would consider another debate with me and I propose Elk City, he notified me that he would not meet me, and asked me if I had any thing to say. I arose and said to that audience that I did not see why any one should refuse to enter such a discussion if he really wants the truth, and if Cowan or Johnson could "thrash me to a "frazzle" on the question that I was ready for the thrashing, and would consider them my best friends if they would do it. But even this did not seem to interest them.—Ed.)

Find enclosed \$1.25 to renew my subscription to The Truth and to get five copies of the Clark-Harper discussion on the cups. It is sure fine.—Sam Finto.

The Truth gets better all the time. It is the only paper I will support.—M. Estep.

Enclosed find subs. and donation to Truth Fund. We are with you in the fight of faith for the Ancient order, the apostolic pattern. We are sure proud of Bro. Phillips as a preacher who does not flinch from standing for the truth as revealed in the New Testament, and no apology to make for it.—G. W. McCain.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, FEBRUARY 1, 1930

No. 3

BRO. WIGGS, JR., AND THE CUPS

Brother Wiggs is very, very weak with his symmlogisms in trying to reply to me on the cups. He has not proved to us that our Lord used or indorsed the use of "two or more cups" in the communion; and this is our good brother's sad, sad predicament. He told us that "the truth is all that is said on the subject," and that is right. And since this is so no man can learn anything about the use of "two or more cups" from the Bible. It is all of man that this is learned, just like the organ and the Sunday School. And such practice is not the truth, and can not make us free. So you will have to make some more syllogisms, for these are worthless as pertains to the truth. And the truth is what we need. Will you give us the cups if you do not find them in the truth? Why don't they give up the organ? Why don't they give up the S. S.? And why don't they strive for the things that make for peace, and things wherewith we may edify one another? Can they meet God in peace with such contentions that are making havoc of the church?—Bob Musgrave.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found Bro. Hewitt Smith's explanation as to why we do not give our readers the Smith-Trott debate on the cups. The Doctor is standing in the way of the advancement of open investigation on an important issue. He may be able to account to God and be blameless in the matter; but if we should let personal matters interfere with the advancement of the truth, we should have quit the whole field long ago. We love God and the cause of Christ too much for that.

Why not publish this debate in the Way—it is an "open forum," they say? The Doctor's trotting with the Way makes about as good a "pair" as a well groomed race horse with a burro. He could not even commune with the editor of that paper where they use the cups at Littlefield.

Now listen, ye cups advocates. The Doctor says he has out a tract on the cup question and that he ventures to say that none of you will attempt to answer it. Now don't wait until the Doctor is gone, and then mess over it. Get at it right now and give the Doctor a chance to learn the truth on the matter. Dare you attempt it? If I believed as you cups men do, the ink would not yet be dry on the Doctor's challenge until I had the thing wound up, or admitted that "It can't be done". Every point in the tract is fully covered in the Clark-Harper discussion of the subject, 5 cents each at this office.—Ed.

We want to say a happy and prosperous new year to all. And we wish to thank those who have donated to the support of the paper from time to time to keep the truth before the people. Some are getting real mad, and would like to whip us; but to do so physically is too easy, and to do so religiously is too hard for them; so they just pout, and make faces at us. Many are getting their eyes open, and realize how easy it is to "drift away from the things" which we have heard and which are written. Heb. 2:1.

May we do nothing through strife and vain glory, and love one another.

Bro. A. R. Moore, Kansas City, Mo., says, "Whenever religion makes us look, speak or act to shun a mortal's frown or to catch his smile, we may know that there is something wrong: we are off the proper ground of divine Service. No man is in a position to serve others in religion who is not wholly independent of them."

True; and the present time is ripe with time-servers, held by the strings of "filthy lucre". And Paul and Peter told us of such times to come, saying, "Having itching ears, they shall turn away their ears from the truth and be turned unto fables." And the "fables" bring the smiles. And the preacher thinks he is fooling the people. He gets their money and does them no good; and the people think they are fooling the preacher. They close his mouth with their money. But the truth is, Satan has them both fooled, for he gets the whole bunch, led captive by him at his will, as the apostle says.

In the Christian Leader, under the heading "Questions on the Woman Question," the Editor, Ira C. Moore, with whom J. D. Phillips debated the Sunday School question in Charleston, W. Va., Moore's home town, more than a year ago, says: "I confess that I have broken away from the old moorings on this question and am enjoying such a feeling of security and confidence in the correctness of my present views as I never enjoyed on this question before."

Now, listen, brethren. He advanced those views in the above-mentioned debate, and Bro. Phillips so completely "whipped him from the face of the earth," as one brother said, that when he was challenged to meet us on the question through the Leader and the Truth, so all could get it, he backed off. It seems that Rowe does not enjoy the same "feeling of security and confidence in the correctness" of Moore's "present views" that Moore does. He would have to revise his "Bible

in Question and Answer," and other editors on the Lead r would have to cut loose from "moorings" compared with which Moore's seems to be very insecure.

In fact Moore is now as completely stranded as is J. W. Chism, who holds that the language about woman's silence in this Corinthian letter is that of some teacher at Corinth, whose teaching Paul is quoting and refuting.

He advanced this theory in his S. S. debate last summer at Ringling, Okla., and I challenged him to meet me in the Firm Foundation and The Truth on it. They would as well ride right over Paul, as I once heard an elder do, saying, "Let us hear from the sisters, too, even if it is contrary to what Paul says," as to try to detour around as Moore, Chism, and others keep doing.

GREETING

To the Friends of "The Truth" Everywhere: Brother Harper has given us a paper for the past two years that is above reproach; and he has done this under great financial strain and the very worst hardships. He has not only shown his ability as an editor and publisher, but he has also demonstrated his faith and honesty to the God of the Bible.

"The Truth" has not missed an issue in the two years of its existence, even giving us the holiday issue which the other papers generally miss. And he is still keeping the price at one dollar a year for an eight-page paper. And he has not rejected a single article that was sent in for the paper.

With the first issue for the new year, 1930, we notice the name of Brother J. D. Phillips, of Montebello, Calif., added as an editor; and I am glad to see this. I believe of him as Brother Gay said of Brother Harper when the paper was started, it is "The right man in the right place."

"The Truth" came into existence on a demand for an "open forum." We had to have such a paper as it has proved to be or the cause of New Testament Faith and Practice in all things would have suffered much loss—nearly all we had gained in the struggle of twenty years of hard work. And now since it has proved its worth and merit we should every one help all we can and let the brethren know of its merits. There is a studied effort on the part of some who think more of selfish ends than they do of the truth of God, to keep the brethren from knowing that there is such a paper. Therefore, let us push it as never before, and get it scattered among those who are anxious to take God at his word and follow it. Let every preacher that stands for full and free investigation of all Bible matter get behind the paper and help circulate it as never before. The time of our work is so short, and the need is so great that we dare not lose a moment, if we are to hear the Master's "Well done." Let each member of the church talk the paper to others, and send in subscriptions. And those who can should donate to "The Truth Fund." The paper is being sent free to a number of afflicted and unfortunate.

The brethren have been doing well to help; but let us all try a little harder. I will. Will you?—Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

By Bob Musgrave

All Christian liberty is within the circumscribed limits of God's revealed will to man, which to the Christian is the New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. He said to the unsaved, "Ye shall know the truth (God's word is truth—Jno. 17:17), and the truth shall make you free." And there is no liberty to the alien sinner beyond the word of God to him. But coming within the circumscribed limits of this word, he has freedom, or liberty. And having done the will of God in obeying him in Faith, Repentance, Confession, and being baptized, he is "made free from sin." And Paul says, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." Gal. 5:1.

Here is a warning to the saved. They may lose this liberty in Christ by going beyond the word of God. And so Paul warns the church at Corinth, "that ye might learn not to go beyond the things which are written." 1 Cor. 4:6. And Peter warns, saying, "His divine power hath given unto us all things pertaining unto life and godliness." 2 Pet. 1:3, 4. And he tells through Paul to Timothy that the "Scripture given by inspiration" does thoroughly furnish unto every good work. 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.

Those who lead us where we have no Scripture for what we do, lead us into bondage to sin again. The instrumental music practice in the worship was advocated as a Christian liberty, but when we called for the word of God for it, its advocates utterly failed to give it—there was none; but they held to it, and so we parted company. We could not afford to go beyond the things which are written; and so we "stood fast" and they went on, and said they were "progressive." But their progress was into bondage.

Brother Hines pointed this out in the Firm Foundation more than twenty years ago. Just hear him again, He says:

Since the church is a divine institution and the Bible an infallible and perfect guide (see 2 Tim. 3:16, 17), it is a sin to introduce things of human devising into the worship, whether the things be right or wrong. Such things cannot be logically done by any except those who claim the authority to legislate for the Lord. Any man who accepts God's legislation as a perfect law cannot do it. While those who claim such authority are wrong, they are consistent with themselves; but, those who make no such claims are utterly inconsistent when they add to God's law.

Not of Faith

Again, Paul says that "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," Rom. 14:23. He is evidently talking about the service we render to God. In this realm we must "walk by faith." Since faith comes by hearing God's word, Rom. 10:17, we walk by faith

when we do what his word says. But when we do as service to God what he does not command, then we are not walking by faith. Such service is not of faith, and is, therefore, a sin. The sin in the case is not in the nature of the thing introduced, for that might be a matter of pure indifference, but because it cannot be a matter of faith, not being based on God's word. That is just the point exactly where the sin comes in. Nothing is better for human nature than to learn submission to God's will—to walk by faith instead of opinion. Worship by opinion has never been acceptable in any age. The case of Cain is the first example of its rejection and also the first example of worship. God rejected such worship at the very beginning. Abel offered his sacrifice by faith and was accepted. Let us walk by faith and sin not.

JOHN T. HINDS.

And twenty years ago, when the Sunday School advocates among us began their work as the "progressives" among the "anti-music party," they urged the same plea of "Christian liberty," but they led the churches into bondage. In 1909, when Nichol was "whipping Showalter into line," he said, "I am glad the brethren at Austin have a 'Sunday School,' and that Bro. S. has allowed himself to speak of it under that name, that he is not disposed to see a 'bugaboo' in the name 'Sunday School.'"

And again: "The Firm Foundation has been regarded as an anti-Sunday School organ, and true, some of the contributors are opposed to such work, let it be understood that Bro. S. is not, and that he objects not to the use of literature, dividing the students into classes, nor women teaching in that work. Let others fall into line."

But there were others that did not think as much of the "money bag" as did Showalter, and did not "fall into line" at the bidding of Nichol; and Nichol has never had the courage to attempt to bluff "into line" a man who thought more of the truth and his soul than he did of the "money bag". He has shown himself to be as big a coward on this unscriptural practice that has now divided the church again as any organ advocate ever was. But this is characteristic of all digressives from God's holy word as a perfect guide, and now Hines is guilty with the rest who have been induced by other considerations than the truth to "fall into line," and follow Nichol, yes, R. C. Nichol, the religious coward; too cowardly to meet an issue of his own making. And this is not all by any means, for there are now the advocates of the cups, who are crying "Christian liberty" to use them since they cannot find them in the word of God. Brethren admit that there is no command or example for them in the word of God. They are not of Faith.

Paul says, "Brethren ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh (something not of God), but by love serve one another." And in 2 Cor. 3:17 he says, "Now the Lord is that spirit, and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty."

Then there is no liberty where the spirit of the Lord is not to be found. But there is the "perfect Law of Liberty" for all to look into and see the will of God. Jas. 1:25. And he that does according to it is blessed in his deeds. Where there is Liberty, there is the word of God for the deed, otherwise it is an "occasion to the flesh" and leads to bondage.

Read the word of God, think soberly, and obey gladly as he directs.

Yours for Christian Liberty as taught in God's word.—Bob Musgrave.

AN EXPLANATION WITH REGRET

The reader may remember seeing a statement from Brother Harper to the effect that he had the promise of the manuscript of the Smith- debate on the cups. The statement was in the Jan. 1, issue. It was I that promised the manuscript, and only after receiving a letter, written Dec. 15, with the following statement did I agree to do so: "You have my permission to use your own discretion as to dealing with the debate."

So I arranged to send Brother Harper the manuscript which he was to publish in a special issue of The Truth, March 1, but another letter of Dec. 30, with this statement blocked the move: "I am not in shape to write long letters and thought I had made it explicit enough that I leave all disposition of the debate to you with only one restriction, No writing over my name is to be published in Harper's paper."

The reason I do not give the name of the writer of the two letters is because the statement in the second forbids it and I am writing this for publication in The Truth to let the readers know why I cannot furnish the manuscript.

I will say that the original idea when this debate was arranged for was to publish it in tract form and I had a statement to that effect in Apostolic Way of Dec. 1. However, I think I had reason to believe the tract would fail, for the present at least, and I was glad of Brother Harper's offer to run it in The Truth and furnish extra copies at 5 cents each. The tract, as arranged for was to be 15 cents. I hope to be able yet to publish the tract and by cutting down some on the size of the type and using the regular paper instead of heavy cover I can furnish them for 10 cents per copy. If I succeed in getting it published, I will be glad for Bro. Harper to announce when it is ready.

Hewitt Smith, Route 6,
Brookhaven, Miss.

"Babylon," means confusion; in the Book of Revelation, it means religious confusion—a thing we should hate. And God is now calling His people out of it. Read it: "And I heard Another Voice from HEAVEN, saying, 'Come out from her, my people, so that you may have no fellowship with her SINS, and that you receive not of her PLAGUES.'"—Rev. 18:4.—A. C. Campbell.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL REVITIES

By J. D. Phillips

"He (J. D. Phillips) will affirm that the First Christian Church baptism is for the remission of sins and the Sommerite Church of Christ is scriptural in shaking them in, so I will deny."—Chas. F. Reese in the Apostolic Way, Dec. 15, 1929.

Proposition for Debate with Reese: "It is scriptural for the Somerton church of Christ to receive members from the First Christian Church of Yuma on their baptism."—Aff., J. D. Phillips; Neg., Chas. F. Reese.

Bro. Reese's statement that I am going to affirm that "the First Christian church baptism is for the remission of sins" is absolutely false. He knew when he penned this falsehood to R. F. Duckworth that he tried for an hour to get me to affirm what he here says I am going to affirm, and I would not do it, for I know that some Christian churches do not teach baptism for the remission of sins.

"The Sommerite Church of Christ is scriptural," etc. He knows that nothing was said about what he here calls "the Sommerite church of Christ."

"Shaking them in on their baptism." He knows this is false, too. He knows that I am as far from "shaking in" people on sectarian baptism as he is.

The issue between Reese and loyal brethren is simply this: Should the loyal churches of Christ receive brethren into their fellowship when they give up digression and make a full confession of their wrongs? This is the issue and Bro. Reese knows it. He says, "If a man or woman that I baptized should join a sectarian church, they would depart from the faith and would have to be baptized again before they could be saved."

Any one wanting to know when the debate with Chas. F. Reese, on baptism, is to be held, at Yuma, Arizo., should write W. H. Hilton, Somerton, Ariz., as he will make the arrangements for it soon.

"Bro. Kyle begins, proceeds and ends with the thought that 'cup,' even 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' 'is the cup on the communion table con-

taining the wine.'"—Ira C. Moore, Leader, May 28, 1929.

Yes, and if Ira C. Moore knows "beans," he knows Bro. Kyle is right, for he is backed by the highest linguistical authority on earth—J. H. Thayer, who says of the Greek word translated "cup," "**Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel.**" And Thayer is in good company, for Liddell and Scott say of the same word, "a drinking-cup, wine-cup." Berry puts himself in the company of Liddell and Scott and Thayer, for he says, "**Poterion, a drinking cup.**" And Robinson is in the same good company, for he says, "**Poterion, a drinking vessel, a cup.**" And we are sorry that Bro. Moore has stepped out of such company, if he has ever been in it, and is teaching something that has no backing—except his assumption.

Thayer says "**Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel,**" is used literally in 1 Cor. 10:16—"the cup of blessing which we bless." He also says, "**to poterion tes eulogias, the consecrated cup**" (1 Cor. 10:16). Can Bro. Moore beat J. H. Thayer on the meaning and use of words? If so he can beat Chicago, Yale, and Harvard Universities, and Bethany College, for they all say Thayer is right. So Moore should show where these linguists are wrong before criticising Bro. Kyle for teaching as they do. And there are others—Cowan among them—who need to read a little before getting off so many "smart" (?) ones.

"Bro. Phillips: I notice in your review of Mason in "The Truth" that you say: "a cup," "this cup," etc., cannot be made to mean two cups, two hundred cups," etc. I agree with you, but what I call "the cup" and what Jesus calls "the cup" is not what you call "the cup" at all."—J. N. Cowan.

What I call "the cup" and what Jesus took when "he took a cup" (Matt. 26:27) is from the Greek word "**poterion**"—"a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer)—"a drinking vessel, a cup" (Robinson)—"drinking-cup" (Berry)—"a drinking-cup, wine-cup" (Liddell and Scott), and Robinson and Thayer give the literal, and metonymical, and metaphorical uses of the word "**poterion,**" and they both say that it is used literally in Matt. 26:28, and metonymically in Matt. 26:28, where "this" (in the sentence, "this is my blood.") has as its antecedent "**Poterion, a cup a drinking vessel**" (v. 27). And since one use of metonymy is "Container and the thing contained" (William's Rhet., p. 220, under "3"), the "container," which is "**Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel**" (v. 27) is referred to in v. 28 to suggest to the mind what it contains, which the context shows to be "the product of the vine" (v. 29). And since there is no law of language by which cups can be properly called "the cup," we know that one "**Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel,**" was used on this occasion. And Bro. Clark is man enough to admit it (See Clark-Harper debate). And if the wine had been in cups, it would have been called cups, using the figure metonymy.

So what I call "the cup" is exactly what both Matthew and Jesus call "the cup"; Cowan to the contrary notwithstanding.

"Bro. Phillips, nothing would give me more joy than to see you brethren drop the extreme position that when Jesus said, divide the cup among yourselves, he meant by all drinking from the same container, and that it could not have been divided among them otherwise."—J. N. Cowan.

Neither is there anything that would give the S. C. advocates "more joy than to see you brethren drop the extreme (?) position that when Paul said, "For ye can all prophesy ONE BY ONE," he meant for us to follow his teaching, and that the church should not be organized into classes for the purpose of teaching.

When we teach that Christ took a "**Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel,**" which, as Thayer (page 533) truly says is used properly, that is, literally, in Matt. 26:27, and taught them, saying, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves," by obeying the command, "Drink ye all out of it," "**Πίνο εκ του poterion,**" "Drink out of the cup," we teach the truth. And "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" from the use of cups which originated in "Mystery Babylon" (Rev. 17), and is a departure from "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6). And you need not expect us to "drop this extreme (?) position" unless you show us that we are wrong, brother. And you must produce "the goods," which you say you have, before you convert us to your "two or more cups" theory—you must.

Had you been present when Jesus instituted His supper, to have been consistent, you should have said:

"Now, Jesus, you are too much on the extreme about this matter. Nothing would give me more joy than to see you drop this extreme position." And had you been in the Corinthian Church when Paul bound Christ's example on them (See Matt. 26:26-28; 1 Cor. 11:23-29), to have been consistent, you should have said:

"Now, Bro. Paul, nothing would give me more joy than to see you and Jesus drop the extreme position that one cup should be used in the Communion. You know, Bro. Paul, that I have put Warlick, Tant, Chism, Sommer, et al, to route by quoting your language as found in 1 Cor. 14: 31, 34, 35; and now Harper, Musgrave and Phillips are trying to put me to route by using your language as found in 1 Cor. 11:23-29. Phillips and Harper have already put Johnson to route on this matter, and all they lack putting me to route is getting me cornered so I would have to debate. I would hate to be put to route on it—I would lose my prestige.

"By the way, Bro. Paul, I wonder if you have ever seen a copy of my CREED I wrote and gave to the brethren at Roswell, N. Mex. I went there and found the brethren divided—some wanted one cup: they stood with you and Jesus; some wanted "two or more": they stood with me; some wanted Individual Cups: they stood with Johnson and Hall. So I wrote a creed that would have settled the matter if they had followed it. And I made provision for my "two or more cups" in my creed, for I wrote: "That in the communion service, only a sufficient number of cups be used to

conveniently wait upon the congregation." And I think this is fine.

"Bro. Paul, I wrote Phillips about "the 'one cup' heretics." You don't want me to brand you as one of them, do you? Let me say again, Bro. Paul, that nothing would give me more joy than to see you and Jesus give up your extreme position on the cup question."

"Christ gave two generic commands—to sing and to teach."—E. C. Fuqua.

Wrong, brother. Christ never gave one generic command, for, as J. B. Briney, the great linguist, truly says, "All of God's commands are given in specific terms."—The Form of Baptism. Now see: "Replying to your inquiry, teach is specific."—The Lexicographer's Easy Chair of The Literary Digest. Again: "Replying to your inquiry, 'Is teach a specific term (Matt. 28:19)?' Yes.—F. R. Gay, Professor of Greek in Bethany College, since 1910."

"Truth crushed to the ground will rise again; the eternal years of God are hers; but error wounded writhes in pain, and dies among his worshippers."—Selected.

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

And that is why it is so hard to get errorists to meet us with an open Bible.

"Yours for more discussions, J. N. Cowan." All right, brother—we are ready to meet you. We believe what Jude said: "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."—Jude 3.

"The air of this world is unwholesome to a Christian. Politics are a moral pestilence. The strifes of the forum and the fierce debates about *meum* and *tuum*—*thiney* and *miney*—are the scorching wind, the sirocco, the Syrian blast to the soul. So is the love of wealth, of political power, and a worldly temper. Christians, keep yourselves from idols!—Affectionately and forever yours, In the brightening hope of immortality, A. Campbell."

THE OLD AND THE NEW

The old year with all of its events, both good and bad, has past and forever gone. As I take a retrospective view of the year 1929, I wonder if I have redeemed the time as profitably as I should have. Perhaps, I could have done more in the cause of my Lord—could have preached a few more sermons; spoken a few more words of comfort and encouragement to lighten the burden of some poor wayworn traveler; could have read several more chapters of my Bible; yes, and could have prayed more; given more liberally of my means for the Cause of Christ. All these, and

many more things, no doubt, many of us could have done. I believe that the year just past has been the busiest year of my life in the cause of the Lord; and yet, I see where I could have done more, and some things that would have been better to have left undone.

But, as Paul says, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto the things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." May we make new resolutions—resolutions that we shall not make the mistakes of the past—and with a determination that cannot be moved carry out those resolutions to the end of the new year and each succeeding year of life. May God help us to be more diligent and faithful in the work of the Vineyard of the Lord! In the language of Paul, thus: "wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith."

—Homer L. King.

PERILOUS TIMES

"This know also that in the last days perilous times shall come." Perilous to men's eternal welfare. Why? "For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." Paul to Timothy.

Are not these "times" upon us now? We realize that these are "times" of action and energy, when men's minds are centered upon the accumulation and hoarding of wealth, and everything is made to serve interests and welfare of this life before death comes. All for self here and no interest in the hereafter.

With the advancement of art and science, men's minds have become engrossed with the thoughts of passing events while they live, with the thoughts of the age, which is foolishness with God. 1 Cor. 3:19. And their minds poisoned with the wisdom of this world ("which shall perish with the using") have brought these perilous times upon us; and many of the gospel preachers, instead of acting with caution, as they should, are blindly corrupting the teaching of God, and are tampering with things untaught, and thus adding to the perils of the times. Traitors, they are, and heady, high-minded, having nothing but a form of godliness, and by their actions, denying the power thereof. And God warns us—from such turn away, for "a little leaven leaveneth the

whole lump." And this warning to the wise will not go unheeded. Let these corrupters of the word of God take their own course with its consequences: we must not follow with them; but fear God and do as he tells us in his Word of truth. And let us do all we can to warn the faithful that they may not lose their reward. It will be an awful time at the judgment when those who have had their own will and way here must depart into outer darkness, and truly there will be "wailing and gnashing of teeth." Why will brethren (Paul is speaking of the characteristics of members of the church) be so thoughtless. Brother, sister, awake to righteousness. And this means for you to take God at his word and follow it. Why take any chance on a thing so dreadful? God bless you—awake, awake; I know you do not want to hear the sentence of condemnation. Just take a view of the past, and God's dealings with the disobedient, those that set God's way aside in what they did not like or wish to do for various reasons, largely because of the love of their own pleasures, and they modified God's commands or ignored them entirely.

Look at the College craze of the last twenty-five years, and what havoc it has done to the church—the Missionary Society, the Sunday School, etc.—yes, anything but the church, God's institution. Too bad that men lose their souls for such things. Why not walk before God in Faith, faith that comes by the word of God? "Let no man take thy crown." Rev. Be careful.—J. B. Daniel.

A PRINCIPLE INVOLVED

"The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," (Acts 2:47). The foregoing quotation, taken from the King James translation, is, in my judgment, the correct statement. Some other translations and many commentaries put it adding the saved to the church, but this is the wrong principle. The adding to the church by the Lord does not take place after men and women are saved. Neither does it take place before they are saved. Neither would I say the same thing that saves them adds them to the church. But when complying with the conditions specified with a pure heart, not mockingly, derisively or ignorantly, but "in spirit and in truth," men are saved and the Lord adds them to the church.

I am sure that the King James translation gives more clearly the idea. "The Lord did not add to the church daily those that went through the formality as perhaps some did of obeying the Lord, or those who were swept by the spell of the multitude that turned to the Lord, but He added to the church, those that should be saved. Some, perhaps, were immersed in water that day that were not saved. Some today, ignorantly or for the wrong purpose or intent, may be baptized or immersed without receiving forgiveness of their sins, and without being added to the church, but all that should be saved, the Lord adds. If a man's or woman's apparent obedience does not entitle them to be saved, they are not added to the church.

Our religious neighbors, who teach that men and women are saved and should be added to the church, miss the principle, which is abundantly maintained and established by other instructions and teachings of scripture and which is presented by the quotation here given from Acts 2:47. The Lord certainly adds to the church daily such as should be saved, but the man who should not be saved, because of lack of proper purpose, intent, or intelligent action, is not added, though he may go through the outward form of a complete obedience.—R. F. D.

Remarks

This is from R. F. Duckworth in the Apostolic Way of Dec. 15, 1929.

If "saved" is wrong in principle so is "should", for both are past tense. The Greek is *tous sozomenous*, that is, those being saved; being saved, is the present passive participle; and the Revised version, which uses the progressive passive verb, has it those that were being saved; and since this gives the thought of the original, it is without objection.

The saving act is the adding act; and in being saved they were being added. And we are ready to say that "The same thing (remission of sins) that saves them adds them to the church." And since the Lord is the only one that can remit sins, he is the only one that can add to the church.

There is a line of demarcation; the world, sinners, the unsaved, on one side; the church, saints, the saved, on the other. And the Lord's part, the last part of the discipling process, takes the sinner across this line, where he is a saint; where the *worlding* is one of the church (*ekklesia*, the called out); and where the unsaved is the saved. And all the fanciful touches based on "should be saved" are foreign to this text. The Lord saves all that obey the gospel, that is, the Lord adds to the church those that obey the gospel. It is impossible for one to be saved and not be added to the church. And to admit that one has obeyed the gospel, is to admit that one has been saved and added to the church.

WANTS INFORMATION

"I see that Clark got you in a tight on that question. Jesus said, Drink ye all of it. Clark proved the Lord was speaking of the wine and not the cup. The pronoun 'it'—What? The wine and not the cup. You did not deny his definitions. Clark asked how you would divide the wine if 5,000 or a 1,000 members meet together to take the Lord's supper. You did not answer him at all. Why dodge the truth of Jesus' statement in Matt. 26:27? I am studying on both sides of this question.—J. A. Comfield.

Remarks

Clark "proved" no such thing, and neither can you or any other man prove such a thing. Clark said, "I admit that 'it' may refer to the 'cup' (container)." And he would as well have left out the word "container," for *poterion*, the word here

translated "cup" does not mean anything but "a drinking cup." And a man does not have to be much to know that a "drinking cup" is not "wine."

Clark said (Fifth Aff.), "Thayer was a Greek scholar, and we all accept his definitions of Greek words." All right, Thayer defines *poterion*, the word in question, which is used in Matt. 26:27, "a cup, a drinking vessel." (p. 533) Do you think that "a cup, a drinking vessel" is "wine"? If you think Clark got me in a "tight" your thinker evidently needs repairs. Thayer cites Matt. 26:27 as an example of "the vessel out of which one drinks." Do you still think "wine" is the vessel out of which one drinks? The antecedent of *autou*, translated "it," is *poterion*, translated "cup", and I have the Greek scholarship of the Universities with me on this, and Clark shows himself in a tight to contend otherwise, for, as I said (2nd Neg.), "And to place 'it' beyond the shadow of a quibble, Paul says, 'Let him drink out of the cup.'" (1 Cor. 11:28) And "cup" here is *poterion*, defined (and "We all accept his definitions," you see) by Thayer, "a cup, a drinking vessel." And do you still think "it" and "cup" are "wine"?

Did not deny his definitions. No. They are Webster's not his. But I did deny that "the scriptures, sanction, warrant, justify, or furnish ground for (Webster) what he affirmed, and I sustained my denial, too.

"5000 or 1000 meet together to take the Lord's supper." Have you found Clark's answer to my question (1st Neg.), "Do you contend that all the disciples in Jerusalem ate from the same loaf?" No; and you find no answer to more than a half dozen other questions of mine. But I did answer his question (2nd Neg.), saying, "I would do just as I do when baptizing—prepare to do what the Lord says to do. Neander says: 'In large towns, where such a place (private house) could not accommodate all, it became necessary that smaller portions of the community dwelling at a distance should choose other places for their meetings on Sunday!' (See also 1st Neg. and 6th.)

If this does not clear up the matter to your satisfaction, come again.

"It must not be forgotten that religious controversy is inevitable where living faith in definite truth is dwelling side by side with ruinous error and practical evil, and people must remember that controversial preaching, properly managed, is full of interest and full of power."—World Evangel.

The Truth is bringing the sweat on the CUPS apologists. They cannot take the "two or more" and defend themselves against the "Individual cups" unless they do it by a human creed. It must be left to man to decide. And this is just a little too much for some of them yet. In the same chapter and verse where the Bible speaks of "two or more" it speaks of individual cups. Don't let up on them until they surrender or run.—W. A. Berry.

AS I NOW SEE IT

I do not desire to sail under false colors for the purpose of gain or popularity. I have always endeavored to occupy ground that is unquestionable, and have ever striven to occupy positions, of which I would neither be ashamed nor afraid, and I see no reason why I should now depart from this course. To it may I ever be true.

When any question arises among the brethren that causes strife and division, making it imperative that I take a position one way or the other; one question has ever been present to assist me in making my decisions; viz., "What is safe?" I feel certain that if we will have "Safety First" in the consideration, when we are called upon to take a stand, we shall not be found occupying doubtful ground. Let us apply this to the innovations that have caused division in the Church of God, during the last century.

The Missionary Society: Everybody agrees that if the mission work is done in and through the Church, to the glory of God and the church, it cannot be wrong. Doing the work through a human institution is the thing that is called in question. "Safety First" then demands that we do the work through the church.

Instrumental Music: I know of no one of any note that takes the position that it is wrong to sing without the aid of the instrument. Hence, to say the least it is questionable to use it. "Safety First" demands that we sing without it. What has been said of these two innovations may be said of all other innovations with equal force.

A Plurality of Drinking Vessels in The Communion—For some time I tried to make myself believe that this question was of little consequence and not worth debating. However, I have always had a preference for the use of but one drinking vessel for each congregation.

It is only recently that I came to look upon this question as I now do. Since the Clark-Harper Discussion of this question some three years ago, I have given more attention to it. I saw then that Bro. Clark failed to sustain his proposition; and that the arguments used by him were very much the same as those used by the advocates of instrumental music and the S. S. and other innovations. And in his last effort, published in "The Truth," I note that he failed to add any weight to his arguments. Knowing Bro. Clark personally, I regarded him second to none in ability, and if he cannot defend the use of more than one cup, where shall we go to find one who can? I look out over the field in vain.

Therefore, I look upon the use of more than one drinking vessel in the communion as an innovation of the worst type (If one innovation can be worse than another) for it strikes at the very heart of the Lord's day worship; viz., the Lord's Supper. I could not now worship with a congregation that uses more than one cup, looking at the matter as I now do.

But what is safe here? Do not all agree that we may worship God acceptably with the use of one drinking vessel? It is the use of more than

one that is called in question, and it is the use of more than one that is causing the strife. All could be agreed on the use of one, all can never be agreed on the use of more than one. Hence as a matter of unity and of "Safety First," we should use but one.

Submitted in love,
Homer L. King.

QUERY

Can they "drink the cup of the Lord" when they use two or more cups?—L. A. Ans. No; they drink cups, where they use two or more. The use of cups is as foreign to this ordinance as "strange fire" was to the altar of Israel. And for one to say, "We use two cups, but yet we drink 'the cup of the Lord' as Christ said we must do," is as absurd as for a Methodist to say, "We sprinkle, but yet we baptize as Christ said we must do." And just as was said in the answer to Bro. Paden (found elsewhere in this issue), such a statement "only shows an absurd lack of knowledge of the ordinary use of language."

In "drink the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:21 and 11:27) "cup" is used metonymically, as every one should know, and as Clark admitted, saying, "How can one 'drink this cup?' By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (See Clark-Harper Debate.)

THE TRUTH FUND

Brethren at Greenfield, N. M.	\$8.00
C. D. Moore	1.00
Bob Musgrave	1.00
J. D. Perkins	2.00
Ira B. Kile	3.00
A Sister	1.00

I am sending you five dollars to help publish "The Truth." I sure do love a paper that is not afraid to publish both sides. Yes, Bond got space in the Apostolic Way, not without cost, and you may too if you keep after them for five years, as I did before I got a hearing—some dragging.—A. J. Bond.

"Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil."—Jesus. And that is why it is so hard to get people interested in Primitive Christianity.

"When the Digressives play an instrument they do not do one thing that Christ commanded, for playing is not singing."—E. C. Fuqua.

And when you brethren organize the church into classes in order to teach them, you do not do one thing that Christ commanded when He said, "Go teach" (Matt. 28:19), for organizing classes is not teaching, nor a method of teaching, you see.

"Truth bows to no human shrine; she seeks neither praise nor applause; she asks only a hearing."—Selected.

Acc. Filantees St. 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.

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, FEBRUARY 15, 1930

No. 4

"THE TRUTH'S" FALSEHOOD

There is no pleasure in being misrepresented, even though it is done innocently and unintentionally; but when done against light and knowledge and evidently out of maliciousness, it is all the more grievous and mischievous. Bro. H. C. Harper, of Sneads, Fla., publishes a little paper which he has wrongly named "the TRUTH." A name truer to form would be, The FALSIFIER; for I doubt if as many false statements and misrepresentations can be found in the same space anywhere else. The paper is devoted to raising all the trouble among the churches of Christ possible over "the one cup" in the Communion, and separating the young from the older and more advanced ones for Bible study on Lord's day mornings. To do nothing in and for the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is the sin, the damning sin, of the unconverted, and a genuine Conversion is a turning to a life of constant activity in the service of the Lord. But in the very nature of the case, it is wonderfully easy to convince some supposed converts to Christianity that they should do nothing toward advancing the Cause of Christ after they get out of the water safely and get their dry clothes on. Such can be made to think they can see sin in studying the Word of the Lord. Absenting themselves from the house of the Lord for months and even years at a time, slipping from under all obligations to help bear the burden of putting a new roof on the church house, having it painted outside or inside, insured, and the expense of protracted meetings, etc., etc., are acts of real righteousness in their estimation apparently, compared with meeting at the church house on Sunday mornings and engaging in a season of sensible study of some portion of God's word, or having more than one vessel in the Communion. These are "turribul" sins; but raising their families for hell and traveling that road themselves, is no sin! The worst sin any people can be guilty of, in their estimation, is to engage in a period of Bible study at the "meetin' house" on Sunday. Why, don't everybody know that the Lord positively forbade to study His Word? Harpers misnamed "Truth" is engaged in creating and feeding just such sentiment toward the Lord's work as that.

Remarks

The foregoing is from the pen of Ira C. Moore, editor of the Christian Leader, who was so thoroughly whipped by Bro. J. D. Phillips in the Sunday School debate in Charleston, W. Va., that he is yet smarting under his defeat; and especial-

ly so since Harper was there to moderate for Phillips and challenged Moore to debate the use of the cups in the communion. While Moore would have it that we are doing nothing, it is evident that it is because we are uncovering his religious crookedness when measured by the word of God that is giving him such fits of madness against us and the little paper, "The Truth."

Do you not wonder why he did not show us some of those "many false statements and misrepresentations"? The truth is he could not find "the wherewith to do with," and deliberately falsified on "the little paper" to create prejudice against it. They are too cowardly even to exchange with us. They fear exposure. They dare not meet us in the open before the brotherhood on their use of CUPS and the Sunday School (the Leader's own name for the thing). Bro. Moore will call on the organ and society brother to meet him on these things; but when we call on Moore to meet us on the digressions advocated by the Leader, he gets mad and skulks off to his den out of danger. O, that "turribul" man Harper and that "turribul" little paper The Truth. O, how "turribul" it is that we can not close the mouths of the brethren any more by keeping them out of the Leader. And now you can see why they rave so against the "turribul" little paper, "The Truth", and stigmatize it the FALSIFIER, and falsify when they do it. Why, if they could meet us in "a fair field and no favors" on these things, they would jump at the job, and all men of sense know it. And here we again see the old saying is true that "Fools vilify; but thinkers argue." They have no argument, so they play the part of fools. Ira C. Moore is too big a coward to meet a kitten. We have a few old numbers of the Leader that we have saved for him. But we can not hope to do these leaders any good. They "wipe their mouths" and go right on in their vile digressions from the word of God, and say, "We have done nothing wrong." If it matters not just so we "study His word," why does not Moore take the Christian Endeavor Society? The first article we wrote in the first issue of the Apostolic Way in 1913, was in reply to Moore's article in defense of the Sunday School, and he has never ventured to meet us on it. We say he is a religious coward. We could, with just as much truth, which is none at all, say he objects to "Bible study" because he objects to the Christian Endeavor, as he can because we object to his Sunday School," the Leader's own name for the thing. Now open up the Leader and let us turn on the light if you dare. But you dare not, since "Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." —Ed.

THE CAUSE OF DIVISION

By P. G. Wright, Corinth, Miss.

A man must stand for something.

The class appealed to is one who wants the truth. Division is a sad picture. One to be deplored by all good men. Christ prayed for unity. Jno. 17:20, 21. There was unity in the apostolic days. The standard was the word of God then. Why not together now? Nothing in the New Testament caused division. It was caused by something on the outside. We should give up all on the outside. The effect would be unity. It would eliminate all human churches to the number of over 200 according to the federal bureau. Those who bring in that which causes division are wrong. Let the church do the work. The Lord and all said this is in the New Testament age. Men wanted organized effort. They gradually departed from the New Testament worship. They developed the Roman church. The reformers failed to reform this institution. Many denominations grew out of it. They have creeds, disciplines, manuals, etc., and wear names not in New Testament order or afairs. There is a difference between God's and man's way. We should be true to God and the church, perform the worship God says perform. Worship should not please us, but God. We make it nothing when we turn it into entertainment. This is true of the Lord's Supper. Singing, prayer. Look at the churches who entertain. I fear God is not in them. We should reject a thing from principle. Never supplant God's way with man's. God has told us the worship to perform: In the spirit and in truth. He has told the elements to use. We had as well change one as another, as well preach one as another. We are told what to use on the Lord's table, so in singing. The fact that we are told what to use excludes other things. Ice cream, etc., are prohibited when God tells us what to use on the table. The same is true in all worship. The religious world should return to God's way. Be measured by the Gospel. Let's sow the seed sown in the year 33 A. D. We will then have the same crop. —C. L.

A DEAD CHURCH

"And to the angel of the church in Sardis write, these things saith he that hath the seven spirits of God and the seven stars, I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead." Rev. 3:1. That was a grave charge against the church in Sardis, but the same is true in regard to the most of the congregations nowadays. They "have a name to live but are dead."

Church in a scriptural sense is either used in the aggregate or congregational. 1 Cor. 12:13. 1:2. Church is from EKKLESIA, which signifies the called out from the world or chosen of God. Jno. 15:19. 17:6:16. The church at Sardis was a working church but its works were not in keeping with the New Testament teaching. Hence, it was a "dead church". The same can be safely and truthfully said of all other churches of Christ

who are not following the New Testament teaching and practice. Yes, they may have a "name that they are living" and boast much, but be as the above church, "dead". What is true concerning the church in Sardis could be justly said of about all others in those days. Read first, second, and third chapters of Revelation.

To speak of death or being "dead presupposes a cause. Death is a separation. "For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead." Jas. 2:26. Ecel. 12:7. A person, congregation, or church can be dead and alive at the sametime. "But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth." 1 Tim. 5:6. Rev. 3:1.

Sin is the cause of both the "spiritual and common death." Jas. 1:15. Ro. 5:12. Isa. 59:2. A church or person is either dead to sin, and alive unto God, or dead in trespasses and sins, and dead to God. Ro. 6:11; 12. Eph. 2:1:5. Mt. 6:24. I wish to notice a few things which if done or persisted in will kill a congregation or church. "Leaving the first love." Rev. 2:4. The first of anything is usually the best. Hence, "The first fruits, first born, etc." Therefore, to "leave the first love" is leaving the best. The church that has left its "first love" may "have a name that it is living but is dead." Hence, for a congregation to "leave its first love" means death to it.

"Love is the bond of perfectness." Col. 3:14. Then a church can not be perfected without love, thus it would die. The church is not to "love the world, neither the things that are in the world." 1 Jno. 2:15. Jas. 4:4. So "the first love" does not mean the "love of the world" for a church or congregation is forbidden to have such love, and it would die on "the love of the world." "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." 1 Jno. 5:3. A church must have the love of God and "walk in it," Eph. 5:2, to live the spiritual life. "Love is the bond of perfectness." Col. 3:14. "Love is the fulfilment of the law." Ro. 13:8:10. When the love of a congregation begins to "wax cold" it is not long leaving its first love. Thus becomes dead spiritually. This is why so many churches "have a name to live, but are dead." Thus divisions and confusion springs up.

Should husbands and wives retain their "first love" there would be no divorces. Should nations have the love for each other God requires, there would be no wars, etc.

Non-attendance will cause a church or any other institution divine or human to die. Thus it is said, "Not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day drawing nigh." Heb. 10:25. 1 Cor. 16:1:2. This teaching disobeyed means death to a congregation. To neglect these commands will bring death to any church. A congregation failing to use discipline, death will be the result. The orders are, "To purge out the old leaven. Deliver unto Satan. Put away the wicked. Withdraw yourselves. Have no company with him, etc." 1 Cor. 5:5:7:13. 2 Th. 3:6:14. The church that ignores the above

doctrine (and the most of them do) may expect to die ere long. Just as the moral body does when infection or disease is permitted to work or spread through it. Discipline is just about a thing of the past with most congregations. This is why so many "have a name to live but are dead." Yes, "Twice dead." Those who preach and practice discipline nowadays are not in demand, but almost isolated. Jealously if allowed to work in a congregation means death to it. It is said, "Jealousy is cruel as sheol, the flashes thereof are flashes of fire." Song of Solomon 8:6. Here we are told that "jealousy is cruel and that the flashes are flashes of fire." Either cruelty of fire or both will cause death. Hence, a congregation full of jealousy is dead. "Jealousy is the rage of a man and he will not spare in the day of vengeance." Pro. 6:34. Thus a church full of jealousy is dead although it may "have a name that it is living." Jealousy is a "work of the flesh." Gal. 5:20. And to live after the flesh is death." Ro. 8:13. Therefore when jealousy after the flesh works in and through a church it will kill it. This has broken up many a home as well as church, caused many to kill themselves or some one else to kill them. It has caused many a soul to be lost. Many sleepless and lonely nights, sorrow and distress. No wonder God said, "Jealousy is a rage, cruel as sheol, and its flashes are as fire." Unscriptural elders or bishops those are the kind the most of the congregations have. Usually those who are not qualified are the ones that want to work in on a political line or scheme. When such characters rule a church, it may "have a name that it liveth, but is dead." Paul, speaking along this line, said, "I know that after departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock, and from among your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away the disciples after them." Acts. 20:29:30. See also Titus 1:16. 2 Tim. 3:5:7. To permit the above parties to have charge of a church or congregation, it is sure to die. A church or congregation is far better off without such persons than to have them trying to "use the office of Bishops." 1 Tim. 3:1. These are only a few of the many things which will kill or cause churches to die. I shall notice the other side next.

—Joseph Miller,
1004 N. Lambert Street
Brazil, Indiana.

WORDING OF A PROPOSITION

Proposition No. 1—A Church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent, that is all he will have to do communion of the blood and body of Christ.

Proposition No. 2—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 Lord's supper.

I will affirm the first proposition if anyone will deny it. I will deny the last one if anyone will affirm it.

Let us get all the light on this question that can be had while it is up for discussion. The ancient order needs restoring as it has been lost for ages. Let us bring it back in name, form and design. Then and not until then will we have peace and growth with the Christ life in the assembly. —Jas. T. White.

Remarks

We suppose Bro. White objects to the term "The Lord's supper" for the "communion of the blood and body of Christ." But if the affirmant should define the term "the Lord's supper" as "the communion of the blood and body of Christ" Bro. White would be at his "row's end," for the affirmant is allowed to define the terms of his proposition. And since the proposition does not state the point at issue, we suggest that Bro. White write another, or better still, it seems to us, write an article or two, and give us "the ancient order."

We have stood for "Bible things by Bible names" in the restoration; and this is evidently right; so turn on the light, Bro. White.—Ed.

With the foregoing before us let us examine "The Remarks."

Yes, Brother, you are right in your supposition that the phrase "the Lord's supper" is what Bro. White objects to, it being the only difference in the wording from the one I offered to affirm. I care not how the affirmant defines Prop. No. 2. That is his business. But I am ready to do just what I said with anyone who cares to take the job. If he can make his proposition stand up and speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent, that is all he will have to do to put me to my "row's end." And I will be on the ground to see if he can do it. If he can, then we can both speak the same thing and be of the same mind and judgment.

Paul besought all that were called to the "fellowship," or "communion" to do this so there would be no divisions among them. Read 1 Cor. 1:9-10. As I understood it that is the mission of "The Truth" to bring about a pure speech and put a stop to divisions in our fellowship or the family of God.

As Bro. Harper has suggested that I write an article or two on the name of the ordinance I want to say just here to all readers of "The Truth" that I am now writing the notes for a tract or book on the Communion to cover form (manner), design (or purpose), name (or what to call it). I have promised Bro. Harper to send in some of the manuscripts as I get them ready for the printer.

I hope to complete it this winter so you may look for something on the name. As to turning on the light, I am always ready to turn on all that I have and I want all that I can get from others. I am ready to let the Word enter, as the Psalmist said that was the way we got it—Ps. 119:130.

Yours for sound speech that cannot be condemned—Tit. 2:8.

—Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, FloridaJ. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL BREVITIES

By J. D. Phillips

"Twelve times hell is translated from the Greek word *gehenna*, which simply means 'valley of Hinnom', which was a valley west of Jerusalem where refuse of the city was destroyed with fire and brimstone; hence the Jews and our Lord Jesus used the word *gehenna* (or valley of Hinnom) to symbolize utter destruction beyond recovery by resurrection."—"The Golden Age" (Russellite).

This would be amusing if it were not for the fact that most people take such assertions to be the truth. What does the word *gehenna* mean? Let us turn on the light.

Webster says, "Hell. . . 2. Place or state of punishment for the wicked after death; the abode of evil spirits;—answering to *Gehenna* and *Tartarus*." Can the editor of "The Golden Age" correct Webster on the meaning of English? Let him try it.

Berry says (Lexicon, page 21), "*GEHENNA*, place of punishment in the future world, Matt. 10:28."

Liddell and Scott, after explaining that the word in classic Greek referred to the Valley of Hinnom where fires were continually kept burning and where children were sacrificed to Moloch, give its New Testament meaning (and that is what we should be interested in learning), saying, "*Gehenna*, . . . in N. T. the place of everlasting torment, hell-fire hell, Matt. 5:22; 29; Mark 9:43, etc." (Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, p. 287).

Robinson says (Lexicon, page 150), "*GEHENNA*, the place of punishment in Hades or the world of the dead." He then explains the relation of the word to the Valley of Hinnom, as do Liddell and Scott, and he says, "By an easy metaphor the Jews transferred the name to the place of punishment in the other world, the abode of demons and the souls of wicked men."—Ibid.

J. H. Thayer, the standard authority on the meaning of N. T. Greek, says, "and then this name (*Gehenna*) was transferred (from the Valley of Hinnom) to that place in Hades where the wicked after death will suffer punishment: Matt. 5:22, 29, sq.; 10:28; Luke 12:5," etc.

Can the editor of "The Golden Age" correct Berry, and Liddell and Scott, and Robinson, and Thayer on the meaning of Greek? Let him try it!

"In the New Testament the word 'hell' is translated in one case from the Greek word *tartaroo*, which word the Apostle Peter (2 Pet. 2:4) does not apply to human being at all."—"The Golden Age." The editor made this statement in answer to the request—"Please explain the meaning of the word 'hell'."

Peter says, "God did not spare the angels that sinned, but having confined them in *Tartarus* with Chains of Thick darkness, delivered them over into custody for Judgment." And "angels" here is translated from *aggeloi* in Greek, and means messenger, and is so translated in the interlinary work of the Emphatic Diaglott. And hence, it can refer to human beings. But what does the word "*Tartarus*", translated "hell" in the King James Version, mean? We have quoted Webster's definition; now we quote the Greek scholars.

Berry says, "*TARTAROO*" to thrust down to *Tartarus*, (*Gehenna*), 2 Pet. 2:4."—Lexicon, p. 98.

Robinson says (Lexicon, p. 101), "*TARTAROO*, a verb formed from *Tartarous*, *Tartarus*, which in Greek mythology was the lower part or abyss of Hades, where the shades of the wicked were imprisoned and tormented." And he adds, "In N. T. *Tartaroo* to thrust down to *Tartarus*, i. q. to cast into *Gehenna*, 2 Pet. 2:4."—Ibid.

Liddell and Scott define it, thus: "*Tartarus*, a dark abyss, as deep below Hades, as earth is below heaven. . . Later *Tartarus* was either the nether world, generally, like *Aides*; or the regions of the damned." Again: "*Tartaroo*, to hurl or cast into *Tartarus*, N. T."—Lexicon, p. 1469.

Thayer (Lexicon, p. 615): "*Tartaroo* (*Tartaros*, the name of a subterranean region, doleful and dark, regarded by the ancient Greeks as the abode of the wicked dead, where they suffer punishment for their evil deeds; it answers to the *Gehenna* of the Jews, see *geenna*); to thrust down to *Tartarus*; to hold captive in *Tartarus*."

"In the New Testament also the word 'hell', or *hades*, is the same as the grave in which the dead lie in the unseen condition, because buried."—"The Golden Age."

The editor of "The Golden Age" is wrong again, as usual. See here:

"*Ades*, the invisible world, *Hades*, Luke 16:23." Berry's Lexicon, p. 3.

"The invisible world" is the "grave", is it? Not by a long way. See:

"*Ades*, . . . in N. T. the world or abode of the dead, *hades*."—Robinson's Lexicon, p. 12.

Thayer says that in Homer's writings *Hades* means not to be seen; and hence it is out of sight. And this cannot mean the grave, as the Russellites teach, for a grave is clearly visible. But hear Thayer's definition. Here it is. Read it:

"The nether world, the real of the dead."—P. 11. Again: "the infernal regions, a dark (Job 10:21) and dismal place."—Ibid. Again: "the common receptacle of disembodied spirits: Luke 16:23."—Ibid.

Now let the editor of "The Golden Age" grapple with these definitions, and show us where these eminent Greek and English scholars are wrong, or else give up his contention that there is no hell for the wicked, and that *hades* always means the grave.

From the foregoing it is certain that *Hades* is an intermediate state—a place where the spirits of the dead, both righteous and wicked, spend their time between death and the resurrection: the wicked in one apartment, and the righteous in another called "Abraham's bosom." See Luke 16:19-31; Acts 2:27; Rev. 6:8.

It is also certain that *Gehenna* is a place of eternal punishment of the wicked in the world of the damned—"the lake that burns with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 20:11-15); "the *Gehenna* of fire" (Matt. 18:9). The wicked reach this place after death.

This article also shows that the Russellites are not only not close students of the Bible, but that they are reckless asserters; and that their system is a form of infidelity, for they do not believe what the Bible says about the damnation of the wicked. And hence they are not "International Bible Students," as they claim; but "International" Gospel Perverters and Soul Destroyers!

"It is absurd to suppose that God would perpetuate Adam's existence in torment for any kind of a sin which he could commit."—"Pastor" Russell in "Bible Studies."

This may look "absurd" to the self-styled "Pastor" of the "Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society" of "The International Bible Students' Association"; but it does not look "absurd" to a disciple of Christ. It is not injustice, as some sophisticated ministers of Satan teach, for God to send sinners and hypocrites to hell: it is what they deserve. God has set life and death before us, and pleads for us to accept eternal life. And if we are lost it is our own fault. Now read Matt. 25:41: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Now read Matt. 25:46: "And these (sinners) shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." It is the "Pastor's" teaching that is "absurd" heresy: not the teaching of the Bible.

"The theory of eternal punishment is inconsistent with the statements that 'the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all,' and that Christ 'died for our sins.'"—"Pastor" Russell,—Ibid.

It is not "inconsistent"; there is nothing "inconsistent" in the Bible, sir: the Bible is harmonious. Hence, the teaching that "He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16) is harmonious with every other oracle in the Bible. "Christ 'died for our sins'" and "the Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all,"—of course he died—but this does not make him a Savior of those who do not want to be saved. He "is not

willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance;" but if sinners do not "come to repentance" they "shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3,5).

The greatest "inconsistency" I know anything about is Russellism—the system of Infidelity and Gospel Perversion that calls itself "The International Bible Students' Association."

"Neither is there any fire and brimstone in sheol, *hades*, or hell."—"The Golden Age."

But since we are taught to "let God be true and every man a liar" we intend to believe what God says and let Him "be true" and you, Mr. Editor, are the "liar." Here it is in plain English: "to be cast into hell fire" (Matt. 18:9). "Cast into the lake of fire and brimstone" (Rev. 20:10). "And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire."—Rev. 20:15.

"The dead in *hades* or hell shall be raised up out of it to life to be tried by Christ for eternal life or death during the thousand years of His kingdom."—"The Golden Age."

Now you said it—just like every other gospel perverter! "The proof is better than the assertion," they say. Now prove that there is to be a "thousand years" during which a second chance will be given sinners to repent. Yes, prove it! You can not do it!!

LOS ANGELES DEBATE

Brethren J. D. Phillips, of Montebello, and G. W. Riggs, of Los Angeles, will debate the Sunday School and cups question in Los Angeles, beginning March 31st. The debate will last at least four days. Brother Phillips prefers six days, and we hope Bro. Riggs will be willing to this. Here are the propositions:

"Teaching the Bible in classes is in harmony with Scripture teaching." Bro. Riggs affirms.

"Each congregation of the church of Christ is restricted to the use of one drinking-cup in the Communion." Brother Phillips affirms.

We have not yet decided just where in Los Angeles the debate will be held, but shall decide soon, and make a definite announcement in the paper later.

"The Truth" is a good paper, and we hope it stays with the Bible. We are with you in the fight of faith. The Montebello church uses one cup in the Communion. Keep the good work going, brethren. —C. E. Holifield, Montebello, Calif.

THE TRUTH FUND

Tom E. Smith	\$1.50
Chas. T. Cook	3.76
Bob Musgrave	1.00
J. D. Phillips	3.00
L. I. Gibbs	5.00
E. L. Landon	1.00
Susie Landon	1.00

Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.
Book, Publication and Commercial Printers

ACTS 20 & 7

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, (discoursed with them R. V.) ready to depart on the morrow and continued his speech until midnight." This passage seems to indicate that the disciples came together on the first day of the week for the purpose of breaking bread, and that Paul's preaching was a special treat for them, so that it may be profitable to investigate as to what they would have done beside "breaking bread" if Paul had not been there, and also what else they may have done while Paul was there. Associated with the "breaking bread" are several items in Acts 2:42—"And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." This passage does not tell us how these things were observed. 1 Cor. 14:26 says: "How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." Here "psalms" are added to the list and some light thrown on how the "apostles' doctrine" (teaching) was observed at Corinth.

The "Communion" is regulated in detail in 1 Cor. 11:20-29, while the "fellowship or collection" is regulated in 1 Cor. 16:1 & 2, and the whole of the 14 chapter of 1 Cor. is given over to regulating the part that everyone is expected to take in the worship. Added to this, the fact that every Christian is a priest (1 Pet. 2:5 & 9) and that our offerings are largely "the fruit of our lips" Heb. 13:15, shows that we cannot lightly refuse to serve in this way.

Some have tried to throw out the whole of the 14 chapter of 1 Cor. on the ground that the things there regulated were done thru inspiration; but this argument would throw out all preaching and teaching, as these were both done by inspiration at the first. We are now commanded to "study" (2 Tim. 2:15), and there is nothing in this chapter that may not be done now with a little study and preparation. It seems a little strange that those who think it wrong to follow this chapter on Sunday still think it right to do these things on any night during the week.

Now we will connect the acts of public worship this way: "They continued steadfastly" (Acts 2:42) "upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together" (Acts 20:7), "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store (1 Cor. 16:2). "If therefore the whole church be come together" (1 Cor. 14:23), "when ye come together," 1 Cor. 14:26, "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together," Heb. 10:25. These passages undoubtedly refer to the assembly of the church on the first day of the week and should be studied as a whole.

Now if the church worshiped at all at Troas (Acts 20:7), we have the same reason for believing that they left off the singing, praying, collection, etc., as we have for believing that they left off any other part of the public worship on ac-

count of Paul's being there, because none of these things are mentioned. We will investigate as to what Paul really did at Troas. That he was the chief speaker, we will admit. See Acts 14:12. But in Acts 20:7, the R. V. renders "preach" "discoursed with," which changes the meaning somewhat, while the Greek word here is *dialogomai* from which we get *dialogue* and is usually translated dispute or reasoned with. See Mark 9:34, Acts 17:2, Acts 1:9, etc., while it is only translated "preach" twice in Acts 20:7 & 9. This will suggest that Paul's preaching was more like teaching or instruction with the brethren taking some part at least in so far as to ask and answer questions. This is in harmony with the custom of Christ and the apostles to teach as well as preach. "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom," Mat. 4:23. "And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he sat down, and taught them." John 8:2. "And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." Acts 5:42. Our preachers usually neglect the teaching and confine themselves to preaching.

The great commission as recorded in Mat. 28:19 & 20, says: "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, . . . Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. R. V. This cannot be done by preaching alone. Paul says to Timothy (2 Tim. 2:2): "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, Who shall be able to teach others also." This means that when a preacher leaves a church that he should have so taught and instructed it that it will be able to carry on without him, with its own teachers who have been taught by him to "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Mat. 28:20. The word for "teach" in these passages is from the Greek *didasko* and means the kind of teaching that was done in the Jewish synagogues and is never translated to preach. The method as used in the assemblies on the first day of the week for a large part may be a little different from that ordinarily understood as teaching or preaching. It is classified as prophesying and does not always mean the foretelling of future events. 1 Cor. 14:3 says: "But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." And in the 31st verse we have a positive law on this subject which says: "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." And this "all" means all with some exceptions that may be noticed elsewhere, but nowhere gives all the time over to the preacher.

Neander, the great church historian says in Vol. 1, page 420, "The reading of the scriptures was followed, as in the Jewish synagogue, by short, and originally very simple addresses, in familiar language, the effusion of the heart, which gave an exposition and application of what was read." Further, on page 258: "These presbyters or bishops then, as we variously call the sane func-

tionaries, considered from different points of view, had the general superintendence of the common interest; but the office of teaching was not committed exclusively to them. For, as we have already remarked, all Christians originally had the right of pouring out their hearts before their brethren, and of speaking in the public assemblies for their edification."

THE SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA SAYS: "It may be considered settled, that there is no order of clergy, in the modern sense of the term, in the New Testament; i. e., there is no class of men mentioned to whom spiritual functions exclusively belonged. Every believer is a priest unto God. Every believer has as much right as any body else to pray, to preach, to baptize, to administer communion." Vol. 1, pp. 498.

"Every child of God, by virtue of his birthright into the family of God a family of kings and priests to God has the right to perform any and every service connected with the church of God, limited only by his ability to do it decently and in order. All should be encouraged to take part in the services, and in doing service each manifests his talent for the work and trains himself for fitness in God's work. The congregation is for educating and preparing men for any and all the work God has commanded to his church." David Lipscomb, in the Gospel Advocate, May 31, 1906.

The following is from A. Campbell in Christian Baptist, Vol. 1, Pages 70 & 71: "When the bishop rests from his labors, the church, of which he has the oversight, by his labors, and by the opportunity afforded all the members of exercising their faculties of communication and inquiry in the public assembly, finds within itself others educated and qualified to be appointed to the same good work." "my very soul is stirred up within me, when I think of what a world of mischief of the popular clergy have done. They have shut up every body's mouth but their own: and theirs they will not open unless they are paid for it. This is the plain, blunt fact."

I believe that few today realize fully what was the position of the church of Christ in the days when the pioneer preachers worked so hard and so successfully to restore the New Testament church. The position that I have taken does not differ materially from that taken by A. Campbell, and many others whose Bible learning cannot be questioned; and what is more, it is in harmony with the New Testament teaching of this question.

—T. C. Hawley, Santa Paula, Calif., 218 So. Olive St.

WEDDED TO THEIR IDOLS

A few weeks ago I made a statement that the North American Christian Convention, at their big meeting in Indianapolis, would have no interest whatever in any overtures by any of our brethren looking toward a union. A few of our honest but misinformed brethren have been made to think that these society brethren would consider giving up their practice of innovations, particularly the use of the organ, in order that we

"might be one." I ventured the statement that when these people know this crowd as well as I believe I do, that they will discover that it is a waste of time and effort to expect anything from them. They are absolutely "wedded to their idols" and the only union that will ever be accomplished will be a union with them on their own platform. In proof of the statement I then made I quoted this from the July issue of the Restoration Herald. This is the organ of the Northern Christian Convention and is published by the faculty of the Cincinnati Bible Seminary.

A Friendly Gesture

We are happy to note an interesting incident of Commencement season in our colleges. Hall L. Calhoun, of Nashville, Tenn., delivered the Commencement address before the graduating class of Cincinnati Bible Seminary.

Bro. Calhoun and C. B. S. represent two groups of the Church of Christ who have had no fellowship for many years. They have been divided over non-essentials while holding to the same fundamental faith. Such a condition ought not to be.

May not this friendly gesture mark the beginning of a sincere effort on the part of both groups to actually practice the old motto: "In faith, unity; in opinions, liberty; in all things, love?" We devoutly trust so.

Note carefully in the above that the Herald says "they", which indicates that they consider that the other folks are to blame. Note also the term "non-essentials," a phrase they have been using for fifty years and the use of which indicates their unwillingness to consider it as an essential as our brethren certainly would. So there you have it right from their own literature, and we ought to know from this exactly where they stand and what fellowship we could expect if we attempted to work with them. The motto they quote, "in faith, liberty; in opinions, liberty," is one that has been flaunted by the Christian Evangelist for forty years, which paper is one of the wide-open advocates of widest departures. However, the best lesson is sometimes a little experience, so we earnestly hope that some of our Southern friends will come to Indianapolis in October and see with their own eyes and hear with their own ears.

F. L. R.

Remarks

The foregoing appeared in the Christian Leader for August 16, 1927.

In spite of the fact that Rowe once warned his readers that the Digressives were "absolutely wedded to their idols," and that the "only union that will ever be accomplished will be a union with them on their own platform," he now says, "we are glad to unite with them in any effort to make of the great body of believers a united brotherhood all preaching the same thing."

Note—that Rowe says, "unite with them in any effort." United with them on what, Brother? On their "own platform" to be sure; for you know they are absolutely, "wedded to their idols." Now what will the honest readers of the Leader do?

Will they get down and "lick the dust" from the feet of the "time-serving" Publishers of the Leader, and receive with open arms his "proposal" to "unite" with the Digressives on their "own platform?" Will they?

"A united brotherhood all preaching the same thing." This sounds fine, and O, so lovely! But, "preaching the same thing," means "Preach the Word" without addition, subtraction, or substitution. In other words: "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent." "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God"—principles, which neither the Standard nor Leader live up to. Let all honest brethren, beware of these "Pussy-foot" reformers. The Bible and the Bible alone is the only platform upon which we can have a united brotherhood all preaching the same thing. Rowe admits that "there is some difference in matters of local practice," and I suppose he thinks that by "uniting" with the Digressives that they can "devise" a plan to "detour around" the word of the Lord by "handling the word of God deceitfully" and lead ignorant brethren to believe that the command, not to "go beyond what is written," does not apply to churches today. We invite the honest element among them to "come out from among," and take their stand on the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. You will never be able to lead people out of error as long as you remain in error yourselves. The Leader was once a powerful factor in fighting Digression; but it has lost its influence for good. What can honest brethren hope to accomplish in the way of "Keeping the unity of the Spirit" by supporting a religious paper that "advocates" and "advises" practices that are barriers to true Unity? Think it over Brother. If you are honest we need you; but if you are neither-for-nor-against, a "compromiser," or too "cowardly" or ashamed to be counted along with others who stand firmly for a "Thus saith the Lord" in their faith and practice, just stay where you are; for he that is not with Christ is against him. And this is just as true of the issues today as it was when the Master said it. Our plea is for a union of God's people on the Bible and the Bible alone. Compare this with Rowe's offer to "unite" with the Digressives in "any effort."

We maintain that all the ordinances should be observed as they were in the days of the apostles. Take your Bible and go into some of the churches that the Leader calls "loyal" and compare their practice with that of the first subjects. Make this test, and if you can't find authority in the Bible for the things they practice it is proof that their claim of "loyalty," is absolutely false.

We "beseech you by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" to accept no man's teaching unless it agrees with the teaching and practice of the apostles.—Ira B. Kile.

NOTICE

Bro. A. J. Thompson, Sabinal, Texas, wants a few copies of *The Truth* for May 1, 1929. Send directly to him if you have a copy to spare.—Ed.

A GOOD WORK

"Some brethren don't seem to think it makes any difference (how many cups are used in the Communion) and that God will wink at them as He did in the days of ignorance; but we must keep reminding them of their folly and thus free ourselves from the blood of all men. I hope you may have a prosperous year and do much good writing for "The Truth." Keep the good work going—some are beginning to feel the force of your efforts."—John T. Chambers, Letter of Jan. 13.

Yes, let us push the work, brethren, "redeeming the time for the days are evil." We are pleased with the donations to *The Truth Fund* thus far, and hope that the brethren will keep "pouring in" the donations and subscriptions, for that is what it takes to make the paper go. The Editors donate their time and work on the paper, and we are glad to do it. And this is no light job, either. And it is your duty to support it by your donations and subscriptions. Let every reader of the paper get a new subscriber this week! Send all donations, subscription money, etc., to "*The Truth*," Box 26, Sneads, Fla.—J. D. P.

WHAT THEY SAY

Enclosed one dollar for which send to address given, copies of Nov. 15, 1929 issue of *THE TRUTH* containing the Clark-Harper debate on the CUP question.

If no copies can be had at this time, place the \$1 in the *TRUTH* fund, advising whether copies can be had later.

Seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that called us by his own glory and virtue; (2 Pet. 1:3).

and

Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work. (2 Tim. 3:16,17).

Surely we can

Examine the scriptures, whether these things were so. (Acts 17:11).—For what saith the scripture? (Rom. 4:3).—if any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God; (1 Pet. 4:11).

Examining the scriptures, it furnishes for speech "CUP," "CUP," "CUP," first middle and last, as you have so ably shown in this debate.

Then by reference to Eph. (4:5) one faith, which cometh of hearing the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:17).

Let us all, Hold the pattern of sound words in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. (2 Tim. 1:13). —L. I. Ooley.

TRACTS

Scriptural Baptism by H. C. Harper.....10c
Clark-Harper Discussion on the Cups..... 5c
(Just a few of these left)

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MARCH 1, 1930

No. 5

"YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE"—Rom. 12:1

Number 2

Dear Brother Harper; no difference with us on that which "God directs" as being "reasonable"; but my plea is that an assembly of disciples can be so large, that to use one cup only in passing the wine to them, would be unreasonable service therefore unscriptural; and you have in effect admitted the same; when you spoke of "reducing it by having another meeting place as was done in the primitive time." Now since you agree with me that the assembly could easily become so large that one cup would be out of reason to serve them all; we call upon you and will expect you to give us book, chapter and verse, in the New Testament where the Christians under apostolic guidance ever did as you say. The writings of the early church historians are not sufficient. It will take divine evidence.

I inform you my confidence has not been so shattered by the arguments of the opponents of two or more cups that any old thing thrown in as proof against my views will be accepted. For instance you say, "The king of Israel once reasoned about as you do, 1 Kg. 12:28." This king reasoned to have the people worship idols, and made two calves for them. I reasoned that when the assembly got so large it would be unreasonable, therefore unscriptural, Rom. 12:1, to serve with one cup, we would be justified in the use of a sufficient number of cups to make it reasonable service: while you would advocate the dividing of the assembly to get away from the unreasonableness of one cup only, and you could not "verify" your suggestion if "your life depended on it."

You say one can drink as well as one hundred and discern the Lord's body. I deny it, so you will have to prove it. So all the talk about the priest drinking all the wine and sprinkling for baptism, as my kind of reasoning, is nil. We hinder no one from obeying the command "Drink ye all of it," while your priest drinking all the wine, and sprinkling for baptism, do hinder obedience. So you will have to try again.

But we are advocating an act to overcome the unreasonableness of the use of one cup only by virtue of too large an assembly; while you would advocate a dividing into two or more assemblies for the same purpose; and your plea is just as lacking in divine sanction as ours, to say the least. So I am inclined to believe and think, as I wrote years ago to Bro. Teurman, that I was sorry you and Brother Trott had raised the question of the one cup service, as I did not believe you had suf-

ficient Scriptural grounds to do so. But the question is up, and I now believe it should be dealt with from every feature, phase, and standpoint by honest, God-fearing men. And I admire Brother Harper's fairness and willingness shown along this line.

If I were meeting with Brother Harper, I would not be a party in the introduction of more than one cup; and would continue thus till the membership had outgrown the one cup service; then would be the time to determine by the Scriptures what should be done? This, to my mind, would be keeping the "Unity," and would be one of the most convincing lessons to Brother Harper and those of like view.

"The cup of blessing which we bless," 1 Cor. 10:16. What was the "blessing which we bless?" To my mind it was the "fruit of the vine," for that was the thing they were to drink, and where the communion is commanded, "Drink in remembrance of me," 1 Cor. 11:25; and this is where the blessing is promised. You have the literal cup part of the communion—two items. You step beyond what is written, and try to commune by looking upon, and handling the cup. We commune as we drink the wine, as commanded. Better be careful that you don't add to the Book.—Brotherly, A. J. Bond, Bloomfield, Ia.

Reply

I offered to affirm that a church can use one cup and "Speak where the Bible speaks," but he admitted this. I offered to deny if he would put it "more than one cup," but he admits he would have to speak "where the Bible is silent" to do so. He just wants to write without a proposition, for my review, a few articles in "advocating an act to overcome the unreasonableness of the use of one cup only by virtue of too large an assembly." His first on this line was in our issue of Jan. 15.

With his "the unreasonableness of the use of one cup" in a large assembly is ground for putting in cups, and to this issue I shall adhere. If he is going to let numbers determine our "faith and practice," I can so increase the number of an assembly that no church can function in any, or scarcely any, item required of it in the N. T. Then, to run on a plane "where the Bible is silent" all a church will have to do is to put in "too large an assembly" to function "Where the Bible speaks." Now, maybe he does see a limit. We are compelled, by the ground we take, to "Speak where the Bible speaks" in our "faith and practice," but we are not compelled to meet in assemblies "too large" to thus function.

I gave not only the historian for apostolic practice, but "the Book, chapter and verse. (Rom. 16: 5 and 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. v. 2.) And our "plea" is not "just as lacking in divine sanction" as yours is, not by a long way, for we can "Speak where the Bible speaks" for the use of one cup, as you admit; and you can not for the use of cups.

But you want to know where they, under apostolic guidance, divided an assembly. Just where they put out an organ, brother. Under apostolic guidance, and I speak advisedly here, they did not have the organ, "where the Bible is silent," neither did they have assemblies so large that they could not function in all items as the Bible speaks. But churches that went wrong were called upon to "repent" (Rev. 2 and 3); and we have the same Bible authority for putting the church in condition to "Speak where the Bible speaks" in the Communion that we have for putting out the organ. And if you should come to worship with "Brother Harper," there will be no occasion to put in the cups nor divide the assembly. There are plenty of places to establish congregations, and we will never let the assembly get so numerous that we can not function in, not only the Communion, but every item "Where the Bible speaks." And with your willingness to use one cup, "Where the Bible speaks," there will be perpetual UNITY—thank the dear Savior, who loved the church so much that he died for it, and prayed so fervently "that they all may be one."

But while you admit we can use one cup and "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent," and that you could worship with us, yet you say of our worship, "You step beyond what is written." You seem to know our hearts and what we are "looking upon." You can commune, using one cup, it seems, but we can not. Listen, Bro. Trott well says in his tract (And he challenges you or any other cups advocate to reply to it, and we are mailing one to you), "The wine was already in the 'cup of blessing' used by the Savior and referred to as 'the cup' and 'this cup.'" And you should know that "the fruit of the vine" was not "the cup," but was in "the cup" referred to. "The fruit of the vine" was literal, as well as "the cup" that contained it. And if you want to argue this issue which the cups advocates make, just affirm the proposition that Cowan signed with me in 1925, namely, "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. Or if you will deny that—The word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid, which he denies, do so; and I will meet you unless C. D. Moore, who is now nibbling at it, or Cowan, who has now had more than five years to study it, beats you to it. It will be waiting for you, I feel sure, so let us now stick to the issue on "too large an assembly."

What would you do if you went to the creek and found "too little" water there to baptize, as "the Bible speaks?" To be consistent, you would sprinkle "where the Bible is silent," to be sure, for there is "too little" water. But I say, Arrange

so that you can "Speak where the Bible speaks" in what you do, or do nothing at all. Yes, we tell the "priest" Christ commanded "all" to drink; and we tell you he commanded to drink out of "it", not them, as you have contended.—Ed.

4. Our plea is not as lacking in divine sanction as yours is, for a church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent" with our plea. And it can not do it with your plea for the cups.

METAPHORICAL MUSINGS.

There are different table customs in different parts of our great country, and throughout the world.

As examples, I submit the following: At one table they hand me the rice and say, "Have out rice". They use the same form when offering me any food that is to be handled with a spoon: but if it be "forkable" food, such as fried meat, they say, "Stick out some meat," and if I decline, they insist by saying, "Stick out, stick out!"

At other places I have been, they hand me some food, and say, "Have some of this dish." Where the family is large it is quite common to have two dishes (vessels) with the same kind of food therein, but, according to their custom of thinking and talking, it is but one dish (food).

One morning in New York, the good old brother said: "Now, brother Moore, we have two cups—tea and coffee—which cup will you have?" I said, "Tea, please." He picked up the tea-pot and poured tea into one of the several cups sitting there, and handed it to me. Two others there called for tea and got it, each in a different cup, so there were three of us drinking that cup—tea—from different cups—vessels. And had the good old brother drunk his share out of, or from the pot, would he not been drinking the cup—tea—also?

They called the noon meal "lunch," and water was the "cup", as the brother explained, saying, "we have but one cup." Did he mean that we would all have to drink out of the same cup—vessel? Or did he mean that there was but one liquid to drink, and that was water?

Had he had nothing for us six to drink but "fruit of the vine," that would have been "the cup" he would have given us to drink, from six cups—vessels. Yet he would have said, "Brethren, we have but one cup today: will you all drink of it?" Had he drunk his share out of the bottle would he not been drinking the cup—fruit of the vine—also? Had you been there, would you have gotten the idea that he wanted us all to drink from, or out of the same cup or vessel?

We call a certain food "this dish" while it is yet in the kettle or stewer, and before it is put into a dish or dishes. And we call it "this dish" after it is placed into several dishes on our table.

We call a certain liquid "this cup" while it is yet in the pot or bottle, or pitcher, and before it is poured into our cups, at our table. And we call it "this cup" after it is poured into several cups on our table.—C. D. Moore.

Remarkable, Yes, Remarkable,

But we have promised the "remarks" shall be "easy". He has certainly bordered the ludicrous, whether intentional or not; and were it not for the gravity of the matter under consideration, we could not restrain some touches, at least to ask our daughter, who has finished her course in domestic science, to prepare "this dish" and "get a taste of what "We call a certain food," for just what that "certain" food is, I have no idea now, whether vegetable or meat, soup or solid, sweet or brackish, fresh or stale. And I would order a "cup" just to see what in the name of reason and English I would get to drink, or whether any "drinkable" things at all to go with my "forkable" "this dish," providing it was "forkable." And if it should be, and they tell me to "stick out," I will now know what to do; but I never could have guessed it before the information here given, although I have studied and taught English for years.

Candidly does the brother expect to make such use of English a key to open to us a knowledge of the Bible? He is hard driven for support of his contention if he does. Does he think there is no standard of correctness in the use of New Testament Greek, and English? One would think so from his lingo.

Metaphorical language is figurative language, that is, languages that expresses thought in a different way from the ordinary. But figurative language has well defined limits and laws of usage. And the man who sprinkles water on a person and says of it, "I baptize thee," no more falsifies than does the man who takes wine in a bottle, and says, "We thank thee for this cup." Such a lingo comports with neither reason nor revelation. And all this "cup, container" nonsense, as Dr. Trott said in his reply to Bro. Paden's questions seven years ago, "only shows an absurd lack of knowledge of the use of language." We could easily brook such errors did they not come from those of mature thought with studied intent to combat the truth. Poterion is a cup, it is not wine nor any other liquid; the Greek word means cup. Then why add "container" when this idea is in the word cup? To do so gives a false impression—an impression that cup might be something else than container, in its ordinary use. And when it is used by metonymy it is still cup, not a liquid. Metonymy is the figure of suggestion; and in the kind used with the communion, namely, "the container and its contents," the cup is named to suggest what is in the cup; as, "Drink the cup." Cup is not the name of what is in it. The name of what is in it, in this case, is "the fruit of the vine."

We care not what some ignoramus in New York or any other place said: we want the truth. Alva Johnson repeated what some "beer-guzzler" had said, in his debate with me at Roswell to combat and try to set aside a standard authority on the use of English, as given by me. Such tactics are the stock of deceivers. There is no honesty of purpose in it.

As the old saying goes, we may "call a calf's tail a leg." But that does not make it so by a long way. Slang and "loose speech" can not be brought into this court while I attend it to set aside reliable witnesses.

Would the brother have us believe from his lingo that Jesus did not have the fruit of the vine in the cup?

He says, "We call it (a certain liquid) 'this cup' after it is poured into several cups on our table." Yes, just as an ignoramus calls a calf's tail a leg. "Talk" is cheap. You can not do it by any law of language—literal or figurative. If the liquid is in cups, you may, by the figure metonymy, suggest it to the mind by naming the cups, but not cup. Please state the law of language by which you are able to do as you say and not talk nonsense. And while you are hunting, just give us the law of language by which you call a liquid in a bottle a cup. I know you can call a bottle a cup, just as an ignoramus calls a calf's tail a leg, but that is to talk nonsense: there is no law of language for it. It might suit the Hottentot.

"Water was the cup." The brother explained. Very well; now you explain to our readers that "water was the cup" and maybe we can learn it. Water is not, was not, and never will be the cup, until language turns a somerset. Water that is in a cup may be suggested to the mind by the figure metonymy by naming the cup that holds it.

Thayer says: "by meton. of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup," p. 533. If the contents are in a cup, the cup is named to suggest the contents by metonymy; if in a bottle, the bottle is named; if in a jug, the jug is named, etc. And if in cups, cups are named. To pick up vulgarisms and scant expressions, and press them into use here is but to admit that by no law of language can your contention be maintained. When we were children at home, we used to call raisins bugs, but to use such cant in a public way would be nonsense. Moreover, it is the N. T. meaning, as in baptism, that settles the matter, and not even what is good modern English. And to expedite the matter, we ask Bro. Moore to affirm the first or deny the second of these propositions to which J. N. Cowan affixed his name more than five years ago, but has backed off from: 1. "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; H. C. Harper denies. 2. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. H. C. Harper affirms; J. N. Cowan denies. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." I am ready. The paper is open to you.—Ed.

TRACTS

Scriptural Baptism by H. C. Harper.....10c
Clark-Harper Discussion on the Cups..... 5c
(Just a few of these left)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

John says (Rev. 13:18): "Here is wisdom. Let him that has understanding count the number of the Beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is 666."

A brother in Oklahoma, who once heard me preach on "The Two Beasts of Rev. 13" writes:

"Do the Roman Catholics admit that their Pope is Anti-Christ and that he wears the number 666? If they do not, how do they answer the argument you make when you show that the Pope does wear that number?"

Of course they deny that the Pope is Anti-Christ. To admit that he is Anti-Christ is to admit that they are an apostate church, and that they are not "the only holy, apostolic, catholic church of Christ" as they claim.

I have read a great deal after the Catholics and the only attempt I have ever read where they tried to meet the argument on the number of the Beast being worn by the Pope is in their "Question-Box" written by Conway. Some one wrote:

"Your Pope is Anti-Christ. Does he not wear the number 666 in his belt—the number of the Beast?" To this question, Mr. Conway replied:

"My questioner has fallen far behind his intelligent Protestant brethren, who reject as mere raving this old-time absurdity. Luther was the first to set the fashion when he wrote his pamphlet *Against the Execrable Bull of Anti-Christ*."—Question Box, p. 210.

Now since John said for those who have understanding to "count the number of the Beast," why did not Mr. Conway do this, and show us where we are wrong in thinking that the Pope is Anti-Christ? Why does he keep such a good thing in a corner? When Alexander Campbell made this argument in his debate with Bishop Purcell, the Bishop answered: "If he will give me the time to decipher him, I will find the number 666 in the name of Alexander Campbell." Campbell answered: "If you can, I will give up the argument." The Bishop failed.

Mr. Conway says the "intelligent Protestant brethren reject as mere raving" the idea of the Pope wearing the number 666. But I wonder if he thinks that Martin Luther, Alexander Keith, Adam Clarke, Philip Y. Pendleton, et al, were not

intelligent. Adam Clarke figured out the number 666 from the Greek words *E Latine Basileia*—the Latin Kingdom.

Alexander Keith says: "The Beast had a name, a number and a mark (Rev. 13:18; 15:2), and his number is six hundred three score and six. (Among the Hebrews and Greeks all the letters were numerals, or equivalent to figures, which were not in use among them). Three different designations being given, three corresponsive words, instead of one, as has been generally sought, seem to be required. The Beast was first described by Daniel; and in Hebrew characters *Romiith* (Roman), agreeing with *Beast* or kingdom, contains the precise number, or that of his name; while *Lateinos*, the number of his name, 'which is the number of a man,' and *Apostates*, the mark, the brand of the apostacy, both fatally contain the prophetic number."—Keith on the Prophecies, p. 394.

He then gives these three words, the first in Hebrew and the other two in Greek, and figures out the number from each of them as follows. (As our printer is not prepared to set the type in Hebrew and Greek, I will spell the words in English, giving the numerical value of each letter, as they are counted in Hebrew and Greek).

The Name:	The No. of His Name:	The Mark:	
R equals 200	L equals 30	A equals 1	
o equals 6	a equals 1	p equals 80	
m equals 40	t equals 300	o equals 70	
i equals 10	e equals 5	st equals 6	
i equals 10	i equals 10	a equals 1	
th equals 400	n equals 50	t equals 300	
	o equals 70	e equals 8	
	s equals 200	s equals 200	
Total 666	Total 666	Total 666	

Thus the Pope is shown to be Anti-Christ; and the Catholic Church, the Apostate Church.

I have before me a tract called "Gematria" written by Robert R. Hull. He says (p. 25):

"But more interesting than all this is the 'number of the Beast.' . . . As stated in our previous article some of our English letters are sometimes used as numerals, as I, 1; V, 5; X, 10, etc. As the inscription on the cross was written in Latin, Hebrew and Greek, let us first count the number in Latin, giving each letter its valuation: 'Vicarius Filii Dei,' vicar of the Son of God, is one of the Pope's chief titles. Some say it is on his triple mitre." He then shows that: V equals 5; i, 1; c, 100; i, 1; v, 5; i, 1; l, 50; i, 1; i, 1; D, 500; i, 1—making a total of 666. A, r, s, e, and f have no numerical valuation.

Robert R. Hull was an influential preacher of the gospel at the time he wrote this tract in 1918. But four years later, or in 1922, he joined the Roman Catholic Church, and is now one of their leading writers. We would like to see him answer his own argument on the Pope wearing the number of the Beast. Some time after his deflection into Catholicism, C. W. Sommer said of him:

"Let Robert Hull be counted null; This is a sad, sad story: For Romish gold he sold his soul To land in Purgatory."

ERRATA: Some time ago I quoted in these columns from Bro. Ira C. Moore in the Leader as follows: "Neither let any one legislate the law. . . that each congregation should join more than one group." "Join" should have been "form."

In our issue for Feb. 1, col. 2, page 4, line 21 from the bottom of the page, I said "Matt. 26:28" when I should have said Matt.26:27.—J.D.P.

"I cannot get the consent of my mind that being baptized in order to obtain the remission of sins is Scriptural."—Guy E. Pound in *The Baptist and Commoner*, Ben M. Bogard's paper.

Well, Mr. Pound, I wonder if you can "get the consent of" your mind that the Baptism preached by Peter on the Day of Pentecost "is Scriptural?" If you can, you should have no difficulty in getting the consent of your mind "that being baptized in order to obtain the remission of sins is Scriptural:" for Peter said, "Reform and be immersed, every one of you, by the authority of Jesus Christ IN ORDER TO the remission of sins."—Acts 2:38, L. O. Tr.

The design of baptism is "for the remission of sins" as all admit. But the question is: Does "for" in Acts 2:38 mean because of or in order to? The answer to this question can be learned, beyond a shadow of a doubt, by consulting the Greek Text, where the preposition *eis*, translated for, unto, with a view to, in order to, etc., in the English versions is used. Young's Analytical Concordance says, "For, with a view to, *eis*. Acts 2:38." Thayer, the highest Greek authority on earth, says, "*Eis* athesin amartion, to obtain the forgiveness of sins, (Acts 2:38)." And this should settle the matter with all who believe the Bible. And if Mr. Pound believes the Bible he should lose no time in getting "the consent of my (his) mind that being baptized in order to obtain the remission of sins is Scriptural."

A GREAT WORK BEFORE US

I appreciate very much the article of Bro. White concerning the paper, and I am sure all the brethren that want nothing but the truth of God on all subjects, do admire what he has said. I can see much of its peaceful work among the churches. They have learned the truth of the Bible on the cup question, and the advocates of the cups have learned that "the little sheet so-called *The Truth*" did not die, and was not "born to die," and was born "in due time" to head off the grand rush in digression led by a few preachers bent on catering to the big churches. And it has taken all the fight out of "Bob" Duckworth, who has become so loving, and friendly with digression that he can easily practice in the worship what he admits he can not defend by the Bible, just like the organ and the Sunday School

digressives. And the brethren can now see that he doesn't stand on the Bible any more; but he has become popular, so much that he can "mix it" and hold the reins where others who had a conscience could not.

Yes, brethren, we have a great work now before us in teaching all "the way of the Lord." So let us keep the paper going, and right in the front on the "firing line" all the time. The brothers and sisters are now seeing things that they could not see two years ago with a magnifying glass, and I am glad to see the brethren lining up for the truth as soon as they see how matters are going. A great rush will be made for the churches by the College men soon to "bluff, brag, or borrow" every penny they can get their hands on, not for the church for which the Redeemer died, but for the College, salaries and sports of the College craze, and high-sounding titles with empty heads and bent on following the President in things they "can not defend" by the Bible. They will come your way with a sweet, sweet smile for your money, all they can beg, borrow or bluff from the brethren. Think what it means to see the cause of Christ suffer by work they admit to be wholly secular. Why do not our farmers go out preying upon the brethren for money for implements, houses, barns, feed, money to pay overseers and other helpers? Must a private enterprise be saddled upon the churches besides their obligation to "sound out" the word and build up the church. Brethren, think it over.

We plead for the Cause of Christ and his church. Let us make it possible with what little means we have to spare from our living to so build the church that it will be a light to the world. Make it possible for Brother Harper to go on with the work of the church. We are glad that Bro. Phillips is willing to give of his time and energy in helping to edit the paper. It means much thought and worry to do this, so let every true Christian make a greater effort this year if possible so the burden will not fall so heavily in the few willing ones. Send in your renewal. See others and ask them to take the paper. Hand out copies. Send it to a friend. Subscribe for a year if you can. If not, take it six months for fifty cents, or three months for twenty-five cents. Donate to *The Truth Fund* all you can. It is all for the church Christ died to save. With love, Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

THE COMMUNION OR JOINT PARTICIPATION

What Should It Be Called?

We first see how our Lord set forth this new institution and who it was that ate of it with Him. To best understand any institution we should begin our study with the origin or beginning of the institution itself. We will proceed by quoting Matt. 26:19-21:

Verse 12: "And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the pass-over."

Verse 20: "Now when the even was come, He

sat down with the twelve."

Verse 21: "And as they did eat, He said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you will betray me."

We can see from the scriptures given above that the purpose of the assembly was to eat the pass-over supper, an institution to symbolize His death that was very near. Assembling to eat a symbolic supper would be of no use after the symbol had passed into the reality of His death. With this last passover the last symbolic institution of His death passed forever there being no further need to observe one.

"We will now quote our Lord's own words that brought the new institution into being. Matt. 26: 26-28: "And as they were eating Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take eat, this is my body. And He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying Drink ye all of it: For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

Mark's account being almost the same as the foregoing in Matthew, we will omit, and give that of Luke, it being somewhat different. Beginning with Luke 22:14: "And when the hour was come He sat down, and the twelve apostles with him." Verse 15: "And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:" Verse 16: "For I say unto you, I will not anymore eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Verse 17: "And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves:" Verse 18: "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." Verse 19: "And He took bread and gave thanks, and brake it and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me." Verse 20: "Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you."

Luke here adds "after supper;" Matthew, "while they were eating." Luke mentions dividing the cup in while the supper there states what happened after the supper. We get this by reading the statements from both writers. Thus, when the Lord took bread and followed it with "likewise" and stated that supper was over, it must have ended the passover and the new institution came into being immediately.

Now, what did they have? A new institution to eat. It could not be a symbolic supper of His death as the passover supper was that; or Lord's supper to show forth his death. They had already eaten the passover supper with him for that purpose. If that had been the purpose of this institution it would have been fulfilled when He died. Seeing He went right on to trial and crucifixion and they saw it all take place.

The Lord did not name the new institution but He did tell separately what the bread (loaf) and cup were that were in the institution, or that made it up. What did he form? A communion; a fellowship; a joint participation. In what? The bread, His body; the cup, His blood of the new agreement, formed with the apostles in jointly

participating with them and in each of them. Three in all, two in number, the fruit of the vine was joined in the cup, sanctified together, set apart that way for them to handle and drink from.

Thus we see that the foregoing scriptures show what went out of form with the old covenant and what came into form with the new. As we get no new name for the newly formed thing here, we shall have to look further on for the name when we find it in general use by both Jew and Gentile. So we go to 1 Cor. 10:16 and hear Paul call its name, "The cup of the blessing which we bless, Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Paul uses familiar terms here like all understood that it was the communion of the Lord's blood and body or that there was no one simple enough to dispute it and call the cup and bread anything else but what he called it. (Paul only told what the Lord had put into being.)

For the benefit of some we will here examine the original word, "Koinonia," from which we get our English translations. The definition is, "A communion, a fellowship, a joint participation." Is not that what the Lord had with His apostles when he and they ate and drank it together on the night in which He was delivered up? If the foregoing be true, and it is, do we not get our fellowship with each other, and with Him, and with the apostles in the bread, the body; the cup, the blood of the new agreement?

This article is to be followed by others on the name of the new institution. I am now writing a pamphlet on the communion question, setting out its name, form and design.

—Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

A CRITICISM

In *The Truth* of Jan. 1, Bro. Smith tried to prove that Jesus ate of the bread and drank of the cup of the communion. He said, "If I can prove that Christ partook of the cup, I am sure every one will agree that he ate of the bread." He has failed to prove that Christ drank of that cup. His only proof is inference, which is no proof. Jesus's saying "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," is no proof whatever that he either ate of the bread or drank of the cup. One might offer me a cup of water, and I could refuse to drink it, and say, "I will not drink water henceforth until I get to the river." Certainly no one would think that I drank of that cup of water.

Matthew, Mark, and Luke all say that after he gave thanks for the cup, he gave it to the disciples. If he had drunk of that cup, surely some or all of them would have mentioned it, since he was giving them an example to be followed after he was gone. The expression "And as they were eating," means nothing more than they were yet at the table, since Luke and Paul both say it was after supper, Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25. Paul says after he had supped, that is, after he had eaten his supper.

"WIRES CROSSED"

"The freaks of the human mind are many and various, as well as surprising, and in many cases, amazing. I suppose that the most of us get our wires crossed sometimes by forgetting at one time what we taught at another, or fail to see what bearing our teaching at one time has on some of our other positions."—Ira C. Moore, C. L. Jan. 1, 1929.

Bro., you deny that you have been "inconsistent" in your "teaching", and get rather "huffy," and "het" up, when any one tells you about it; we are submitting some samples of your "teaching" on the "woman question," Verbotim, so you can see and "be convinced", by your own "convincing." March 11, 1924. In reply to the question: "Is it right for a woman to teach in public?" Moore says, "All the teaching of the Bible is against the practice of woman speaking in public."

March 29, 1927. Moore says, "The Bible is not "silent," but "speaks" "on the question of the women speaking in the public assembly." "A writer occasionally may have advocated "Equal rights" for the sisters in the worship; but such has never been advocated editorially in the Leader.—

March 12, 1929. In reply to the question, "Is it right for a woman to teach in an assembly of Christians? Moore says, "As we now use the word "teach," and if the most advancement can be made in scriptural knowledge, and she can do so without neglecting or forsaking the duties imposed on her by her child-bearing," Yes."—"teaching" now is not doing what the Corinthian women were attempting to do."

Referring to 1 Cor. 14: 31-35, Moore once said, "If these scriptures can be reasoned away so as not to mean that women are not to "keep silent" in the churches, then I know of no command of God that cannot be set aside,—better stay by the Book." Moore says, "debating is good, healthy exercise and lots of fun." Very good. Now, if the readers of the Leader have any confidence in Moore, just put him up, and lets have a discussion of the "woman question," yes, and the "cup question" too, so Moore can have some "exercise." As little boys are wont to say, "we double-dare ye!"

The brethren at Sistersville have "Sunday skulitis," and those at Pursley are trying to "ketch it;" maybe they will put Moore up to debate the "Sunday school" question, and "cup question" with H. C. Harper. Will you? Bro. Rice, Tracy, and Eddy? How about it, Bro. Kelch? Are you still opposed to the brethren at Pursley hearing the truth on these questions? We are waiting.

—Ira B. Kile.

D. D. Lunsford, Bloomfield, La. — Listen, brethren. God never left anything to man concerning the government of his church. "For unto us a child is born: unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders."

But these cup people want to take some of the burden from the shoulders of Christ, it seems. But Paul says that whatever is without Faith is

Jesus did not tell his disciples to sup or sip, but to "drink." Luke 22:17, 18 says, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come."

Jesus's body was broken when the nails were driven through his hands and feet; also when his side was pierced.

I have tried to be kind, though plain. I have nothing but kind feelings for Bro. Smith, as I have heard that he is a young preacher who is contending for the faith.—A. J. Jernigan, box 523, Elk City, Okla.

Rejoinder

I am glad to have Bro. Jernigan to help me with this study, for I want to be right and have the Book for what I teach. But it says, "as they were eating," and I am persuaded that they were "eating," and not merely at the table, brother. And if the brother should say, for example,—I shall not henceforth drink beer, I am sure this indicates he had drunk beer; but Mark may be plainer to some. He says, "I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Mark 14:25. Or as Moffatt gives it—"I will never drink the product of the vine again till the day I drink it new within the Realm of God." Certainly this is no "inference," but a Bible statement that Jesus drank.

I see by Berry's interlinear that both Luke 22: 20 and 1 Cor. 11:25 have it "after having supper" that he gave them the cup. "Sup" is to take in a small amount of liquid. "Drink" is to swallow a liquid. And they must take it in (sup) before they swallow it (drink); it seems to me. And if Jesus "after having supped" did not swallow it (drink), he spat it out, evidently; and if the disciples did not "sup" (take in a small amount of liquid) first, they did not "drink" (swallow a liquid), for they had none in the mouth to swallow.

"The disciples came together to break bread." Acts 20:7. "The bread which we break." 1 Cor. 10:16. If the disciples did not break the bread, too, when Jesus gave it to them, why do we leave it for each to break as he eats? And if when Jesus broke the bread this is taken as proof that he did not eat, when Paul says, "The bread which we break" must be taken as proof that "we" do not eat. We not only break the bread, but also eat; and Jesus not only broke the bread but ate. "They were eating." He gave them the "example," to be sure, brother, and he said do "this", after showing them how.

If I broke my arm, I broke a bone or two. If my body was broken, a bone or two was broken, as I understand language.

Brotherly,

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.

THE TRUTH FUND

From Sistersville, W. Va. \$3.00

sin, and he says that Faith comes by hearing the word of God, and the word of God is as silent as death about having two or more cups. And such advocates have gone onward (transgressed) and do not abide in the teaching (doctrine) of Christ, and have not God with them. 2 Jno. 9. Like the carnal Corinthians, they have gone beyond that which is written." 1 Cor. 4:6 Yes, they went out from us, and they are not of us, who keep the commandments of Jesus. Rev. 22:14.

Brother Harper: Sister Minnie, wife of our good brother Isaac Peterson, of Canute, Okla., departed this life Feb. 12, 1930. She had been a devoted member of the church of Christ for forty years, and was very zealous for Christ. His word was her guide; his promise was her hope. Her faith was known abroad. We that knew her know heaven to be her eternal home. I was free to speak of the hope I had for Sister Peterson in the presence of her many, many, friends, and her kindred. We were sorry that she must leave us, but rejoice that she is at rest. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." Rev. 14:13.—Bob Musgrave.

OBITUARY

Minnie Belle Dunlap was born at Platte City, Mo., August 30, 1867. The family moved to Kansas, and from there to Jack county, Texas, in 1876. It was here she was married to I. A. Peterson, Feb. 22, 1893, at the age of 25 years. To this union were born three children. One boy died in infancy. The daughter, Iona, preceded her mother in death fifteen years ago, being then nearly sixteen years of age. Her mother never recovered from this loss. The other boy, Glen, is now twenty-three years of age; and no boy ever had a better mother or no mother a better boy than Glen. They have been constant companions.

Fourteen years ago Aunt Minnie's niece, Myrtle Stinson Bills, upon her deathbed requested that Aunt Minnie take her baby daughter, whom she had given her own daughter's name, Iona, and keep it as her own. They took this baby at the age of five weeks and loved her as they did their own.

She had been a member of the church of Christ nearly forty years, and was always a zealous believer in her Christ. Her influence has been far-reaching among her nieces, nephews, friends, and neighbors.

Her father, R. N. Dunlap, preceded her in death some forty years ago; her mother, six years ago. Her only sister, Mrs. U. M. Stinson, passed from this life fourteen years ago. This leaves only two brothers of her family—N. E. Dunlap, of Hammon, Oklahoma, and Rob Dunlap, of Dumont, Texas. Both were present at this time.

To those who are left we can only say—Weep not. In knowing her you have known a wonderful mother, wife, and friend. Her life will be an inspiration, a guide, beckoning you on to meet her

over there. Her favorite song was—"Will There Be Any Stars In My Crown." We believe hers will shine with the good deeds she has done during her sojourn on this earth.

"But some think it is wrong and heretical to study the Bible in the church house on Sunday mornings by the question and answer method."—Ira C. Moore, C. L.

"I wonder if the man who contends for one cup believes that the Lord meant for them to break to pieces the container and swallow it?"—Will J. Cullum, C. L.

Remarks

Moore seems to be holding a grudge against those who have exposed his "heretical" teaching on the "class" and "woman question;" and instead of confessing his mistakes like a Christian should, he resorts to the despicable practice of maliciously misrepresenting those whom he can not meet in debate. We have never said that it was wrong for men to ask and answer questions in the assembly. As for his "Sunday School," he can't possibly furnish one single Bible statement for it, and that is why he will not meet our arguments fairly. Brother Hutson well says: "We should meet the argument fairly if we can, but if we can not our cry of, "hobby" and "crank," is an empty dodge and smacks of hypocrisy." Funny how these two old boys' disagree in so many points and yet stick together like two burs.

No, indeed Bro. Cullum, those who contend for one cup in the communion do not "believe" that Christ meant for us to "swallow the container." It is "ridiculously silly" for you to imply such a thing, but I suppose you did it just to show how "smart" you are, compared to us poor ignorant fellows who don't know any better than to contend for one cup in the communion. Now Willie if you want to show the Leader folks how 'smart' you really are, just try your hand on exposing—in a written discussion—the ignorance of "a man who contends for one cup" in the communion. Will you Willie? I simply hope you have the courage to meet one of the "contenders for one cup;" there are several near you that would be tickled at the prospect. Moore has completely "backed down" on the issue, while Hutson has never come out of the "hole" he scampered into when Brother Harper was here over a year ago; and Cowan is still on the "dodge." Close in now Willie and show these "religious cowards" how easy it is to refute the arguments of "a man who contends for one cup".
—Ira B. Kile.

W. R. Sutton, Red Rock, Ark.—I am in touch with a young evangelist who preaches the truth in its purity. Any congregation or isolated members of the church of Christ needing such a man, will do well to write to me.

Oswald S. Hodges, Harptree, Sask., Canada.—Am glad to see you are giving us a few more articles that will build up the brethren. It seems to me this is what we need. "Let all things be done unto edifying."

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MARCH 15, 1930

No. 5

ARTICLE TWO ON THE NAME OF THE COMMUNION LOAF AND CUP

Chapter 2.

Why should anyone apply human names to this divine ordinance or even names that are found in the scriptures that do not properly define the meaning of the ordinance?

We will now examine some of the appellations that are in the most common use:

(1). "The Eucharist." The word imports the giving of thanks. Because before participating, thanks were presented for the cup and the loaf.

(2). "The Sacrament." "This name was adopted by the Latin church because the observance was supposed to be an oath or vow to the Lord; and as the term 'sacramentum' signified an oath taken by a Roman soldier, to be true to his general and his country, they presumed to call this institution a sacrament or an oath to the Lord." The above definitions are from "Christianity Restored" by A. Campbell.

I cannot accept either of these as a name that would properly suggest the meaning of the institution. They are both of human conjecture yet we hear them used by very pious people as though they came from God.

(3). "The Lord's Supper." The Greek word "deipnon," translated "supper," is defined in the lexicon "the chief or evening meal." In fact to our minds, the word always suggests a common meal and to add "Lord's" does not take the suggestion away. The term "Lord's Supper" is not interchangeable with the word "communion" and cannot be so used. Therefore it cannot express the thought of fellowship equal as a fellow, partner on common grounds as the Lord set forth in the ordinance of the fellowship (or communion.) The supper they had eaten did not do that, hence the necessity to do away with a supper. We can break the order set by the Lord and yet have a supper, for more than one cup could be used with propriety in any kind of a supper. This being true, let us call it what the institution itself suggests, "a fellowship," "a communion." One objector may say, "That is what I mean when I say 'Lord's Supper.'" If it is, just say what you mean and all can agree, I am sure it is just as easy to say "communion" as to say "the Lord's Supper" and then tell us that you meant "communion." Thus we see that the term "Lord's Supper" is useless. Let us drop it and all speak the same thing.

(4) A number of brethren and others have thought to call the New Institution "The breaking of Bread," being their claim on such passages

of the Scriptures as Acts 2:42 and 20:7. This name seems to be nearer the Scriptural idea than any of the preceding, yet it has some of the same defects. We object to this as the name of the New Institution for several reasons, the major reasons we will now set forth. First, like the "eucharist," which gets its thought from the thanks being given. The thanks are a part of the new order but not all. There is something to be considered in the things that were blessed and the manner of participation that should enter into the name as well as the thanks being offered. Just so with the "breaking of bread." We could not have the institution without breaking bread as that is a part of it. But that is not all. The phrase, "brake, break" does not even suggest to the mind that a cup was used in the designing of the ordinance. It does not even suggest that it had to be done collectively as a joint participation, as each could have broken and eaten his own loaf to himself.

Really, this seems to have been what the Corinthian church was practicing—1st Cor. 11:20—that Paul corrected as the phrase "breaking bread" in Bible times was used and generally understood to be a meal. Thus we see Paul instructed the Corinthians that they could not make a meal, nor could not eat the Lord's supper, as the term "supper" would suggest a meal. And a meal was usually called the breaking of bread. Neither was necessarily a communion or fellowship. So we will reject No. 4 along with the preceding three, seeing it does not take the proper scope and is easy to be misapplied or applied to things other than the design of the New Institution.

Here is one more name that seems to be coming into pretty general use:

(5) "Our Memorial Service." They get this idea from the statement by Paul in 1st Cor. 11:24-25. We will examine No. 5. Paul did not restrict the ordinance to a memorial service ONLY, although memory is in it like other names we have examined.

I will now quote from Wilson's Emphatic Diaglott. In speaking of the loaf and cup (1st Cor. 11:24:25)—(he had already told what they were in chap. 10, verses 16-17.) "—and having given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is THAT BODY of mine which is broke on your behalf; this do you for MY remembrance. Verse 25—In like manner also the CUP after supper saying, "This CUP is the NEW Covenant in MY blood; this do you as often as you may drink, for MY remembrance."

Question—Do we do this to remember Him or

do we do it for Him to remember us? Answer this one way or the other if you can and not break the fellowship of memory. This institution is not like that of a monument over a dead man. Our Lord is living and he promised us a table at which to eat with Him—Luke 22:29-30—the loaf His body, the cup, His blood to commune with Him—1st Cor. 10:16. When we DO this we remember we are eating with Him and He remembers He promised to eat and drink with us. Thus we see we had better call it a fellowship with Him and us.

"O," says one old teacher, "But haven't I always taught that it was like a tombstone in a graveyard and made the folks shed tears over their dead ones; and are you going to cut me off from my graveyard sermon and leave me to teach that this is a living and life giving institution? That would make the members shed tears for joy and I won't do it." Well, then if you will not, let the man that can and will teach communion of life at the living Lord's table. He died for us that He might live again and that we might have life in Him, and live in Him and He in us. We could not have had this institution if He had not died and put this living new testament or will into force, and lived again to give it life in fellowship with Him. Thus we see that God is not the God of the dead but the living—Matt. 22:32. We have no concern in what others have said or taught on this subject, but rather that which Inspiration teaches us. I shall take the affirmative and endeavor to set out the teaching that we find in the Inspired writings on this question in name, form and design. However, if there should be someone that is willing to affirm either of the five names that we have objected to and will affirm them to the exclusion of all others, I will be glad to deny it.

We will now give the name that we are willing to affirm to the exclusion of all others, not only those that we have numbered and objected to, but any other that might be in use or come in use hereafter. The name is "The Fellowship of the Body and Blood." We get the name from the Greek "koinonia," defined in the lexicon as "Participation, Communion, fellowship," as in 1st Cor. 10:16, 2nd Cor. 13:13, 1st Jno. 1:7; "contribution," as in Rom. 15:26, Heb. 13:16.

The Lord, fellowship also signifies equality as a fellow; all on equal plains; or standing; being one in common; many partaking of one thing, each one receiving a benefit common to all; a oneness in purpose; a joint possession; a partnership; united in one union like the Lord prayed for in John 17:11.

"Faithful is God by whom you were invited into the fellowship of his son Jesus Christ our Lord," 1st Cor. 1:9 (Wilson's Diaglott.)

"But I urge you all, brothers, for the sake of our Lord, Jesus Christ, to agree in what you SAY, and not to allow factions among you, but to be perfectly united in mind and judgment—1st Cor. 1:10 (Goodspeed's Tr.).

Now by the authority of the apostles we urge

all who are interested in a return to pure speech to drop all this Ashdodic babble in speaking of the new institution and call it what it is.

Question—who are you that will say, when you use your pet name, that you are not referring to the fellowship of the loaf, the body and the cup, the blood? Yes, that is your definition. Then let us speak it and thereby create the same thing in mind and our judgment will be the same. We must have a name to call the new institution that will suggest the form or we will have no form. With a multitude of names as we now have, we see a multitude of forms. Then the design is lost for lack of form.

After about a hundred-twenty years from the time that the Campbells and others began to call people out of all denominations to one standard of speech and restored the ordinance of baptism to its proper place, many being baptized into one body, we see that one body divided over names, forms and designs of the ordinance that should have given complete fellowship, one with the other. Then we must do the restoring of this ordinance back to that name, form and design that it was given. The Campbell restitution failed in this and ALL is being lost. We have about as many factions now among the restored as there were different faiths from whence they came.

With this we will close our remarks on the "name" and have something to say on the Scriptural form of the new institution that our Lord set in order and see if we can find that form.

This article completes all I will have in my tract on the name. The rest of it will deal with Form and Design. I hope to get the tract out before long.

Your Brother in Christ,
JAS. T. WHITE,
Lometa, Texas.

"CONTRIBUTION"

Bro. Chas. F. Reese did not know enough to know that I was not talking about the establishment of the church, but was denying that he could prove by "Holy Writ" that on the Lord's table was the place to put our Lord's day contribution. I still deny that he can prove it. He cites Matt. 21:22 and Mk. 11:15, and said we find money on the table in these passages. Yes, we certainly do, and we also find Christ throwing them out into the streets and turning the tables of the money-changers over. So no Lord's day contribution in these texts, as Christ said, "You have made of the Lord's house a den of thieves." Strange some people will resort to such "tactics" to support a theory. If you wish to join that "thief bunch," that is your privilege, but excuse me from putting my Lord's day contribution in with them, please.

Bro. Reese criticised me for citing Heb. 8:5, and I shall also cite Acts 7:44. Then, gentle reader, turn to 2 Kings 12:9 and 2 Chron. 24:8-13. In the latter quotation they laid by daily, which conflicts with Paul's admonition to lay by in store

on the first day of the week; but no conflict in where to put it. If you will note, these contributions were for the repairing of the house of God, too.

You said it seemed that I did not know the difference between the table of the Lord and a mourners' bench; but shall say you can't distinguish the difference between the contribution of the Lord and the table of devils since you quote Matt. 21:12 and Mk. 11:15 in support of your theory. You then try to splice on to this, Lk. 22:29, 30. I wish to inform you that this is a different body of people, here spoken of, from the one Matthew and Mark were talking about and you simply can not get a contribution out of Lk. 22:29, 30 to save your life. They were eating and drinking here if you please.

Bro. Reese quoted: "Ye can not be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils." 1 Cor. 10:21; so it seems to me you got into the latter bunch when you used Matt. 21:12 in support of your theory.

Then Bro. Jas. T. White comes along to assist you, and he makes himself ridiculous by his explanation of a joint-fellowship. He, like Bro. Reese, tries to join Lk. 22:29, 30 with contribution, which is not hinted in this text. He said the bread and cup were joint-fellowship and also the contribution, and I agree with him, but he tries to put the whole thing on the Lord's table, and contends that if it is not done, it is "not the Lord's table." I contend that singing and praying are also a part of the fellowship, and that being true, if your interpretation be correct, it would all have to be rendered on the table; so all the preaching, praying, singing, and all pertaining to the worship would have to be upon the table, and all the Greek you could put up would not get you out of this predicament.

No, Bro. White, partaking of the bread and cup does not resemble that "bee hive" work in stalking to and from the table to contribute, in the least, and I assure you it is not the singing that creates the confusion, but it is the promiscuous walking to and from a table to throw down a coin to be seen of men, that creates the same confusion of the sectarians gathering around their mourning friends at the bench.

Christ said in Matt. 6:1-4 to give "in secret," and he would reward openly. I am asking "any one" how they can give "secretly" by walking to and from a table in a public assembly to contribute. I was once talking with an elder of a congregation where they placed their contributions on the table, who remarked—"we want to treat Bro. _____ nicely, for he gives one dollar each Lord's day." Brother _____ had attracted the attention of that congregation to his Lord's day contributions. Christ said, "Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward." Matt. 6:2. I recently read in the Apostolic Way that a brother had taught the brethren in that section that it was about the same as sinning against the Holy Ghost to contribute their Lord's day contribution anywhere else except upon the Lord's table.

Neither that preacher nor any other man can prove a thing like that by the Book. If he can, I would greatly appreciate the verse which teaches it. On the other hand, to my mind Christ teaches differently in Matt. 6:1-4. Let's be careful how we jump at conclusions, but study God's Book more closely.—W. T. Jones.

A CORRECTION

In proposition No. 1, under the heading "wording of a Proposition" in the February 15 issue of The Truth the printer took out a line and put in another that made the proposition worse than nonsensical. The proposition should have read "and use one drinking cup in the communion—" but instead it read thus "that is all he will have to do communion." I would not care to affirm one worded as the printer worded this one.

My reason for sending in the proposition was to start readers to thinking and investigating the different phrases that are used in speaking of the cup and loaf. I would like to have a correction made in the next issue.

JAMES T. WHITE,
N Lometa, Texas.

A CORRECTION

In the issue of March 1, where it reads, "I see by Berry's interlinear that both Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25 have it, 'after having supper' that he gave them the cup," it should be "after having supped" that he gave them the cup.—Tom E. Smith.

We have notice from Sister Trott that Brother Trott "passed away just as the sun went down Saturday, the 22nd." We hope to have the obituary in the next issue of the paper. We shall all miss the Doctor very much in the fight for the truth. He had written his tract on the "CUP" and renewed his subscription for "The Truth" just a short time before his death. We weep not as those who have no hope, for "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit: that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them. A wonderful character, full of "good deeds," spiritual and physical. Sister Trott has our heart-felt sympathy, and may the condolence of the whole brotherhood go out to her in prayer for sustaining grace in this trying hour, and to all the relatives.

"And having done all, to stand."

In Memoriam

He stood a reed unshaken . . .
When the storm of digression fell.
(Sequel later.—Ed.)

NOTICE

Brethren wanting me to stop and preach should write me now so I can arrange dates in order to accommodate all and not be at the expense to "back track" needlessly. I hope to leave for the West in May.—H. C. Harper.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

The Son of God says, "Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." Mohammedanism, the religion founded by an illiterate epileptic, described by Daniel (Dan. 8) as "a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences," has for its guide in religious matters, a book called "The Koran," a scrap-work of "dark sentences," the pretended revelations of Mohammed. This great religious counterfeit has always flourished in the dark.

Christianity, the religion established by the Son of God, has always flourished in the light. The more the claims of Christianity are investigated, the brighter its light. Debates have done much to unravel many doubts in the minds of the people. In the days of the Apostles of Christ, many disputes arose, one of the most notable ones being mentioned in Acts 15. In the days of Alexander Campbell, religious controversy ran high. Bro. Campbell was a great debater. His debates did much toward bringing the disciples of Christ out of Mystic Babylon. His debate with Purcell made Catholicism wither. The one with Owen made infidelity hunt its dark corner. The one with Rice made Protestantism quake. He could say from experience with the leaders of darkness that "Truth ever gains, and error uniformly loses, by discussion."

When a man refuses to defend what he believes and teaches, it is evident that he has but little confidence in his own doctrine; and that he, like the wicked in the days of Christ on earth, "loves darkness rather than light because his deeds are evil." There was a time when any man professing to be a disciple of Christ rejoiced when it was evident that "men were running to and fro and knowledge was increasing." (Dan. 12). But those good days are gone, and disciples now say, "Let that doctrine die out of itself. We must not argue. The days of debating are over." The men among us who want open investigation before the people are "few and far between."

Some time ago Bro. Bob Musgrave held a meeting for the brethren in Somerton, Ariz. He preached a few times at the home of an afflicted brother

who, on account of a lack of sound teaching, had fellowshiped with the Christian Church of Yuma. After hearing Bro. Bob preach, he made a confession of his wrongs, stating that he wanted to fellowship with the loyal brethren in Somerton. The brethren made inquiry as to what he did to become a Christian, and he answered that he had obeyed the gospel requirements which are: (1) Faith in Christ; (2) Repentance of sins; (3) Confession of Christ before men, and (4) Baptism for the remission of sins. They accepted his confession, which was the only thing to do since he had obeyed the gospel that makes one a child of God. He could not have been "born of water and the Spirit" a second time, for no one can be born twice either physically or spiritually speaking.

When Bro. Chas. F. Reese heard about them taking this brother into their fellowship, he put out the report that they were endorsing sect-baptism and challenged for debate. When I went to Somerton for a meeting, I had a talk with Reese on this matter, and we finally signed a proposition to debate this matter. L. C. England of the Reese congregation in Yuma and W. H. Hilton of the Somerton Church agreed that each side should bear half the expenses of the debate, which was to have been held in a Theatre in Yuma. But when it came to a show-down the Reese side backed down on their obligation. The two men serving as Elders in the Yuma church have married divorced women. We put this matter before Bro. Reese, and told him that if we debated the baptism question, he would have to defend his Elders in their unscriptural marriages. This he refused to do. Thus the debate was called off, Reese and his followers refusing to defend their practice.

A Mr. King of the so-called "Pentecostal Movement," from which Aimee McPherson withdrew a few years ago, recently held a meeting in El Centro, Calif. Bro. Elzy Offill challenged him to meet me in debate, and he agreed to do so. When I got to El Centro to conduct my part of the debate, Mr. King backed down, saying that "the Pastor of the church" would not "allow it." The brethren then offered to bear all the expenses and to guarantee him ten dollars per day to debate with me. This he refused. So there will be no debate with him.

Bro. Foy E. Wallace, Pastor of the Central Church of Christ in Los Angeles, is now in a meeting at Holtville, Calif. Some one asked him some questions on the number of cups the Scriptures authorize in the communion, and answered it his own way, saying that "two or more" or "individual cups" may be used. Bro. Thos. S. Stark went to him after meeting that night and challenged him to meet me in debate on the matter. He told him to bring me to his room in the U. S. Hotel in Holtville on Saturday P. M. and we would make arrangements for it. Bro. Stark went to Somerton, Ariz., on Friday night and brought me to his home in El Centro, Calif., where I stayed that night. On Saturday P. M. we went, according to agreement with Bro. Wallace, to the Hotel, but learned that he had not been staying there

that week. We then went to the home of the Pastor of the Christian Church and made inquiry of him concerning the whereabouts of Bro. Wallace. He and others informed us that "Bro. Wallace got a telegram from a dear, dear friend in Nashville, Tenn., wanting him to come to his bed-side, for he is nearing death. So he closed his meeting last night and left for Nashville." But Los Angeles is as far as he went! After a week's stay in Los Angeles, he returned to his meeting in Holtville, evidently thinking that I was back at Montebello and that he would not be bothered about a debate. But I was in a meeting at El Centro when he returned to Holtville, and by appointment with him, Bro. Stark and I went to his room where he is now staying at a Hotel in Holtville, but Bro. Wallace could not be found. He sent us word, however, that he would talk the matter over with us privately, but would not debate it publicly!

From the foregoing facts it is evident that these men will not debate their practices because they "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." This we regret.

Bro. Noah Garwick, a refined gentleman, Pastor of the Christian Church in Brawley, Calif., and I will debate the instrumental music question in El Centro, Calif., next week. Bro. Garwick is opposed to any kind of a society or organization besides the local church, and he says he is debating the music question for the purpose of learning the truth. He is so strict that some of his people say he is more with us than with them. We expect to have a nice, clean debate.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found a good article from the pen of Bro. Paul Hays, a very able writer. He has out a number of tracts, on important themes, such as the "Sunday School," "Bible Colleges," "Conversion and the Church," "The Curse of the Fiery Cross" (on the K. K. K.), "Israel's Messiah" (written for the Jews), etc. These tracts for free distribution. So order them, brethren. Be sure to send postage. Address: Paul Hays, Route 4, Box 15, Fresno, Calif.

"The Truth" is growing and its influence for good is being realized by many. But it would do much more good if it had a wider circulation. So let each reader be a subscription getter!

GIFTS AND FRUIT

There are Nine of the 'fruit of the Spirit', and Nine of the Gifts. (Compare Gal. 5:22, 23, and 1 Cor. 12:8-10). We call the fruit of the Spirit the 'ordinary' fruitage of Christian Character. But the Gifts of the Spirit are 'extraordinary.' The 'gifts' are not a result of character, an accompaniment of character, nor a direct help to character building. In fact, a person may have these gifts and be 'nothing' as a Christian. (1 Cor. 13:1-3) They may lead only to Pride. (2 Cor. 12:7).

The Fruit of the Spirit, on the other hand, is the

very essence of Christian Character. No one can be a Christian without it. Every Christian is indwelt by the Spirit of God, and the evidence of such indwelling is the 'fruit'. (1 Cor. 6:19) (Rom 8:9-11) (Matt. 7:20).

The Gifts are Miraculous endowments for more effective service, and power in service. The endowment is sudden, and came by visible outpourings from heaven (as on Pentecost), or by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles.

The Fruit is attained gradually, through growth and development. It begins with a New Birth, and develops with Christian experience, much as children develop in the natural world, through proper food and exercise. (Heb. 5:14).

The Gifts were essential in the beginning of the Kingdom of God,—just as every-thing in Nature began by miracle, but is perpetuated by Birth and Growth. The things necessary to, and accompanying birth and growth, we do not call a miracle, because they belong to the 'ordinary' course of life.

Now the Miraculous Gifts never did produce the New Birth, but only the 'first parents', and the seed of the Kingdom, which is the Word of God. As Adam and Eve were created 'full-grown,' so the 'progenitors' of Jewish and Gentile 'generation' were created full-grown, in Christ.

Heaven's gift was full and comprehensively complete. But what came thru the laying on of the apostles hands was partial, and limited. It is probable that only one of the 'nine' gifts were bestowed at a time, thru the laying on of hands, (2 Tim. 1:6) (Rom. 12:6-8) (1 Cor. 12:8-10).

Everything that passes thru human 'hands' must deteriorate. Moses could but bestow part of his 'spirit' upon Joshua. (Num. 27:18-20). Elijah could but bestow a double 'portion' of his spirit upon Elisha, and that was 'a hard thing'. (2 Ki. 2:10). The apostles were fully gifted, but those on whom they laid their hands were only partially gifted. In the very nature of things these gifts must cease.

Only the fully gifted could supervise the work, and judge between the real and the counterfeit. One of the gifts was 'a spirit of discernment,' and only he who had this gift could 'judge,' before the Law of judgment was completed. A Complete New Testament is the final court of appeal, so far as this world is concerned.

In the production of the New Testament, gifted Men were required. In the perpetuation of the Kingdom of God, the dependence is in the Seed, rather than in Sowers. 'So then, neither is he that planteth Anything, neither he that watereth.' The seed must be sown, and watered, but not by 'gifted men.' 'One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren!

Paul Hays,
Fresno, Calif.

THE TRUTH FUND

J. M. Tuttle ----- \$1.00

I do admire the paper and the Truth it stands for.—D. A. MacCallum.

BROTHERLY LOVE

"Let brotherly love continue." Heb. 13:1. Brotherly love is something to be desired and cultivated, for if I "have not love," says Paul, "I am become as sounding brass and tinkling symbol." I Cor. 13:1. And John assures us that "He who loves God loves his brother also." 1 Jno. 4:21. Hence brotherly love is something we should strive for at all times, for without this love no church can exist and grow spiritually. It may exist in a formal way in as much as a certain number may meet on the Lord's day for worship, but without brotherly love there can be no true worship. How can they worship God if they do not love him? How can they love God unless brotherly love exists among them as children of God, the loving Father, who loved us even when we were in sin. It is only a mockery of God to pretend to worship him without brotherly love. For as the apostle of God says they only eat and drink damnation to their own souls.

In Rom. 12:10 Paul says, "Be kindly affectionated one to the other with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another." Brotherly love means brotherly kindness, brotherly affection. Now if we have brotherly fondness or affection for our brothers and sisters in Christ, we would not do or say anything under any conditions to offend them. If we heard a tale of some sort that they were supposed to be guilty of, one that was not in accord with the rules by which a Christian should abide, we would go to that brother or sister and determine whether or not the thing is true; and in case it is, we would plead in a brotherly way to win the soul back to the right and persuade the one to make the wrong right, and walk thereafter more closely to God.

But I am sad to say that in too many cases I find the brothers and sisters standing alert with a readiness to collect and scatter scandle of any sort they can hear about a brother or sister. And in many cases the whole tale is originated from some little unguarded remark and is scattered and grows as it goes from one to the other among the brothers and sisters, and it is hard to tell who started it: in fact it was not started as it now is told with various shades and additions in its progress onward among one another.

Ah, what would the Savior say if he were to come and visit us as he appeared unexpectedly sometimes among the disciples. I am truly afraid he would say as he will say in the last day, "Depart from me ye that work iniquity. I never knew you." There is not even a "speck" of Christianity in any man or woman if there is not "brotherly love," no life as a Christian, as lifeless as "sounding brass or tinkling symbol."

Now, brethren, what are we going to do about it—just keep on and go to perdition? Think it over; and let us reform. Bad habits are hard to break, I know, and it takes constant watching with prayer to keep right. But it seems to me that we do not endeavor to rid ourselves of these sinful things. "Put off the old man," put on the new man." Eph. 4:22-24. You have "not so learned Christ." "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and

make no provisions for the flesh to fulfil the lusts." Rom. 13:14.

Now, if the church is to stand a light to those in darkness, this evil conduct must stop. The world are watching. Many want a chance to assail the Bible and Christianity. It is an awful thing to "stand in the way of sinners." Let us so live our profession as to win them to Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, "whom to know aright is life eternal."

If there is not enough of "brotherly love" to bind the brotherhood together, there is nothing that can do it. And "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." And if there is not a feeling of love among the brethren in this, the church will go to ruin spiritually.

In 2 Pet., 1st ch. we have these words: "And besides 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; for if these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.

Now we see plainly that the congregation that has not a tie of love is unfit for work in the Lord's vineyard. Oh, wouldn't it be wonderful if each brother and sister in each congregation would live a life so far above reproach that no one could help but honor and love them? Then the cause of Christ would grow spiritually and the body would be "knit together in love" and would grow in numbers from day to day and become stronger to stand against the "evil that is in the world."

Brethren, don't give this matter just a passing notice. Study over it; pray over it, and each do your part to help bring about this desirable condition. Put it before your congregation. Get them to thinking about it. Get all the "old sores" healed. Get them "to love as brethren." Drive out the coldness. Drive out the "lukewarmness." Let us see if we can not eliminate all strife among the family of God. Let us take God's Book as our only guide "Fear God, and keep his commandments." Let us make known by our practice as well as by our words that God is our Father and that we are his lowly servants to do his will.—C. L. Cage.

REVERENCE — No. 2

Solomon has said, "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God for to draw nigh to hear is better than to give the sacrifice of fools, for they know not that they do evil." Eccl. 5:1. This scripture teaches that people (especially the Lord's) should conduct themselves in the House of God in the way that God will be revered. Paul charged Timothy, "But if I tarry long that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. 3:15. We find according to the above instruction, God's people are to be reveren-

tial, hence behave themselves. When we come to prayer instead of standing upon our feet like the sects do, do as we are directed under the reign of Christ, kneel down on our knees. This attitude shows reverence and humbleness and we are to be "clothed with humility." 1 Pet. 5:5:6: 3:8. Jas. 4:10. For example on prayer read Acts 7:60. 9:40. 20:36. 21:5. Eph. 3:14. Why not do as the Lord would have His sons and daughters do? Those who desire to reverence God in lowliness and humbleness kneel down upon their knees when they pray.

Be clothed with humility, 1 Pet. 5:5. Jas. 4:10. Before going to meeting, then, our nakedness will not be visible. See 1 Tim. 2:9:10. 1 Pet. 3:1-6. Not wait until the Church has gathered together for worship then sit and prune or trim your fingernails, leaving the offallings on the seats and floor for the janitor to clean up. "In all things showing thyself an example of good works, in thy doctrine showing uncorruptness gravity." Titus 2:7. Don't wait until you get to the meetinghouse to put a big cud of tobacco in your mouth and chew it all through the worship, leaving a fair size puddle of saliva where you were sitting. "Having, therefore, these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." 2 Cor. 7:1. Don't go to the assembly with your pockets full of chewing gum, leaving the wrappers and gum on the seats and floor. "Look therefore carefully how ye walk not as unwise but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil." Eph. 5:15:16. Exo. 23:13. Don't sharpen your knife and use it to whittle on the seats and other furniture of the church. "For which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands". 2 Tim. 1:6. "But thou, O man of God, flee these things, and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." 1 Tim. 6:11. Don't write in the song books or other church property, just to see how your new pencil works, but rather "Till I come, give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. Be diligent in these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy progress may be manifest unto all." - Tim. 4:13:15.

Don't wait until you get into the meetinghouse to clean the mud off of your shoes, leaving it on the floor and seats. "Abstain from every form of evil." 1 Th. 5:22. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men be strong." 1 Cor. 16:13. Don't go to sleep at meeting, while you are asleep something might be said which you don't believe. "So then let us not sleep, as do the rest, but let us watch and be sober." 1 Th. 5:6. "And this, knowing the season, that already it is time for you to awake out of sleep, for now is salvation nearer to us than when we first believed." Ro. 13:11.

Don't fill up your pipe and light it soon as the congregation is dismissed, cigar, or cigarette. "So then, as we have opportunity let us work that which is good toward all men and especially to-

ward them that are of the household of the faith." Gal. 6:10.

My prayer to God in the name of Christ is, that the faithful may all continue in the "narrow way" which leads onward and upward to the "mansions which Jesus has gone to prepare. Let all of the Israel of God be more reverential, then we may be ready for the "Receiving the end of your faith, even the Salvation of your Souls." 1 Pet. 1:9.

—Joseph Miller, 1004 N. Lambert Street, Brazil, Indiana.

APPEAL FOR COUNSEL

In my last article I promised to give a summary of what others have written me, in my next; so here goes.

I will mention the favorable things first of course, which runs as follows:

I was glad to hear from you and shall do any thing I can do scripturally to bring about a reconciliation among the brethren. As to the meeting suggested by you, I will say: I am heartily in favor of it. I heartily agree with you. I am working for just such a meeting. I hope you will succeed in getting some to agree to have such a meeting. I liked your plan and am sure you are right.

It is my hope and prayer that you may succeed and any assistance I can render will be gladly given.

Your splendid letter voices my sentiments exactly.

I have been working for a meeting as you suggest for some time. Your letter to the preachers about a meeting for counsel is fine. Just keep pressing them on that.

This is a very brief summary of a few enthusiastic letters from preachers. I am glad and I know many others are too, that there are a few preachers who can read the writing on the wall and are not afraid or ashamed to do so.

Now we preachers want the cooperation of brethren who are willing and ready to comply with the Lord's plan of action for the purpose of keeping all within the bounds of his creed, and in submission to his disciples. I want to hear from congregations that want to unite in this effort to bring about reconciliation among the brethren. You see from the above that I am not alone in this so far as preachers are concerned and you can see by reading your bibles that we are right.

Now we will see a few objectors' briefs. I would like to see a united ministry but am not very hopeful that such will ever be.

I believe the churches of Christ who have freed themselves from the Sunday School practice are scriptural in their practices. If I thought counsel would help any I would be anxious for it.

Your idea may be right and the best thing to do, but I can see objectionable grounds. I appreciate your motive in your suggestion, but I doubt your ability to carry it through. I fear your meeting would soon degenerate into a regular row—and make matters worse.

You say "That is what I want and what must be." Now what I want is the command or example.

This is not all, but enough to give you an idea of the lack of confidence in the brotherhood and loyalty to our heavenly father, manifested by so many.

If we do not love one another we do not love the Lord and without love we are nothing; because it is the perpetual power ordained of Him that is love. I fear that many have proceeded from love to ambition on the wings of which they have been carried to extreme, breaking the ties that bind us together and forgetting the obligations of gratitude, the immense debt we owe him who prayed for our oneness when He was ready to offer up His life that all might be one.

Nearly all that have offered objections agree that such a meeting would be scriptural, but indifference is the chief factor hindering the accomplishment. Dear readers, please do not be thus; but awaken and let your lights shine.

GEO. M. McFADDEN,
Arkoma, Okla.

A GOOD SOLDIER

"Thou therefore endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier. (2 Tim. 2:3, 4.)

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."—2 Tim. 4:7.

"When therefore Paul and Barnabus had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabus, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question."—Act. 15:2.

"But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." (Gal. 2:11.)

"Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."—Paul. (1 Cor. 11:1.)

Brother, are you a good soldier for Christ? Are you fighting a "good fight". Do you ever have any "dissension and disputation" with those that oppose the TRUTH, even as it were at Antioch—with brethren? Have you ever withstood a brother to the face as Paul did Peter? If not, are you following Paul?

When we think of the restoration movement, begun by Campbell and carried on by David Lipscomb, J. A. Hardin, Srygley and others—think of the many battles they fought, even with brethren who advocated and introduced innovations in the church of God, we think there must be some truth in the statement that Bro. Tant has often made. "We are drifting."

We have preacher brethren over Alabama (Fred M. Little, I. L. Boles, W. T. Grider and others) who are advocates of an innovation, The SUNDAY SCHOOL, who dare not defend their practice in either written or oral debate. They are so sweet

spirited, they want debate with a brother; yet they advocated and supported the Walker-Hall debate, which was held in Montgomery, Ala., on instrumental music in the worship. Considering this debate then, which was held with a brother, and which they supported, (Read the following in the Gospel Advocate, July 26, 1923: "Brethren Little, Hines, and other ministers in attendance did their work well in standing by us.") according to reports, it makes me wonder whether these brethren be sincere when they say: "I don't believe in debating with brethren." At least they should be consistent. My experience with them proves to my mind that when they have the truth, they are ready to defend it with any one on Earth, but when they are in error, they are "cowards."

Now, you brethren who have your Sunday School—the assembly divided into classes with a plurality of teachers, including women teachers, call on your preachers to defend the practice of such, or say that you have "DRIFTED" and will continue to drift with the rest of the world, and drop the old motto: "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent." Don't let them pull that old "gag" off on you: "I won't debate with a brother." If they follow Paul, they will debate with a brother if he is in error; and if he is not in error, they should QUIT PRACTICING THE THING THAT IS CAUSING STRIFE AND DIVISION IN THE CHURCH OF GOD, and OFFENDING BRETHREN.

—W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.

A WORD

Dear readers of The Truth: I am in a hospital recovering from an operation, do not know just when I can resume work. I can't write much lying flat of my back; but thought you might appreciate hearing of my condition. The doctor says I am getting along fine. That is a great consolation, but financial burdens being heaped up so far above our ability to meet is certainly embarrassing.

I hope to be back home before this is read in the paper, and would be glad to hear from any of you and if you want a meeting I will be glad to serve you. I will need to get busy and stay busy when I get out. All of you can pray for me and I want your prayers in addition to anything else you may feel disposed to do.

Good Bye,

Geo. M. McFadden,
Arkoma, Oklahoma.

WHAT THEY SAY

I can truthfully say, Brother Harper, that I believe "The Truth" stands four-square for the truth on everything more than any other paper it has ever been my privilege to read.—W. H. Reynolds.

Brother Harper—Enclosed you will find check for a year's subscription to "Truth." Can not do without it. Renew with Jan. 1st if you have back copies as I do not like to miss any of them.—Noble Brinegar.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, APRIL 1, 1930

No. 7

YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE

Rom. 12:2

I have Brother Harper's reply to my Second number, on the above. He says I "admit" I could not speak where the Bible speaks, and use two, or more cups. I have failed to find where I said it.

My first number published in The Truth, Jan. 15. I then wrote Brother Harper I did not care whether he published it or not. When I sent in second number, he wanted to start all over, and we deny one cup being scriptural, or affirm two or more cups were.

I replied, as I had claimed under certain conditions, two cups or more would be Scriptural, that I had rather continue as we had begun, to which he agreed.

As to my confidence being shaken in the use of two or more cups; I have learned from God's word, things that have fully restored it; and believe I have found the key, that unlocks, or makes plain and will set at rest the matter of the cups quibbling; with all God fearing persons.

The proof is so convincing, that it will take mighty plain positive proof to the contrary to move me.

I have studied what smart, scholarly, honest men, have said, pro and con, on this question; till I had given up hopes, of any thing said by either could be so reasoned-out to make plain just which was right; but I had always had strong confidence in God's word, that some where, He had made clear to us, who were "hungering and thirsting" for the right, might be satisfied, so I cast about to see if I could not find the long sought for, and needed help.

I felt too, I would have to look elsewhere, from the much beaten path, worn by both sides, in their much used arguments.

Now I will try to unfold the facts as they came to me; which I believe solves the matter.

When I had; time, and again, read Paul's statement, "Ye can not drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils" 1 Cor. 10:21, it would recur to me in a casual way; did the Devils just use a literal cup, and restrict their idol worshipers to a literal cup, in their drink service. I could not think so.

But here was Paul's cup of the Lord and cup of Devil's; joined together in the same verse; so I was compelled to conclude, what ever "cup" meant in the cup of the Lord; it must necessarily mean in the cup of Devils. If Paul meant literal cup, and that all in the church at Corinth must drink directly out of it, then it necessarily followed that the Devils had just one literal cup.

And if cup meant something else in one, it meant the same in the other.

From this I can see no escape. So while I mused and wondered, if there was not some statement in God's Word, that would help to decide what "Cup" meant in ver. 21 My thoughts turned to the book of Daniel, where Belshazzar made a feast to a thousand of his lords; and he commanded to bring the gold and silver vessels, taken out of the House of God; to drink wine in honor of their God's, Dan. 5:1, 2, 3, 4. Then I turned to Jer. 52:19, and found the vessels of gold and silver were cups.

When I had learned the above, I was fully satisfied; the Holy Spirit, through the apostle Paul, meant the wine by the term cup, without regard to the number of literal cups used. This being true, and what Paul received of the Lord; we can boldly assert, the literal cup or cups used, in the first supper of our Lord, and all others, was no part of His blood "shed for the remission of sins."

Though the wine may be in one, or one hundred literal cups; it, the wine, is still "the cup of the Lord," and the one hundred drinking the wine have drunk the cup of the Lord.

The literal cup, or cups then: is only, a means of preserving the wine, just as the one, or ones, who prepare and get the wine, to those who partake of it, are means to that end, and no part of the communion.

Christ said "Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you: John 6:53. If we do not drink His blood, when we drink the wine, discerning it; there is no way of doing so. And if when we drink the wine remembering him we do not drink the blood of the New Testament, there is no way of doing it.

When we do the above, regardless of the number of cups used, we are assuredly drinking "the cup of the Lord" according to the Scriptural meaning of the term "cup" as given in the citations of Scripture above. Brother Harper's citations of Scripture, to prove his contention—divide up the congregation, when unreasonable to use one cup, only proves there were local congregations of disciples, which no one disputes, and the reasons for them, was for convenience, no doubt; the very thing he is fighting his brethren for wanting, in the communion service.

Now if we were meeting with him on Lord's day, and three to five hundred brethren present; we could attend to all the items of worship very easily, till we come to the literal one cup service; then he would say, we will divide up into two or more groups, for it would be unreasonable to attend to this while in one assembly. So he has his way, and we have groups instead of one. Each company has its own literal cup; and all that were

together at first, have drunk "the cup of the Lord", The Wine, but they drink it out of Cups my Brother.

If I should go to baptize, I would go where there was sufficient water, I would not go where there was "too little water," and then do something that would divide the church as you would do on Lord's day; if there were five hundred disciples present, to have but one literal cup to each assembly, and then claim you had drunk the "cup of the Lord" when your two or more divisions of brethren had done the very thing you were opposing—drunk the wine "the Lord's cup," out of cups."

On next Lord's day, there will be many congregations, drink the Lord's cup—the wine, but will have drunk it out of cups; if each assembly should have, but one literal cup. Yes I know the fruit of the vine was literal as well as the cup or cups, that contains it; and "you should know that Paul's language—"Ye can not drink the cup of the Lord, and "Cup of Devils", does "refer to the fruit of the vine, as cup—when referring to the drink offering. When we find in plain language cups were used in the drink offering in honor of Idols, see Dan. 5: 4, Jer. 52:19.

Brotherly,
A. J. BOND,
607 W. Chestnut St.
Bloomfield, Iowa.

REPLY (YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE)

"Quibbling." Now you said it; but the quibbling is on your side of the house, not ours, and it has been nothing but quibbling on the part of those who have tried to defend by the Bible the use of cups in the communion service.

At first he thought he had found them in "his own supper" at Corinth. But after our reply his "confidence" was still "shaken," and he "quibbled" to "an assembly too large for convenience with one cup," saying, "This fact alone keeps me from believing our Savior meant all must drink from the same cup." But after our reply, even this did not satisfy his "confidence," and he again exclaims eureka (I have found), yes, "I believe I have found the key . . . things that have fully restored my confidence," and he lands on "the cup of devils," not knowing, it seems, what he is talking about. Let us see—

"The Cup of Devils

"For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread and when he had given thanks, he said, 'This do ye in remembrance of me, this is my body;' and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, he said, 'This is my blood;' and gave it to them alone. Which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same thing to be done. For that bread and a cup of water are passed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn."—First Apology of Justin Martyr, p. 185.

This is not a new place for "quibbling" on the

part of the cups advocates, my brother. Johnson tried it at Roswell, N. Mex., but went down. And we doubt that you can find a single track in a cow-trail anywhere that has not been searched for the cups in the Lord's supper. They will look any old place except where the ordinance was given and reiterated. That does not "look good to them," it seems.

They were there told to "drink the cup." Listen: "How can one 'drink the cup'? By drinking what it (yes, "it," brother) contains, and in no other way."—N. L. Clark, in Clark-Harper debate, 3d aff.

Now if you know another "way," let us have it. But, as we told Cowan, "Here is a chasm you will never be able to cross," quibble as you may. And if the wine is in 100 cups, they drink cups and not "the cup of the Lord."

We did not say Bro. Bond said he admitted that he could not speak where the Bible speaks for the use of cups in the communion. But we said he admitted it. How? When he found that he was disposed to discuss the question, we proposed that he deny in a proposition "the use of one cup" or affirm "the use of more than one" in the communion service is "Where the Bible speaks." He said he "admitted" the use of one cup, and could worship with us; and the Bible being true, it could not then "speak" for the use of more than one, even to individual cups, for he contends for "any number," and the Bible speaks of "cup", not cups.

Each congregation using a cup, makes lots of cups. Yes, and the Lord in his Book provides for the congregations, as the brother admits, and he provides for a cup in the communion for each. Now show us where he provides for "two or more" or individual cups ("any number") for each. The S. S. advocates said, "Harper has lots of classes all over Florida." We said, "If you wish to call the church a 'class,' there are, indeed, many of them, and the Lord in his Book provides for them: now you tell us where in His Book the Lord provides for the 'classes' in a church." But they never tried it.

"Congregations for convenience." No: but to obey the Lord. This is his provision. And when you huddle together in numbers so great that you can not function in every item as the "Bible speaks," you disobey the Lord. He has made provisions for congregations, and there is no excuse for such conduct. You take the route of the sprinkler, who assumes that sprinkling is baptism, and then sprinkles "for convenience." (See Form of Baptism, pp. 207, 274, 255). You assume that the use of cups, even to individual cups, is "Where the Bible speaks," and then "for convenience" use them, thus trying to escape the burden of proof for your practice as he does. We say—Prove your practice by the Bible, or quit it for the sake of unity. You don't believe in "dividing a church" if it should be allowed to get so numerous that it cannot function in all items "Where the Bible speaks," eh? All right. We will give you one of 50 thousand, yes, 100 thousand maybe. Now tell us what you would do. You would not go where there is "too little" water to baptize, but you

IN MEMORIAM

(In loving remembrance of Brother G. A. Trott)

He stood a reed unshaken
When the storm of digression fell
O'er the church of Christ like an Alpine blast
That sweeps both peak and dell.

With faith unfeigned his buckler;
The word of God his sword:
At the front he stood on the firing line
To battle for his Lord.

He stood for "that which is written,"
Or example from God's word
For all our faith and practice;-
For these his voice was heard.

The fight he now has finished;
The victory he has won;
A crown is now assured him
From Christ, the Father's Son.
—H. C. Harper.

"The dearest wish and highest ambition of every true child of God, is to do God's will in God's own way. Such a one demands precept or example from the New Testament scriptures for every item of faith and practice, and gladly renders the same to others.

"In these perilous times, I know of no admonition that needs to be more emphasized and reiterated until the church of Christ is cleansed from every spot and wrinkle what human customs have brought upon it."—G. A. Trott, M. D. in "The Truth" of March, 1928.

Sister Trott wrote us that Brother Trott died on Feb. 22, 1930, as the sun was sinking in the West, surrounded by children, relatives, and friends, at his home in Munday, Texas.

"And He soon will call for me;
And then my home will be
Where the watch ticks no more,
And the clock strikes no more,
And there is no more time for me."
"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." I Cor. 5:10.
"And behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12.

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." I Cor. 15:58.

W. T. Taylor, De Leon, Texas, Rt. 1.—I visited the brethren at Cheaney, and preached three sermons. I have held three meetings for these brethren. I certainly was glad to be with them again. They seemed to appreciate my work, and insisted that I come again. Two sisters there I baptized nearly twenty-four years ago. They are present each Lord's day. I rejoice in their faithfulness.

would go with a church that is so numerous that it can not function "Where the Bible speaks" any more. And you would not "divide the church" no matter how numerous it was permitted to become. Shame on you. And when you "divide the church" to get it in congregations, as the Lord provides, so they can function as the "Bible speaks," we will do the same thing: just as we would put out the organ, if it was permitted to get in, so that the church could function "Where the Bible speaks." If we walk as the Lord directs, there will be no occasion to put out the organ or "divide a church" into congregations.

"So he (Harper) has his way." No, this is the Lord's way. And since the Lord provides for congregations and each congregation must function "Where the Bible speaks," there is no more necessity of having a church too numerous to do so than there is to sprinkle for baptism "for convenience," sanitation, decency or any other plea.

We know, brother, that in "drink the cup," cup is used metonymically to suggest to the mind what is in the cup, but not what is in cups. If they drank from cups in your Dan. 5:4; Jer. 52:19, they drank the cups, not "the cup." Your assumption here is contrary to the facts. And it is no more strange that you should go to "the cup of devils," to Daniel and Jeramiah, for finding the use of cups in the communion of the body and the blood of the Son of God, instead of to the institution itself as given, than it is that a sprinkler should ramble all over creation for sprinkling instead of going to the language of the institution in which it was given; for there is a reason—what they are looking for is not there. Brother, neither the wine nor the cup "was any part of His blood shed for the remission of sins." But Jesus did say, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." And Paul said, "The cup of blessing which we bless." Hence the "cup" has a place in this institution as well as the "wine," and without both you have no institution of the Lord here. "Five hundred present." No, indeed. But take your 50 thousand; your 100 thousand without fudging now: there is no limit, you know. Now worship in "all the items" as the N. T. directs. You must not "divide the church." Clark took the hint, and dropped this; but you waited for the kick—and got it. Now if you feel "sore," you have nobody to blame but yourself. And if you limit the assembly to where it can function in even one item "Where the Bible speaks," we will, as the Lord directs, limit it to where we can function in "all items" "Where the Bible speaks," and "drank the cup" "By drinking what it contains," for we can do so "in no other way." "If language may be used arbitrarily, and words applied capriciously, there is an end to all confidence among men."—Ed.

THE TRUTH FUND

A Brother	-----	\$2.00
A. J. Bond	-----	1.00
J. Y. Morgan	-----	2.00
C. W. Smith	-----	1.00

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL REVIEW

By J. D. Phillips

"The Truth" is doing a good work among the brethren, calling them out of digression, in all of its forms, into the light of God's holy word. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," says the Lord. This paper was named "The Truth," not because we thought everything in it would be "the truth," for we knew when it was started that some things would appear in it which would not be "the truth." It is impossible for everything in an open forum to be "the truth," for a paper that publishes both sides of every issue—and "The Truth" is the only paper in the world that does it—will publish the wrong side with the right side. It is necessary that the brethren see both sides of every vital question so that they will be able to learn "the truth" on the matter. "The Truth" stands for "the truth" of the Christian religion, and that is why it is called "The TRUTH".

"The Truth" was not started in opposition to any other paper, as our enemies have falsely said. But when the one cup brethren were cut out of another paper, and were not allowed to expose the cups theory and practice, circumstances demanded that we start another paper in order for this great digression to be checked as far as possible. With this end in view, Brother Harper started "The Truth". Every digressive element in the Church mourned its birth, as did Herod the birth of the Lord Jesus, because they knew that they would be met with an open Bible. But the brethren who are seeking to "know the truth" and to find "the old paths" so that they can "walk therein" appreciate the fight we are making. Now let others fall in line with us and help fight digression out of the Church.

Brother Daniel Sommer says in the Apostolic Review that he has learned that "two papers"—meaning The Apostolic Way and "The Truth"—"are against each other" on the cup question. This shows that brethren not connected with either "The Truth" or The Way know that The Way is a cups paper, and that "The Truth" stands, flatfooted, for what the Book says—"the cup"—"a cup"—"this cup"—"that cup," etc.

Here is something that is interesting: Brother Ashley S. Johnson wrote a number of professors of Greek, asking them to give him the literal translation of Matt. 26:28 and Acts 2:38, so that he could get a true translation of "for the remission of sins" in each passage. The cup question was not under consideration at all, for Bro. Johnson was getting information on the design of baptism. But some of these professors translated the latter part of Mat. 26:27 with Matt. 26:28, in order to get the whole connection, and they, incidentally, show that the Greek word "ek" from which we have the English word "of" in the command, "Drink ye all of it," should be translated "out of." The Emphatic Diaglott reads "out of," and it is backed by Thayer's and Pickering's lexicons and many others. Here are some samples of letters Bro. Johnson got from the professors of Greek.

"The Professor of Greek, University of Mississippi, University P. O., Miss., says: "Matt. 26:28, 'Drink ye all out of it (i. e. all of you must drink out of the cup).'"—Ashley S. Johnson in "The Great Controversy," p. 281.

"The Professor of Greek, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, says: "Using Westcott and Hort's edition of the New Testament, I translate Matt. 26:28, thus: 'Drink ye all out of it.'"—Ashley S. Johnson, *Ibid.*, p. 281.

"Professor Frank M. Bronson, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., a specialist in New Testament Greek, says: "Matt. 26:28, 'Drink out of it all of you.'"—Ashley S. Johnson, *Ibid.*, p. 283.

"And he took a cup."—Matt. 26:27. "Cup" in this passage is a translation of "poterion, a small cup" (Pickering's lex.)—"a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer)—"a drinking vessel" (Young)—"a drinking vessel, a cup" (Robinson)—"a drinking-cup" (Berry)—"a drinking-cup, wine-cup" (Liddell and Scott). And, as Bro. Harper has pointed out, language will have to turn a somersault before "cup" will mean "the fruit of the vine" as some smatterers of language teach. And this establishes the fact that Jesus took one literal cup of wine—a "wine-cup" (Liddell and Scott)—and gave it—the "wine cup," "the cup of blessing"—to his disciples, saying, "Drink ye all OUT OF it."

"F. F. Gay, professor of Greek in Bethany College (W. Va.), since 1910," says, "It has as its antecedent the word 'cup.'" Hence, when the Savior said, "Drink out of it," he meant for them all to "drink out of" the "wine-cup," "the cup of blessing." And this is backed by Thayer who says of the word translated "of," "from," or "out of," "Ek, with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks, drink out of the cup, pino ek tou poteriou." So there is no escape from the conclusion that the Lord meant for all disciples in an assembly to "drink out of" one "wine-cup."

In view of the stand "The Truth" has taken on all important issues is it not the duty of every

lover of "the truth" to help keep it before the brethren? It is. Brother Harper is making a great sacrifice to keep it going. And the brethren should give liberally of their time and means to keep it before the brethren.

EDITORIAL

We are late with this issue. Funds are not coming in sufficient in time to pay the printers, and we do not intend to run the paper into debt. Let all help a little, and we can make it through the hard times nicely. We can now send the paper to something like two hundred more subscribers with almost no additional cost. Will the brethren send them in before the next issue, so we can be on time?

Notify us as soon as you can about spending some time with you on our trip to the West. We should like to arrange the schedule before starting in May.

Sister Trott would like to dispose of Brother Trott's tract on the "CUP" and now offers them at ten cents to get them out where they will do good. This is a 25-cent tract, but she needs the money and makes this sacrifice to help the good work along. Many brethren will want one of these as the last message from Brother Trott to the brotherhood.

We do not wish to worry our readers with any questions however important, but we desire to give all a hearing. And any position that will not stand criticism in the light of New Testament precept and example should be abandoned. And if the brethren can not show this for the use of the cups, they should, for the good of the cause and their own salvation, be willing to stand on the Book, where we can all stand without the sacrifice of truth and a good conscience. Our fight for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints will soon be over, and what will the Master say to us on "that day?"—"Well done?" or "Depart?"

QUERIES

In "... present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service," Rom. 12:1, what is the Greek word for "reasonable" and for "service," and what do they mean.—W. T.

Ans.—"Reasonable," logiken, pertaining to the soul, or spirit, in distinction from the flesh. "Service," latreian, service rendered to God, worship. The Am. Standard reads "spiritual service." This is in contrast with what they had been doing before conversion when giving their bodies to lusts to please self.

2. How many of the chosen apostles were fishermen?—how many were preachers?—how many were doctors or lawyers? Ans. Most of them were fishermen (Mt. 4:18): Peter, Andrew, James of Zebedee, John, James of Alphaeus, etc., none being a lawyer or doctor, or preacher.

AS I SEE IT

I hope all the readers of our excellent paper have read carefully and prayerfully what our good brother White has had to say on the "Name". I intend this in no sense as a review of what was said; but I do wish to notice a few points raised. And I am glad that we can investigate Bible subjects without fussing. This shows the brotherly spirit that prevails among God's children.

A creed that is narrower than the word of God is too narrow; and any creed that is broader than the word of God is too broad. We can safely use any terminology to designate a New Testament institution that is used by New Testament writers, and "Speak as the oracles of God," using "sound speech that can not be condemned." (Titus 2:8). That the three following terms are used by New Testament writers to designate the same institution is evident; namely, "Lord's supper" (1 Cor. 11:20), "break bread" (Acts 2:42; Acts 20:7), and "communion" (1 Cor. 10:16).

Law of terminology: First the object; then the name. Hence two new terms came into the language with the writing of the New Testament—"Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10) and "Lord's supper" (1 Cor. 11:20), terms sacred to the Christian and full of meaning, as were "Sabbath day" and "Passover supper" to every Israelite. It takes the "Lord's supper" to give proper setting to the "Lord's day." And it takes the "Lord's day" to complement the "Lord's supper"—no other day can do this. The Lord's death without the complement of the Lord's resurrection would give us no gospel—good news. On taking the "Lord's supper" the Lord's death is "Shown" (proclaimed). "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. 11:26). And the respecting of the "Lord's day" as a day to worship the Lord (1 Cor. 16:2; Acts 2:1; Acts 20:7; Rev. 1:10) proclaims the Lord's resurrection (John 20:1-20; Mark 16:9). "E kuriake emera (the Lord's day), the day devoted to the Lord, sacred to the memory of Christ's resurrection, Rev. 1:10."—Thayer, p. 365. "Kuriakon deipnon (Lord's supper), the supper instituted by the Lord, 1 Cor. 11:20."—Thayer, p. 365.

These are the only terms used by the New Testament writers to designate these institutions, and nothing else. "Breaking bread" may designate taking a meal of victuals, or it may designate the "Lord's supper." The context must determine which. And "communion" (koinonia) is used of other things besides the "Lord's supper." The "first day of the week" is not a terminology unknown before the New Testament writings. However, we can use any of these terms to designate what they designate in the New Testament writings, and "Call Bible things by Bible names." And anything that binds us to anything narrower is a human creed, as I see it. And if we may bind the church here, why not also bind it to use one terminology for the children of God to the exclusion of all others? As one has well said—"In seeking to get out of Babylon, we must not run past Jerusalem."

"In remembrance of me" or "in my remembrance," is how they were to "eat" and "drink." "Eis ten anamnesin—to call me (affectionately) to remembrance; 1 Cor. 11: 25, 25."—Thayer. This has no reference to Christ's remembering them; it commands them in these acts to remember him affectionately. And this eating and drinking as directed by the Lord will be a feast to the soul for those that "hunger and thirst after righteousness," and the partaker will be built up to full spiritual strength. And since the "Lord's supper never signifies "a common meal," the idea of "a common meal" is not correctly associated with it any more than "sprinkle" is associated with the word "baptize." There is no such idea in the word.

Paul did "away with" the eating of "his own supper" by each in the assembly, but not the "Lord's supper," for in this he says, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup ye katagell-ete, show, announce, proclaim, declare openly the Lord's death till he "come." And they were to do this "every first day of the week," 1 Cor. 16:2; Acts 20:7, or "Lord's day," Rev. 1:10.

At Corinth they were in no condition to eat the "Lord's supper" in loving remembrance of him to "declare openly" his death, "for in eating each one takes first his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken."

Neither can an assembly take the "Lord's supper" with "more than" one loaf and one cup without "breaking the order set by the Lord" (Matt. 26:27, et al.) and the dictates of Paul (1 Cor. 10:16). And in the "Lord's supper," when observed as divinely directed, is a *koinonia*, joint-participation of the "loaf" and a *koinonia*, joint-participation of the "cup." 1 Cor. 10:16. *Koinonia* is from Gr. *koinos* (Latin equivalent, *communis*), "common" "one loaf" and "the cup" for all.—In hope, W. A. Berry.

COWAN'S CONFUSION

Elsewhere in this issue will be found Cowan's introduction to his "Reply to Prof. Goodspeed," which is taken from the Apostolic Way of Mch. 1, 1930. In this he plainly states that he is arguing in favor of the cups, and the reader can see that the Apostolic Way, which fought the cups under Trott and Harper is now "giving aid and comfort" to this rank innovation on the New Testament order of things. It does not offer even a criticism of what this cups advocate has to say. When F. L. Rowe, of the Christian Leader, was fighting the cups in 1910, he jumped on the Christian Standard after this fashion; to-wit:

More Inconsistency

The Standard, in its issue of May 4, publishes an article by W. P. Keeler, on the individual communion cup question that is certainly most astonishing in its statement, which is evidently indorsed by The Standard, as they offer no editorial criticism of the same article. The writer, Mr. Keeler, states that when the question came up in the Englewood church, Chicago, whether or not they should adopt the individual communion cups, there

was a division of sentiment among the members. The matter was left to a "vote by ballot," resulting in 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 "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 favored the individual cups could be served from the same tray. The Standard writer thinks this a very happy solution of a perplexing question, and freely commends their course to other churches where the issue is forced upon them.

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

Immersion is right, or it is wrong; sprinkling is right, or it is wrong; the individual cup is right, or it is wrong. It should require no more time for the Standard to decide the question of scriptural department 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 the "mode" of baptism. After the very pronounced stand taken by Prof. McGarvey, on this very question of the individual cup, we are astonished that The Standard would permit an article like this one (by Keeler) to appear unrebuked. This is not 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.

But now the Leader has "locked arms" with "The Standard" and has been advocating and advertising the individual cups, gone, as Bro. Walton, in same issue of the Way, says: "to the world, the sects and the devil." And if the fact, as Rowe, noted, that The Standard made no criticism of this individual-cup writer, put that paper down with the individual-cups digression, the fact that the Way has remained silent and let its columns be used by J. N. Cowan to boost the Cups, is proof positive that the Way is lined up, contrary to its former editors and owners, and is now going "locked-arms with the world, the sects and the devil."

We suppose Rowe, now say Brother instead of his "Mr. Keeler," of twenty years ago, and the Way can furnish its columns to the Cups advocates to go unchallenged to the individual cups, where they are headed.

Yes, Cowan thought he had a club to maul us with in the Goodspeed translation, but "he reckoned without his host," for when Goodspeed came

back, he told Cowan that "These questions raised in Mr. Cowan's second paper (No. 2) have in general nothing to do with my translation any more than with any other that is faithful to the Greek. How the great Christian groups in Jerusalem or Corinth divided up for Christian worship is a historical problem, not a translational one. "This is just as we pointed out to Clark, namely, "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses. In large towns, where such a place of assembly could not accommodate all, it became necessary that smaller portions of the community dwelling at a distance should choose other places for their meetings." Neander, p. 402, Vol. 1. See Rom. 16:15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile v. 2.

C. says, "Some in the church of Christ use his translation on Matt. 26:27, because he translates 'wine-cup,' which they understand to mean a literal drinking vessel."

Yes, "they understand" it so; and Cowan does not "understand" when he says it means something else. And here is the evidence:

Sneads, Fla., Sept. 28, 1928.

Edgar J. Goodspeed
Chicago University,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir: Is the word "wine-cup" in your tr. used literally in every case? Ans.: So far as I have noticed. 2. Is the word you translate "cup" in Lk. 22:17 and 1 Cor. 10:16 used literally in each case? Ans. Yes.

13 Follen Street

Cambridge, Mass., 1 October 1928

Mr. H. C. Harper:
Dear Sir:

The word "cup" as used in Matt. 26:27; Lk. 22:20—1 Cor. 10:16 is used literally. James H. Ropes.

This is the testimony of two of the greatest living scholars of N. T. Greek.

J. H. Thayer is the standard authority on N. T. Greek, and in his Lexicon of the N. T. he gives the use of "cup" as literal in these texts: Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 10:16: 1 Cor. 11:25 and 28. p. 533.

Now you can see why Johnson, like the sprinkler, wants the dictionary left out. And after Cowan has gone "through the course of sprouts" as Johnson has, he will want to leave the dictionary out, too. He can appear wise before the ignorant when "measuring himself by himself."

"Broke in pieces." There are no words in the Greek for "in pieces," C. says, "They were forced to say for the same reason that the bread should not be broken into pieces for fear of having more than one loaf after broken."

Then "they" were just about as ignorant as Cowan is in contending that "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same.

Who are "they," anyway? Name some of them. If there is any difference in the thought expressed in "broke in pieces" and just "broke," let Cowan tell what it is. Does Cowan understand from this what Jesus broke the loaf into a pile of frag-

ments and gave the pile to the disciples? Does he understand that Jesus broke the loaf into two pieces and handed them to the disciples? Does he understand that the disciples "broke" (and "in pieces," if you please) bread in the communion service? Paul says, "The loaf which we break." Did each one break a "loaf" into a pile of fragments? Did each one break the "loaf" into two pieces? Did each one break a piece from the "loaf" and lay it down or throw it away? Let the reader remember that I am not taking any position now, but am asking. Is Cowan right?—Ed.

Canon City, Colo., March 15, 1930.

Mr. H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida.

Dear Sir:

A copy of your paper "The Truth" has been sent to me. I picked it up and started to read it and on page two, in explaining your position on using just one cup in the communion, so say that in Mark 14:23 it says "They all drank OUT of it." I just turned and read Mark 14:23 and I find that you have added to God's Word, but it does NOT say they drank OUT of it. But "They all drank of it." A man that has to add to God's word in order to carry his point is mighty hard pressed. "The Truth"?? Bah! Please do not bother me with your paper any more.

Yours for the TRUTH,

Roy Loney.

Remarks

We have known sectarians and Catholics who were actually afraid to read for fear they would find themselves wrong, and of late years there is quite a sprinkling of just such folks in the church of Christ, and they are all "beating it" down the same road with their eyes closed, ears stopped, and minds hardened, headed for destruction. And it is remarkable how much alike in sentiment they become, and how nearly alike they express themselves in defending their course.

Approach the sprinkler, and tell him Mk. 16:16 says; "He that believes and is immersed, shall be saved." And he, Loney like—rather Loney like him—replies: "I just turned and read Mark 16:16, and it says, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved" and I find that you have added to God's word, but it does NOT say IS IMMERSSED, but is baptized. A man that has to add to God's word in order to carry his point is mighty hard pressed. "The Truth"? Bah. Please don't trouble me with such stuff." And on he goes—rather dodges into his hole out of danger, or sticks his head in the sand like the ostrich for fear he may see something that will "get his goat," and cries, B-a-h, b-a-h! to try to scare somebody.

And when we tell our "salvation-before-baptism advocate that the Bible says "be baptized in order to the remission of sins," he tells us it says "for the remission of sins" and that we have added to God's word.

We invite criticism; we invite investigation; if we are wrong, it is your duty, brother, to show us, and God will hold you accountable for it. The space in this paper is open to you. We will listen

to you. What translation of the Bible did you read? We tell the sectarian that the original of Acts 2:38, signifies "to obtain the forgiveness of sins." Thayer, p. 94. And we tell you that the original of Mark 14:23, ek is "ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks." Thayer, p. 510. And we say on the highest linguistic authority on earth that "for," of the King James and "unto," of the Revised version, must be used in the sense of "in order to" to represent the idea of the original; and we tell you that "of," the King James, or "from," of others, must be used in the sense of "out of" here to represent the idea of the original. This is the truth of the matter, and we challenge investigation. Ed.

WANTED

To know the whereabouts of Bro. Charley Watkins. I have addressed two letters to him, asking him to come here and teach the church in a joint discussion that the use of a plurality of cups for the distribution of the wine in the communion is according to the scriptures; but can get no response. Before it became generally known that he was in favor of the cups, I had no trouble in hearing from him. If he will not condescend to meet one of us, he can have Bob Musgrave, who will hold us a meeting to last from the first to the third Lord's day in July. In this way others can learn what the Bible teaches on the subject. Now here is a chance for Johnson or Cowan if Charley does not feel equal to the task. Where is the CUPS church that will make such an offer? Yes, where? They should do so if they are not afraid of the truth like the organ and the S. S. churches. Perhaps Cowan would meet Johnson on the proposition he (Cowan) has signed on the individual cups at Ralls? Why not, and get the truth before the people? Will the Apostolic Way help us to get this offer before these preachers? Why not?—J. S. Bedingfield, Box 219, Lorenzo, Texas.

DEBATE POSTPONED — WALLACE BACKS DOWN

Please get your "Truth" for March 15, and re-read my article on page 4, concerning Chas. F. Reese, Holy Roller King and Foy E. Wallace all backing off from discussing the issues between us.

Brother G. W. Riggs, a good man, with whom I signed propositions to debate the Sunday School and Cups questions in Los Angeles, beginning March 31, 1930, is not physically able to discuss these matters now, and will not likely be able before June or July. So the debate has been postponed for a while.

Bro. Riggs went to see Bro. Foy E. Wallace, to get him to take his place in this debate, and Bro. Wallace backed off and refused to debate. The brethren who know of his willingness to debate with sectarians would be a little surprised at his backing off from this debate if it were not for the fact that they know he does not have the truth on these questions. "Alas, poor Yorick, he is dead!"—J. D. Phillips.

BAPTIZE.—"L. D. M.," Fayetteville, Tenn.—The word baptize came into the English from the Old French baptiser, from the late Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptizo, from bapto, to dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkling is not to be associated with it.—Lexicographer's Easy Chair, *The Literary Digest*, March 7, 1925.

If this is not the truth, let some sprinkler meet it. This paper is open to the one who will show that the foregoing is not the truth.—Ed.

TRACTS

The "Cup" by Dr. Trott 10 cents
Scriptural Baptism by H. C. Harper 10 cents
Building According to the Pattern by T. C. Hawley—free.
Clark-Harper Debate on the Cups 5 cents
(Include enough to pay postage on order).

I would like to know whether you are publishing the paper called "The Truth." I saw one copy, and thought it contained more truth to the square inch than any other paper I ever read. I would like to have a copy with the subscription price, and will subscribe if it is within my reach and get others to subscribe.—C. A. Sutton.

Brother Harper, you are publishing the only "open forum" in the brotherhood now so far as I am able to find out. They all have pets to protect and are not open to receive the truth. I am hoping and praying that you will continue as you are. We need just such a paper, and it is bound to win with the brethren in the long run, and I am glad to see it gaining so fast.—W. A. Berry.

Please send me two or three copies of your paper, "The Truth," by return mail.—M. D. Yochum.

Send me some samples, and I will get some subs. The Truth is the best defender of "the faith" I have ever seen.—J. M. Tuttle.

Dear Brother: You are gaining friends and influence by the noble stand you are taking for the church. Brother Trott said it right when he put you down as one of the best writers in the brotherhood. It does my soul good to read after you. How I wish brethren would take God at his word and leave all things of man out of the worship, and "speak where the Bible speaks."—A. Ray.

I am writing for sample copies of *The Truth*. I have never seen a copy.—J. C. Trapp.

Jan. 23, 1930. Our dear Brother Mills, of St. Albans, W. Va., who took his stand against the Sunday School after the Moore-Phillips debate at South Charleston, was killed a few days ago by a train near his home. A good preacher is gone, one that stood for the Bible and the Bible alone, and we will miss him greatly.—G. W. Terry.

The Truth is getting better all the time.—Herman M. Stewart.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, APRIL 15, 1930.

No. 8

Ballinger, Texas, 3—17—'30.

E. J. Lidbury,
Gunter, Texas.

Dear Brother in Christ:-

In answer to your recent letter containing the letter from Brother Welch, which I am enclosing, will say that I doubt very seriously if there is a "one cup congregation" that will allow brother Welch to represent them.

I would demand that he have the endorsement of H. C. Harper, Jas. D. Phillips, Bob Musgrave to meet me in a public oral discussion of the cup question. My reason for this is, if I should meet Welch, they would say he was not a fair representative of their position, and we would not gain anything by the debate. But if they will endorse him to meet me, I feel that we would have enough backing to make the debate worth while.

Again, I will demand that the debate be held where there is confusion over the question, and where both sides were favorable to the debate. I have agreed to meet both Musgrave and Harper at the place of their own selection, and each time they failed to come across. Harper left without notice. I not only will meet Welch, but any other man they may select. They all look alike to me when it comes to exposing their falicious reasoning.

Notify Brother Welch that if he can crow loud enough to make his people hear him, and get them to put him up, I will be glad to attend to him at any place where the debate is wanted.

You may send him this letter if you like.

Hoping you a successful trip to Canada, and that you may have success in the Lord's work, I am,

Yours in Christ,

J. N. COWAN

P. S. Will get mail at above address for 10 days yet. J. N. C.

Remarks

The above letter was mailed to us by Bro. Welch, of Morton, Texas, Star route, and we sent Bro. Welch our unqualified endorsement to meet J. N. Cowan or any other man on this question.

Now listen. We will furnish place about with Cowan, and start "the ball rolling" by furnishing the first, and debate him from now until the first of September, or longer if he wants to continue after that, taking the propositions we have both signed, one in 1925. Now we shall see whether there are two-or-more-cups congregations will endorse Cowan to meet me.

When Cowan signed these propositions with me, there was not a single "string" connected with the proposal to debate. He put these strings on to

keep from meeting me at Ringling last year. This was the "place" of my choosing where there was a large community Tabernacle in reach of Loco, Wilson, Healdton, Pike City, Caddo, and other communities. And when I went to Cowan, who was already on the ground in debate with Chism, and told him I had secured the Tabernacle for our debate, he said, "It suits me." And I told him to announce it that night, and to make sure that he would not forget to do so, I stepped up to the stand just before the debate opened that night, and mentioned it to him again. But he said I would have to see the church there, and if they were willing, it would be all right with him. The next day I learned that Geo. W. Phillips, who was promoting the Cowan-Chism debate, and Fish and Stewart of Ringling, were objecting to the debate, and Cowan was now hiding behind them to keep from meeting me. This I told to those who were with me, and a brother from Wilson said to have it announced there and he would try to get a place; so that night it was announced for Wilson. The Cowan-Chism debate closed that night. In the morning I received a phone message at Healdton, from the Brother at Wilson, saying he was not able to get a place for the debate. My meetings were all through, and I had nothing farther to keep me, and so to save fare as much as possible, I accepted the invitation of Dr. Watking, who was leaving for Gainesville, Texas, to accompany him there, and I did so, and came on home, having met a miserable coward, who put up a miserable excuse to keep out of doing that which he had signed up to do. Why send you notice when you had already backed out and refused to meet me at the "place" of my choosing? When I see you tied that you can not get away, then I will believe you may try to meet the issue, and not before. I have no confidence in your word whatever. You once backed squarely out, and I have no assurance that you will not do so again. You can "crow on the run," that's all. You have been tried and found wanting. And your downright falsehood that I "failed to come across," is equalled only by the other that Musgrave did the same, when you know you are not telling the truth. Musgrave was on the ground, and you failed to come at the bidding of your own side who said they would not endorse you. And Musgrave at their anxious bidding so notified you. And you said if you found out that this opposition to the debate was from your side, that you would come, but when notified that it was, you were still conspicuous by your absence. You did not come.

We are not afraid to have you test our "falicious reasoning," neither are we afraid that we cannot expose your fallacious (and as full of fallacy as an egg is of meat) arguments,—not a bit of it.

And now if the cups churches have any confidence in your ability, they will readily accept the offer of "turn about" here made, and put you to work to silence us. Dare they do it? Try them, and maybe they will not fall in line with your Elk City crowd. You are our best friend if we have not the truth to thrash us to a "frazzle," as I told Johnson at Sentinel. And remember that you bluntly told the truth in that letter when you said you had "avoided" a debate of the question for five long years. Take off those miserable "strings"—just such tactics as the S. S., the organ, and the M. S. all resorted to "avoid" meeting a man in debate, and you know it. Let us see. It must be—

1. "where there is confusion over the question,"
2. "where both sides are favorable to the debate,"
3. "that he have the endorsement of," etc.

And it seems, too, that you are to be the sole judge of the whole matter, and are in addition to all this, like the old tramp, "Looking for work, and praying that he will not find it."

Talking about chasing Sommer around for a debate a "whole year." What is that compared with the chase I have had after J. N. Cowan since he signed a proposition to debate with me in 1925? What is your answer? Say it with a debate if you dare. You said you would go to Elk City and debate if it was your side that opposed it (but you did not go) and at Ringling said you would not when your side opposed it. Must the "moon" be right, too? —H. C. Harper.

SAUNDERS-MUSGRAVE DEBATE

This debate was held at Reydon, a new town on the Santa Fe, sixteen miles west of Cheyenne, Okla., beginning Monday night, March 10, and lasting six nights.

Prop. 1.—A church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and observe the communion using one cup to drink from. Bob Musgrave, affirmative; Freney Saunders, negative.

Prop. 2.—A church of Christ can speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent and observe the communion using two or more cups to drink from. Freney Saunders, affirmative; Bob Musgrave, negative.

Prop. 3.—Our practices—the method of teaching the word of God as practiced by the church of Christ, the whole assembly being taught by one man teaching at a time, is the only Apostolic method of teaching an assembly. Bob Musgrave, affirmative; Freney Saunders, negative.

Prop. 4.—Our practice: Those Churches of Christ that maintain a regular meeting on Lord's Day for the purpose of teaching the Word of God, to all who attend and those that are taught are divided into classes with men and women teachers, all teaching at the same time and place is Apostolic method of teaching an assembly. Freney Saunders, affirms; Bob Musgrave, denies.

The writer kept time for Bob Musgrave, and everything went off nicely. One session only was given to the communion question; two to each of

the others. I can truthfully say that all who attended and wanted divine authority appreciated Bro. Musgrave's presentation of his speeches. Of course, every careful Bible reader knows that Saunders could not give a single Scripture for his proof. On the cups Saunders tried to cover up the issue on "cups to drink from" by what he called Greek, but Bro. Musgrave held him to the issue, and the truth was well presented by his giving the Bible, chapter and verse for his proof.

On the classes Bro. Musgrave made an impregnable fort of the word of God that no man can demolish. And being equipped as a "good soldier of Jesus Christ"—his feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel, for a helmet the hope of salvation, "faith" that staggers not at the word of God, his shield, and "the sword of the Spirit" to vanquish error with—he met his opponent in the spirit of meekness that characterized the contest of David with Goliath.

We wish to state emphatically to the brethren that they will not go wrong in getting Bro. Musgrave to defend the truth. He is able; he is ready; he is humble; he is sincere, believing most heartily in what he is contending for; he has the Bible well studied. Finally, let us who want the favor of God continued to "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent." We will have Brother Musgrave with us in a meeting beginning the first Sunday in June. We invite brethren who can to be with us.—J. C. Spurlin, Reydon, Okla.

Walter W. Leamons, Mountain View, Ark.—I am now located at this place in the heart of the Ozark region. No other preacher and not an active congregation in the county. If interested in mission work, send contributions to me here, and they will be rightly used and promptly acknowledged.

C. H. Williams, South Charleston, W. Va.—Our meeting here closed Sunday night, March 23, with nine added to the congregation, and the brothers and sisters more determined than ever to work for the Lord. There was considerable opposition from various sources, on the part of those who advocate the cups and the classes. Brother Janey and I will debate the Cups question if he does not back out. Brother Robinson emphasized the Bible teaching that the fathers are to teach their children and that if this parental training is left to others, it is a failure, as all of man's ways are when opposed to God's; and that the older women were to teach the younger, as Paul has laid it down in Titus. And such teaching is badly needed today.

"LET YOUR WOMEN KEEP SILENT"

"Your"—who?

Person spoken to, and that was the inspired prophet. See 1 Cor. 14: 27-33. Person spoken of is the wife of the person spoken to, hence not applicable to any woman today. Has no more reference to women today than verse 5—"I would that ye all spake with tongues"—has to men to

day. Has no more reference to women today than have verses 28, 30, which say for men to keep silent. We must learn "rightly to divide the Word of Truth", and learn what is applicable.

The man, being inspired, was to "keep silence in the church", and speak to God. His wife, being uninspired, was to keep silent and "ask their husbands at home." This shows the woman mentioned was married, and that her husband was the prophet who could speak to God.

In 1 Cor. 11: 4, 5 the woman is told to do the same thing the man is, namely, "pray and prophesy." Lack of qualification is all that keeps any person in the Lord's family from doing any work. God does not know us as sexes. There is neither male nor female in Christ (Gal. 3: 27-29), so Paul says. Woman lacks qualifications for evangelist, Bishop and Deacon, so do many men, hence they are excluded from that work, but not from teaching, praying, etc.

W. G. Roberts, 2308 Richmond ave., Matton, Ill.

Remarks

The above is from the Apostolic Review, but it is not apostolic teaching by a long, long way. It is simply a perverting of the word of God in an attempt to justify "commandments and doctrines of men." Col. 2:21, 22.

1. "Has no more reference to women today than verses 28, 30, which say for men to keep silent," he says. What has? Evidently he thinks this of verses 33-35, which speaks of the "silence" imposed on women "in the church."

Taking his own admission then, we find that it does have "reference to women today," for verse 28 is a plain command that is binding on the man today and he dare not speak to the church in a language unknown to them, unless there is an interpreter, that the church may receive "edification." Furthermore, either God is a God of "confusion," or it is not confusion for a man to speak in the church in a language unknown to them without an interpreter. But it is, and God is not the "author" of it—it sprang from man, not God, just as the woman speaking in the church today did. And the truth he has wrongly divided.

Speaking "unto the church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Cor. 1:2), Paul says, "your women," which includes all the women in the "church" at Corinth, and he says, "it is not permitted unto them to speak" (v. 34), and he shows that man has this authority, as the reason why he commands him to see to this, saying of the women, "but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law." And we find this subjection of woman to man plainly stated where he says, "Let a woman ('a virgin, or married, or a widow'—Thayer, p. 123) learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression." 1 Tim. 2:12-14.

Here it is shown that this apostolic regulation "in the church" at Corinth, "as in all the churches of the saints" (v. 33) has its initiative force in the difference of sex—male and female, man and

woman; not in inspired and uninspired; and in the face of this plain word of God, for a man to say, "God does not know us as sexes. There is neither male nor female in Christ (Gal. 3:27-29), so says Paul," is but to pervert the word of God in a most brazen manner. If God does not know us as male and female, the commands from God to the male are also to the female, and vice versa. But this is not true, and Roberts has again wrongly divided the word of truth. When it comes to the promise of God through Abraham, it is to all regardless of Jew or Greek, bondservant or free-man, male or female. W. G. Roberts should be ashamed of himself. How can honest people who want the truth have any confidence in such a man as a teacher of God's word?

The woman is not told to do the same thing, namely, "pray and prophesy," in 1 Cor. 11:4, 5, but when they got to cutting their hair like men, they were taking the work as men, as women are wont to do in modern times; and while the apostles here rebukes but the one wrong, cutting (bobbing) the hair, when he comes to treat the edification of the church in "a more excellent way," he rebukes the other practice of assuming the function (work) of men, as we find in the 14th chapter. And there is nothing unusual about this manner of writing to the church. Just learn to divide the word of God rightly and all will be plain.

Women are not excluded from teaching, as we see in other Scriptures, for example Titus 2:3, 4, and this teaching is badly needed today; but they are "not permitted" to teach "in the church," but must there "learn in silence," for "it is not permitted unto them to speak" there, or "to teach." Hence "it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." And "a woman," a virgin, married, or a widow, as the word means, is any woman. To assume all had husbands, or that none were to speak but the "prophets," or that all the "prophets" had wives, is but to argue assumption.—Ed.

HOW IT HAPPENED

The debate with Freney Saunders of Cups and Sunday School persuasion, was begun on short notice. He had a debate arranged with Alva Johnson, but for some unknown reason to me Johnson did not appear, and Saunders came to Elk City, making some inquiry, and I agreed to meet him. I think much good will result from the debate at Reydon, where it was held. I enjoyed the debate very much, and I rejoice at the good feeling that prevailed. I commend Saunders for being willing to try to defend by the Bible what they practice. Let us have more such opportunities for the people to hear "both sides." Why not? I shall begin a meeting at Honey Grove, Texas, Lord's Day, April 6 to continue two weeks, and will be glad to meet all the brethren there. The Meeting at Newkirk, Okla., I shall begin the first of May, and continue two weeks, and hope all who live near enough there will attend the meeting. I shall be back at Reydon, Okla., where I met Saunders in debate to hold a meeting the first of June. Bob Musgrave.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

THE GARWICK-PHILLIPS DEBATE

This debate was held in the Wilson High School Auditorium, El Cetro, Calif., March 27 and 28. Bro. Noah Garwick, pastor of the Brawley, Calif., Christian Church, affirmed that—"The use of instrumental music in Christian worship is scriptural."

He started out by saying that the use of mechanical music is commanded. To this I replied that, if it is commanded,—

1. **No church can render acceptable worship without it;** for, if it is commanded, a church that does not use it is a disobedient one, and is sure for condemnation.

2. **Every one must play as well as sing to obey the command.** This is not done by any church, for just a few in any congregation play on an instrument during the worship. The ones who do not play an instrument, according to Bro. Garwick's contention, are disobedient to the command.

3. **Paul and Silas, in prison (Acts 16), disobeyed the command;** for circumstances were such that they could not play an instrument there.

4. **The Church during the Apostolic Age disobeyed the command;** for there is no way of knowing that mechanical music was used in Christian worship before the 7th Century, A. D., and it was then introduced by the Pope of Rome, "that man of sin," "the son of perdition" (2 Thess. 2: 2-7), who arrogated to himself the authority "to change times and the law" (Dan. 7:25) of God.

5. **Hence the command was not obeyed until the 7th Century,** and all who died before the coming of the Pope with his Roman Hierarchy which is an apostasy from the religion of Christ are lost.

6. **A poverty-stricken church cannot obey the command.**

I then stated that its use is not commanded, therefore,—

1. **We can worship God acceptably without it,** and hence it is unnecessary, and should be abandoned for the sake of peace so that we may safely "keep the unity of the spirit in the true bond of peace."—Eph. 4.

2. **It causes division which is sin.** I read letters from Lyons, Bedford and Paxton, Ind., and Lexington, Ky., showing that the introduction of the instrument had caused division at all these

places, and that J. W. McGarvey, president of Kentucky University, was driven from the church on Broadway Street, a congregation that he had established; and that when he died, the arrogant brethren brought his dead body into that meeting-house, and, as a token of triumph over him and the truth, played the instrument—the thing he had fought so hard—over his dead body because they had him down so that he could not speak for himself. And this is a manifestation of the spirit of the devil, that evil sprit that works in "the sons of disobedience."

3. **It tends to other departures from "that which is written";** for, when the brethren "go beyond that which is written" they "transgress the law and have not God" (2 John 9), and the way is then open for every innovation on earth. The digressive brethren sowed to the wind, by building on the silence of the Bible, and they are now reaping the whirlwind of discord and division.

4. **Those who force the instrument on the brethren are making a law where God has made none,** and they thus dethrone Christ as King and Lawgiver, and divide the rule or authority of Christ with that of man.

The whole contention rests upon the fact that the instrument is not authorized in the Scriptures. Bro. Garwick quoted numerous passages from the Old Testament regarding the use of mechanical music among the Jews; but I easily showed that he was going to the Law for his authority. Paul says they who do this "are fallen from grace."—Gal. 5.

He also quoted Rev. 14:2 and 15:2, and stated that, since there are instruments in Heaven, we should have them in the Church. I replied that he could baptize infants and receive them into the church, according to his logic; for there will certainly be infants in Heaven. And since he got his instruments from the Pope, he should be consistent with his own teaching, and practice infant church membership by the same logic.

I then showed that John heard "the voice as (or like that) of harpers harping with their harps"—"as of harpers," not the literal harps, but something "as of harpers harping with their harps." And since the "four beasts," "the sea of glass," the "thunders," the "many waters," etc., are not literal, the harps are not, either; and that the music made by the 144,000 redeemed out of Israel was vocal music—"they sing a new song before the throne."—Rev. 14.

Most of the controversy was over the meaning of a word—the Greek verb "psallo" and the noun form which is "psalmos" translated "psalms" in Col. 3:16 and James 5:13, etc. He garbled the definitions of these two words as given by several lexicographers,—Thayer, Robinson, Bagster, Pickering, Liddell and Scott, Donohue, et al. He could have given some thirty-five other authorities on the meaning of Greek; but this would not have helped his cause.

The classical meaning of psallo as given by the lexicons is: "a. to pluck off, pull out: etheiran, the hair. . . . b. to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang. . . . to touch or strike the chord, to twang the strings of a musical instrument so that

they gently vibrate." . . . to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp, etc."—Thayer, page 675. Robinson gives its definitions about the same as Thayer does, and adds: "to pluck, e. g. the hair or beard." Again: "to twang, e. g. a carpenter's line in order to make a mark."—Ibid. Again: "to twang, . . . e. g. the strings of a bow."—Ibid. The other authorities he gave about the same that Thayer and Robinson give.

I made the point that, since all Christians are commanded to "psallo" and since Bro. Garwick insists that we take its classical meaning as the New Testament meaning, he should, to be consistent, insist that every Christian do everything the classical meaning of the word suggests, namely: play on a mechanical instrument, pluck the hair or beard from the head or face, twang a carpenter's line to make a mark on the floor or seat, and shoot a bow and arrow—doing all of this while he sings! and since no one has more than two hands to do all these things with, it is impossible for him to do it all at once. And what proves too much proves nothing.

And the one who attempts to do all these things at once is "in the same row of stumps" with the darkey boy who had stolen two watermelons and was carrying them home, one under each arm, and when he came to the gate, he said: "How a nigger do need three arms now."

Let us admit, for argument's sake, that the verb psallo in the New Testament means what Thayer, Robinson, et al, give as its classical meaning (it does not), that would not give us authority to use a mechanical instrument, for, as Robert Milligan truly says:

"But what does the apostle here (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16) mean by Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs? The word "Psalm" is from the Greek noun PSALMOS, and this again from the verb PSALLO, to touch, to feel, to play on a stringed instrument with the fingers, and, finally, to make music or melody in the heart, as in Eph. 5:19. The meaning of the noun corresponds with that of the verb, and denotes a touching, a playing on a stringed instrument, any song or ode. And hence it is evident that the word "Psalm" may or may not refer to instrumental music. Its proper meaning, in any and every case, must be determined by the context.

"And according to this fundamental law of interpretation, it is evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term "PSALMOS" has no reference to instrumental music; for, in both cases, it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched."

When a preacher in the East began to teach that "Psalms" in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 implied a mechanical instrument, and a brother wrote Bro. J. W. McGarvey for information on this point, this peerless scholar and exegate, replied: "If any man who is a preacher believes that the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church, by enjoining the singing of Psalms, he is one of those smatterers in Greek who can believe anything he wishes to believe. When the wish is father to the thought, correct exegesis is like water on a duck's back."—Christian Standard, 18-95, page

1149.

But the classical meaning of the noun psalmos and the verb psallo is not the New Testament meaning, for Thayer, who stands at the very top of lexicographers of New Testament Greek, says: "Psallo, . . . in the N. T. to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song, Jas. 5:13 (R. V. sing praise)."—Thayer, page 675. Of the noun, he says:

"Psalmos, . . . a pious song, a psalm, Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; the phrase echein psalmos is used of one who has it in his heart to sing or recite a song of the sort, 1 Cor. 14:26."—Thayer, page 675.

So Thayer cuts the advocates of instrumental music out of any claims to finding the use of a mechanical instrument authorized in either the noun psalmos or the verb psallo; and hence, it is not commanded in Christian worship. It is neither scriptural nor "scripturally permissible," as John W. McKee affirmed in debate with me at Ottumwa, Iowa.

When Paul said: "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips"—not the fruit of a mechanical instrument—he cut us out of any claim to the right to use mechanical music with which to praise God. Hence Alexander Campbell says: "I presume to all spiritually minded Christians such aids (as mechanical music) would be as a cowbell in a concert."—Millennial Harbinger, 1851, page 581.

From these premises we conclude that the brethren who make the law that we must use mechanical music in the worship, thus causing good brethren to stumble, come under the condemnation of the Son of God when He says: "There must needs be that occasions of stumbling come; but woe unto that man by whom the occasion cometh! it were better for that man that a millstone be hanged to his neck, and he were cast to the depth of the sea."—Matt. 18.

At the conclusion of the debate, I challenged Bro. Garwick to meet me in a written debate in The Truth on this proposition, but he made no reply. I thought him honest, but when he garbled Thayer's definition of psallo and psalmos, and misrepresented Bro. McGarvey, I had to lose confidence in his sincerity.

I shall send Bro. Garwick a copy of this report, and if he wishes to reply to it, in The Truth, he may do so. He is a nice fellow to debate with. Bro. W. H. Hilton, of Somerton, Ariz., kept time for us.

PROPHETICAL STUDIES

By Paul Hays

The prophecies ought to be studied, as well as the rest of the Bible. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." There is a special blessing pronounced on those who 'Read, hear, and keep' the things of the book of Revelation. Rev. 1:3; 22:7.

There is the same curse pronounced against the one who 'adds to, or takes from' the prophecies, that there is against him who adds to, or changes the plan of salvation. Rev. 22:18, 19. The prophecies are sacred and important.

Daniel was told that the prophecies of his book

were 'sealed, til the time of the end.' He encouraged us to believe that in the time of the end, 'The wise shall understand.' The Book of Revelation claims to Unseal the prophecies. Dan. 12:9, 10; Rev. 5:9, etc. The word, Revelation, means, something revealed. It is for 'the Churches'.

We are astounded that the Jews did not understand the prophecies of the 'first coming of the Lord, but we seem to stagger at the thought of understanding the prophecies of his 'second coming'. 'Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time'. Lu. 12:56.

Jesus said that 'no man, nor angel, (not even He, himself), knew when he was coming again. Yet we are to be always 'watching,—for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh.' Yet, he also indicated that we could know when 'it is even at the doors'. Matt. 24:33.

A thing that staggers many prophetic students is, that the first chapter of Revelation declares that 'the time is at hand.' But this agrees with the Saviour's instruction, to be always 'waiting and watching'. The only possible thought is that the coming of the Lord is always, and at any time, ready to occur.

The apostle Peter indicates that these things have been put off, from time to time, because the Lord is 'longsuffering, not willing that any should perish.' So did God delay the destruction of Nineveh. Peter seemed to think that we could 'hasten the coming of the day of God'. 2 Pet. 3:9-12.

It is when God becomes hopeless of reformation, that 'he will come and will not tarry.' The different crises of history have been crises of judgment, and every dispensation ends in apostasy, and the fierce wrath of the Almighty. 'As in the days of Noah, and as it was in the days of Lot', Lu. 17:24-37.

God's judgments have often been turned aside, or delayed, by the prayers of faithful men of God. But the time is coming when it will do no good to pray. Jer. 11:14. The time is coming when men will not repent. Rev. 16:9. They have heaped up wrath, against the day of wrath. "Thus saith the Lord God, I will make this proverb to cease, ('The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth'). But say unto them: The days are at hand, and the effect of every vision."

God has often started to 'do his act, His strange act,' and has drawn back, through mercy. These partial fulfillments have become a type of future full-fillments. The final full-fillment is cumulative. God will justify his word by literally carrying it out, in the end-time. "One jot, or one tittle, shall in no wise pass, till all be fulfilled."

Many of the apparent fulfillments of prophesy, in the past, are merely 'primary fulfillments', and some of the prophecies of Revelation are clearly typical of greater things: as, for instance, the 'trumpets', and the 'Vials.' The trumpets are 'a warning,' and the vials is 'filled up the Wrath of God.'

The final 'end time' judgments are not extended to (or through) a long series of years, but are limited to 'days'. It is a 'short time.' Rev. 12:12. The devil has a short time, and the Lord will do

a short work in the earth. Mk. 13:20; Rom. 9:28; Rev. 17:10.

A careful student of the book of Revelation must decide that it has a consecutive fulfillment, and yet we are brought right up to the great day of the 'Wrath of the Lamb' before we are done with the sixth chapter. Before we are done with the book we will, perhaps, agree that 'the day of God' is a period of time, covering a few years.

There are two periods of time, reaching up to the coming of the Lord, each composed of three years and a half. If these are consecutive, they cover a period of seven years. Rev. 11:3; 13:5; 19:20. The different expressions: '1260 days, '42 months', and 'time, times, and a half', each amounts to three and one half years. The variety of expression is, perhaps, to indicate its literalness.

Let us briefly survey the '42 months' of the reign of the 'beast'. It is preceded by 'war in heaven,' and the casting down of Satan, 'a short time' before the 'binding of Satan,' at the coming of the Lord. Dan. 12:1; Rev. 12:9. He is called 'That old serpent, the devil, and Satan.' The variety of names, again, indicate literalness.

You will note that the Devil is pictured as having 8 heads, and 10 horns. This, as we shall presently see (doubtless) has reference to the organization of his heavenly hosts, who are cast out with him. Rev. 12:9. Immediately we see his counterpart, with 7 heads and 10 horns, in the (visible) earthly organization of the 'beast'. Rev. 17:8-14. (Also 13:1).

By comparing Rev. 13:1-8 with Dan. 7:17-27 you must conclude with me that 'the beast' is the 'fourth beast' of Dan. 7:17, and is the Restored Roman Empire. It will be here to meet the Lord at his coming. Rev. 19. It is called 'the beast that is not, and is to come back from the Pit', and 'go into perdition.'

It is the eighth head of the Roman beast that comes back from hades, and it was 'one of the seven.' Rev. 17:11. The ten horns are ten kings (or kingdoms) federated under the beast. The beast is their emperor, or 'dictator.' These shall, unitedly, agree to give their power and strength to the beast, for 'one hour'. Rev. 17:12.

Preceding this federation of 10 kingdoms, there is seen 'a Woman' riding the beast. This is the city of Rome, and (doubtless) stands for the Papacy, because a Woman represents a church, (and a Whore, a fallen church). Rev. 17:18. Rome is originally Pagan, and the Emperor was an object of worship. So, when the 10 horns assist the Beast in unseating the Woman, The Beast becomes an object of worship 'for one hour.' Rev. 13:4-12.

Remember that the whole reign of the beast, including the time when the Woman is in the saddle, is a period of three and one half years. The Beast and the 10 horns meet the Lord at his coming. Rev. 19:19. Preceding this, (perhaps) 'two witnesses prophesy in that city where our Lord was crucified, for three and a half years. (Rev. 11).

But, how are we to harmonize all this with the 'imminent' coming of the Lord? Must we wait at least seven years for the Lord to come? How, then can we be always looking for Him?

Beloved, when Jesus comes, in Rev. 19, he is coming with his saints. But before that, he will come for his saints. That time is uncertain, but will, perhaps, precede the terrible judgments and 'vials', including the reign of the Beast.

Satan and his angels are ousted, I suppose, to make room for the saints. God shall bruise Satan under our feet, shortly. "And they overcame him, by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." "Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to . . . the earth . . . for the devil is come down unto you having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Rev. 12:7-12.

The 'Marriage of the Lamb' seems to take place before the coming of the Lord, in Rev. 19. The Saints are with the Lord before they come with him. Rev. 19:7-14. The saints help to judge the Beast. Dan. 7:21-27; Rev. 2:26, 27; Jude 14, 15.

"Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent, that ye may be found of Him in peace, without spot, and blameless." "He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God. And it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

But, O Apostate Church! 'Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! To what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light: as if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him. Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? even very dark, and no brightness in it?' Amos 5:18-20.

Remarks

Bro. Hays says: "Some of my ideas (on Prophecy) are my own—and I had rather see them tested out, before making too much of them.

"My health is very precious, but I enjoy writing and crave to be right. Any criticism or questions will be thankfully received. . . You may invite questions or criticisms."

If you have any question or criticisms on this article, make it brief, and send it to Paul Hays, Route 4, Box 15, Fresno, Calif.—J. D. P.

"BIRDS OF A FEATHER," ETC.

The Christian Standard has been "throwing kisses" at the Christian Leader and the Firm Foundation and Gospel Advocate, thinking, no doubt, that they were "leaning over" far enough to catch them. And sure enough the Leader and F. F. smiled lovingly back, and the Gospel Advocate did not bluntly repel at first. But later one of its editors caught what was going on, and being "one of the old guard," he threw a shot into the trusting party that brought what was going on plainly to the brotherhood of the churches of Christ. He did not hesitate to lay on the whip; but the Leader came back with—your kids were in the game, too; or word to that import, as an "excuse" for waywardness; in fact he claims that

Bro. Smith was actually encouraging the 'trusting' at first himself, and that he now should "apologize in sackcloth and ashes for his cowardly effort to conceal his own connection with an honorable and laudable effort." But even be it so, if a man sees he has "headed in" wrong, and then has the courage to repent, in our estimation he is made of the stuff that will make martyrs for the truth. We know from sad experience the "cunning craftiness" (Eph. 4:14) of the digressives to lead the righteous astray, and we commend the Gospel Advocate for stepping out, even if it be "eleventh hour" effort to clear its skirts of the displeasures of God. Bro. Smith says: "The only memorial day for Christians to remember is the first day of the week on which they are to proclaim the Lord's death." We say, Amen, brother; and not only our Lord's death in the communion of his body and blood, but his triumph in his resurrection, that we might be "saved by his life." "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." Let us stay with the Bible way, God's way.

REPLY TO PROF. GOODSPEED

I'm sure Mr. Goodspeed never comprehended the import of my two articles in the Apostolic Way, "Is Goodspeed Right?" For his benefit I will relate that some in the Church of Christ use his translation on Matt. 26:27, because he translates "wine-cup," which they understand to mean a literal drinking vessel. They oppose dividing the wine of the Lord's Supper into parts for distribution, saying that would make more than one cup. They were forced to say for the same reason that the bread should not be broken into pieces for fear of having more than one loaf after broken. To be consistent they would have to start the loaf around whole. Mr. Goodspeed translates correctly, I think, by saying "He brake it in pieces." That, too, before He gave it to them to eat. I wanted to know if Goodspeed was right about the "wine-cup," why not right about the loaf? In my second article I tried to show by Mr. Goodspeed's translation that there were extra large congregations of Christians at Jerusalem, Antioch and Corinth, even so large that one small cup would not hold sufficient quantity of wine to serve the congregation. This much to begin with, I trust will clarify the matters in Mr. Goodspeed's mind. (J. N. Cowan, in Apostolic Way, March 1, 1930).

Note.—This should have appeared in April 1 issue, where you will find the reply.—Ed.

NOT WRANGLING

"Some members of the church have a lot to say against 'wrangling in the papers'. All discussions of all kinds are 'wrangling' with them. They do not want differences discussed. They are opposed to debates. They object to plain preaching. They do not want to bother anybody, nor do they want to be bothered. They want the kind of preaching and writing which will make everybody feel good and disturb nobody even in his errors. Conversion is the main thing such members need. They do not need petting. They need spanking.

If the church depended on them, it would soon be lost in Babylon. In complexion they are a pale yellow."—Cled E. Wallace in F. F.

Whom Does This Hit?

Bro. Cled E. Wallace writes like he had human beings to deal with down in Texas, beings very much like some in West Virginia.—Ira C. Moore, in Christian Leader.

Yes, very much like some in West Virginia—Ira C. Moore, for example. And like some in Ohio—F. L. Rowe, publisher of the Leader. And not unlike the publisher of the Apostolic Way and the publisher of the Firm Foundation. No wonder the digressives have begun to "throw kisses across the line, for "We are all alike now". These men have done their best to squelch all "discussion of differences" to lay the matters in dispute bare before the people to be examined in the light of God's eternal truth. They have whined, and "belly-ached" 'around until the brethren now have no relish for the "sincere milk of the word," but want the preachers and papers to "prophecy unto us smooth things," as did backsliding Israel. O, how, "sweet" they are!

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.—The readers of "The Truth" will remember that I stated some time ago that the house in which we meet for worship was destroyed by fire. They will be glad to know that, although the building was not covered by insurance and we have received no help from other congregations, we now have a new frame building (30 x 40 ft.) almost completed and partially seated. We have been using it for some time for meetings. We expect to have it completed and seated by the time Bro. Bob Musgraves arrives in Aug. for a series of meetings. The brethren are expecting a feast of spiritual food at that time. The writer would be more than pleased to be present, but as I have meetings in the West booked for that time, will be unable to be present.

The Lord willing, I shall begin a series of meetings at Harrodsburg, Ind., April 11th., and continue, at least, over two Lord's days. Would be glad for brethren in reach of Harrodsburg to attend. I may go on into W. Va. from there. Let the good work continue.

Success to The Truth. I believe it gets better all the time. Let all the friends of the paper take a personal interest in securing subs. and donations that its influence may be felt more and more throughout the brotherhood. Do you realize that we need its influence just now to help stay the tide of digression that threatens to wreck the accomplishments of the last ten or fifteen years? Let us wake up; the Devil is always busy—He never sleeps on the job!

J. Y. Morgan, New Castle, Texas.—Am sending a donation for "The Truth" fund. Will send more later on. Sure like to read it. Not very popular among digressives, but we don't use S. S. or cups preachers. Bro. Pursley, of Graham, Texas,

preaches for us on the fourth Lord's day. Stay in there, Bob. We hope to have you back with us for another meeting some time.

CLEANSING THE TEMPLE

"And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, who is this? And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers, and the seats of them that sold doves; and said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves."

How fitting it would be in this present day should the Savior walk into some of the modern chapels which bear the name "Church of Christ" to hear the denunciation proclaimed. Do not suppers, fairs, festivals, and many other entertainments to raise money for the church, as it is called, come under the condemnation of Jesus?

Commenting on the present attitude of professed Christians toward the world, a leading secular journal says: "Insensibly the church has yielded to the spirit of the age and adopted its forms of worship in modern wants."

All the things, indeed, that help to make religion attractive, the church now employs as its instruments. A profession of religion has become popular with the world. Politicians, lawyers, doctors, and merchants unite with the church as a means of securing the respect and confidence of society and of advancing their own worldly interests, thus seeking to cover all their unrighteous transactions under a profession of Christianity as a cloak.

And in addition to the suppers, etc., above mentioned, as found in the modern worship, we see instruments of music, women teaching classes, and last, but not least, some corrupting the memorial service by adding a plurality of cups, even down to the trays of individual cups.

Watch ye therefore lest he find you sleeping. Perilous is the condition of those who, growing weary of their watch, turn to the attractions of the world. While the man of business is absorbed in pursuit of gain; while the pleasure-lover is seeking indulgence, sowing "to the flesh;" while the daughter of fashion is arranging her ornaments; it may be in that very hour that the Judge of all the earth will proclaim the sentence: "Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting." Oh, how sad.—A. R. Russell.

THE TRUTH FUND

O. C. Matthews	\$2.00
D. E. Stone	1.00
Bob Musgrave	1.00
Joseph Miller	1.00
L. I. Gibbs	2.00
Chas. T. Cook	10.00

W. S. Likes, Nebo, Ill.—Send me "The Truth." I think it is the best paper I ever read. It puts forth the teachings of Christ and the Apostles without partiality or favor to any one.

A. W. Denter M.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.

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MAY 1, 1930

No. 9

"YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE" (Rom. 12:2)

(4th and Last Article)

I thought I did fairly well in my last, by making clear my claims, and backing them up by reason, arguments, and Scripture.

But if we should accept Brother Harpers brag, and bluff, as to what he has done for me, and others, he has us "kicked," and "sore", down and out, and "seems" (to him) do not know what he (I) is talking about. "Let not him that girdeth on his harness, boast himself as he that pulleth it off." I think the reader will be competent to decide for himself.

I still say many congregations using just one literal cup, each have many cups, but the many congregations, drink "the Cup of the Lord"—the wine, out of cups.

Now be good; Say, did they drink the cups of the Lord! He wants me to show where the "Lord provided for two or more drinking cups, and thinks the burden of proof rests on me. You are mistaken, I have always claimed there is no provisions in God's Word, for any prescribed number of drinking cups, for the wine to be in.

I gave sufficient proof in my last, to prove the Wine alone, is the "Cup of the Lord," and "Cup of Devils," regardless of the number of drinking cups the wine may be in, when drunk. The proof, Paul 1 Cor. 10:21; Daniel 5:4; Jeremiah 52:19. You are the one that is binding or trying to bind a prescribed number on the churches; and the burden of proof, rests on you.

I claim the number of drinking cups comes under the head of "Your Reasonable Service", Rom. 12:2, and Let all things be done decently and in order, 1 Cor. 14:40.

I tried to be reasonable when I presented to his mind, a meeting of three to five hundred brethren on Lord's day, to carry out the items of worship, and believe I was; but, instead of taking up the matter, and trying to meet the facts in a fair way; he flew off, to unreasonable matter; quibbling; if you please, and left what I said, untouched.

If he doesn't know, others do know that five hundred brethren together, can "function" in all the items of worship reasonably, till they come to his supposed one drinking cup service, for the five hundred.

And if he does not know, or will not admit; others know, that when he has "his way," not God's way, by dividing up the five hundred, that when they,—the five hundred drink out of their cups, they drink the wine—the Lord's cup, out of cups.

Others know too; they did not drink the cups of the Lord, in so doing.

No, I positively do not believe in dividing a church to comply with your, assumed one drinking cup service; when all the other items of worship can be reasonably attended to, in one capacity.

His flying off; not dealing with the five hundred congregation, to "50 thousand, yes to 100 thousand may be," and the statement, "neither the wine, nor the cup, was any part of His blood shed for the remission of sins; would seem like he wants to confuse the mind of the reader; and bring in other points to discuss, at this time.

He quotes Brother Clarks concessions; as though I had agreed to defend them.

Brother Clark is fully able to take care of himself, and did a splendid work against you; He made concessions he did not need to, I think. Brother Clark did not say the cup one drinks out of, was the Lord's cup, or any part of it; neither do I believe, by reading his arguments, that he meant any thing of the kind. I think Brother Clark, believes as I do; that the wine you drink out of a cup; it alone is the cup of the Lord. If the literal cup the Saviour drank the wine from, was any part of the Lord's cup; no one ever drank it, or out of it; unless the apostle did, and this no one can prove. And unless our Lord had caused the literal cup, He drank wine from to be kept for all time; that all congregations might be permitted to drink the wine out of it, there has not been one Disciple, that ever drank the Lord's Cup, or out of it.

Brother Harper says: "You know Brother that in drink the cup is used metonymically," so he admits the fact, the Lord used the term cup, figuratively; and not in a literal sense at all; and he can not find literal applied to the term cup; by any inspired writer, when speaking of "the cup of the Lord." "Metonymy is a figure of speech; that consisted in the naming of a thing; by one of its attributes, as the crown for the king, or Royal power. Funk and Wagnalls. There is no attribute or characteristic existing, between a literal cup and wine, no more than between water, milk, or beer; and that is none at all.

I believe cup is used, by the Holy Spirit in a metaphorical sense. "Metaphor is a figure of speech, in which one object is likened to another, by speaking of it as though it was that other." God is a rock, is a metaphor.

So the wine—the object, is spoken of, by the term cup, as though it were a cup.

The Lord instituted a drink offering, to commemorate His shed blood; and He chose Wine, and wine alone; for nothing else connected with it can be drunk. Yes and we are commanded to

drink "The Cup of the Lord" half a dozen or more times: 1 Cor. 11:25, 26, 27, 28; 1 Cor. 10:21, etc. and we do actually drink the Lord's cup; but do not drink "the Lord's Cup," out of the Lord's cup; as our brother would have you believe.

Paul was writing of Idol worship, along with the worship of our Lord, in "Cup of Lord," and "Cup of Devils," 1 Cor. 10: 21. What was written aforetime, was for our learning, Rom. 15:4. So Dan. 5:4; Jer. 52:19, gives us the lesson of "Cup of Lord" and "Cup of Devils," showing the wine used by both, was the cup; regardless of the number of drinking cups used; and you contradict Paul, when you say, "if they drank from cups, in your Dan. 5:4, Jer. 52:19, they drank the cups" (of Devils) not the cup"; for Paul calls it the cup of Devils, 1 Cor. 10:21; and there is no "if's" about their drinking the cup, wine, out of cups: and the same is true in drinking the "Cup" of the Lord. Your Dan. 5:4, Jer. 52:19. You see he wants nothing to do with Dan. and Jer; when they are against him. Shame on you; you see too, he pitied, Justine Martyrs apologies, against, Paul, Daniel, Jeremiah to prove them wrong. Your Daniel, etc. that a fine statement for a thus saith the Lord brother, to make against inspired writers, or their writings.

Justine Martyr is speaking of initiating members into their Cult, and not their sites of worship; more quibbling sir.

Though Idol worshippers may cut many antics in their drunken asigies in drinking wine in honor of their idols; Paul's statement "the Cup of Devils", stands true, though every man becomes a liar.

In the communion we drink "the Lord's Cup". But in the communion, the wine is all that can be drunk. Therefore the wine is "the Lord's cup."

In drinking the "Lord's Cup" we drink His blood of the New Testament.

But the wine is all we drink.

Therefore the wine is, His "blood of the New Testament, shed for many for the remission of sins." I have used my allotted space at this time, so will close, with thanks to Brother Harper.

Brotherly, A. J. Bond,
607 W. Chestnut St.,
Bloomfield, Iowa.

Reply

He certainly has made clear his "claims,"—at least to some of the readers, and of course they are "competent to judge." One writes, saying, "What you did for A. J. Bond is enough, and what he did for himself ought to give him full fellowship with any Digressive church on the globe." Another writes thus: "What you say about taking Bond through first, is all right with me. He may 'convince ye,' and then I need not say any more. But if he does not do that, and I know something else to say on the subject, I will be glad to have space, and will try to bear at least a little of the expense as I go along. If I knew of nothing better to say than he says, then I will not need space on the subject."

This is not "Harper's brag and bluff," and perhaps the brother will like it better than anything

I can say. At least, it will do for a change.

He gives us a genuine melody this time, and it is pretty hard to tell just where the chord is that yet holds his "confidence." He tries a syllogism or two; he bears down on the "mass-meeting" a little; he strikes the high key of—"the wine alone, is the 'cup of the Lord.'" he tries it on the "metaphor" string; and he rakes the keys on the minor chords in a syncopated jumble. And what he has accomplished in behalf of the use of cups—"individual cups" and "two or more cups," yes, "any number"—is pretty well expressed by the two brethren who have, as readers, "judged" of his former efforts.

In the first place, he misunderstands his proof text, Rom. 12:2. It has no bearing whatever on what he is trying to prove by it. He uses "reasonable", not in the sense of "spiritual"—spiritual service (Revised version), which is the meaning, but in the sense of "governed by reason," much as the digressives made use of "common sense" as a guide in religion instead of revelation. His "scripture" does not apply; his "arguments" are mere assumptions; and as for "reason," he assumes the role of dictator as to when anything is "in the bounds of reason." If it conflicts with his view, it is "unreasonable." And he makes complaint to the effect that the hard-hearted Harper had no better sense than to throw a monkey wrench right into his main gear.

He does not want to hear about affirming his cups, "any number." Says he has always claimed there is no prescribed number in God's word. Says I am mistaken.

Let us see. In 1910 Bro. Killion advocated the cups in the F. F., even to "individual cups," just as you do, and I made reply, asking him to affirm. He came back, saying that "the burden of proof" was on me. This I denied, and so we submitted it for a decision. Under date of Feb. 27, Showalter wrote: "So far as the communion cup is concerned, I am certain Bro. Killion would be logically in the affirmative." Under date of March 11, Trott wrote: "Every one who knows anything about logic knows that Brother Killion is bound to be in the affirmative." And under date of March 3, N. L. Clark wrote: "In regard to your tilt with Brother Killion, I can not see how you could logically take the affirmative."

But it is not taking the affirmative that scares our esteemed brother, I think; but it is the "wherewith to do with" and "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent" that frightens him off.

The brother wants to go by "reason" up to 500, but when we ask him to take his 50 thousand if there is no limit, he balks. And we certainly have not left what he said "untouched", but we put the "fix'ns" on it so that when he limits the number in order to function "Where the Bible speaks," we can do the same thing, and we are following God's will, for he provides for congregations in his word. And we come just as nicely under his second proof text—1 Cor. 14:40, "decently and in order"—as he can ever think of doing. But he says he positively does not believe in limiting. All right; then let him take his crowd without limit,

too, and go where the Bible is silent," and where will he land? And just as soon as he limits even to have one item "Where the Bible speaks," we will limit to have every item "Where the Bible speaks"—unless he gets to be Pope. And this is just the way I "flew off" and knocked his playhouse over. And it is not Harper's way, but the Lord's in providing congregations. And he is bound to come to it or function with his 50 thousand where the "Bible is silent."

Clark's "sessions." Did he make any that are not true? He said: "How can one 'drink the cup?' By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." And we challenge proof to the contrary. Did you give us another way? No. And when you find the place where they drank from cups and were said to drink the cup by so doing, you will find where language has turned a somersault. It is a violation of the laws of language. And Justin Martyr tells how they drank "the cup of devils," no matter in what part of their service it was. And you assume the very thing you are to prove in trying to connect the drinking from cups as the drinking of the cup. It simply can not be done. Language is governed by laws that will not permit it. Neither can you drink a cup in drinking from a bottle. But you believe this is a "metaphor." And you may believe the moon is made of cheese; but that does not make it so at all. You simply do not know enough about language to know what you are talking about, that's all. Johnson (Excuse me, but these cups advocates talk so much alike that to hear one recalls the other) in his debate said, "It might not be a metonymy." And when I gave the highest linguistic authority—Thayer and others—that it is, he said, "Will you leave it to the school teachers here?" They die hard, these cups advocates.

Many congregations, many cups. Yes, and each congregation that drink from the cup as commanded drink "the cup of the Lord and there is a "cup of the Lord" in each congregation if they drink as commanded from one cup. And there will be cups of the Lord as well as churches of the Lord. And the Lord provides for this. Now you tell us where he provides in his word for cups of the Lord in a congregation. At least affirm on the "individual cups," and let Cowan whip you; then you "about face" and use his arguments and whip him on "two or more." And if you will not do that, just take the negative of the one he has signed, namely: Resolved, That the Individual Cups are deceptive and divisive. J. N. Cowan affirms. Here is your chance.

Use the same literal cup Jesus used. Listen. If the fruit of the vine is the cup, as you say, then I can come as near getting the "literal cup Jesus used," now, as you can in getting the fruit of the vine they drank now. You use other fruit of the vine, eh? Well, we will use another cup then to drink from now.

It nowhere says "literal cup." Not to an ignoramus; but any one who knows enough to teach us on this subject, knows that we are bound by the laws of language to take the literal meaning of a word unless compelled to take the figurative to make sense.

Syllogism: In the communion we drink the Lord's cup. In the communion the wine is all we drink. Therefore the wine is "the Lord's cup."

"In the communion the wine is all we drink," is false as you admit in saying, "We are commanded to drink 'the cup of the Lord' half a dozen or more times."

And "How can one 'drink the cup?' By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." N. L. Clark. Scholium: Therefore it takes both the cup and the fruit of the vine to constitute "the cup of the Lord" in the communion. Cup is the name of a solid; but we are commanded to drink the cup. Drink means to swallow a liquid; hence we can not obey the command since cup is a solid. Then we must say that cup is here used figuratively or say there is no sense to the command. What figure of the twenty or more figures of rhetoric is it? It is the cup and its contents, that is, a metonymy. "How," then, as Bro. Clark well says, "can one 'drink the cup?'" And he answers, "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." And "cup" here is used to suggest what is in the cup. Metonymy is the figure of suggestion. 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 really suggests it."—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220.

"The fruit of the vine" is the object in this case, and it is presented to the mind by naming the cup that holds it, not by giving its name, the fruit of the vine. And they can drink the cup, as Clark says, "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." Get your real scholar in language to deny it if you can. He dare not do it. Hence they did not "drink the cup of devils" nor "drink the cup of the Lord" by drinking from cups. And neither did Paul, nor Daniel, nor Jeremiah, nor any body else but an ignoramus say they did do so. And I say neither the cup nor the fruit of the vine is any part of the blood shed for the remission, you may call it "other points to discuss" or what you please; but it is in answer to your nonsense. And the "cup" is as essential to the communion as "the fruit of the vine," for, as you admit, "We are commanded to drink the cup." And you can drink the cup only by drinking what it contains. Now dispense with the "cup" and drink the cup, if you can.

Second syllogism—"But the wine is all we drink." No; there is more to it than that, for as you admit, "We are commanded to drink the cup," and we can do that only "By drinking what it contains." Therefore the "cup" as well as the "wine" is indispensable in the communion.

In conclusion we wish to thank our readers for their patience while we thrashed this "old straw" he has put up. It may be new to him and some of our readers in some features, but there is not a turn he has made that we have not met time and again with the advocates of the cups. As it was with idolatrous Israel, it takes "line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, there a little" to weed out the old trash of accumulated rubbish and work in the truth. But the prophets who were faithful cleared out a few spots among the honest-

(Continued on page 7)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

The following news item from the Los Angeles Record of April 12 is an important "sign of the times" indicating that leaders in sectarianism are beginning to see the evil effects of humanisms in religion, and are now looking for something better:

ACT TO ABOLISH SUNDAY SCHOOL

CHICAGO, Feb. 25.—A move to abolish the Protestant Sunday school, with its colored picture cards of Biblical characters and its lesson texts, on the grounds it is responsible for the "decay of family religion," and has cut down regular church service attendance, caused a furore in religious circles here today.

The charges against the Sunday school and the demand it be abolished were voiced by the Rev. Dr. Phillips Osgood of Minneapolis at the union ministers' meeting yesterday. The debate that resulted, with ministers of a dozen denominations taking sides one way or the other, had spread to religious workers and laymen throughout the city today.

Dr. Osgood declared that the Sunday school, by separating the religious experience of children from that of adults, has largely killed religion in American family life.

"The seriousness of this can hardly be overestimated because family religion is one of the few forces combatting tendencies which are making the home an accidental sleeping place for individuals," he said.

Remarks

The Sunday School certainly "is responsible for the decay of family religion," because it is contrary to God's divinely arranged plan for the instruction of the young. "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6: 4. When children were trained in the home and taught the great lessons of God's love for Adam's fallen and depraved race, and His divine scheme of redemption through the sacrifice of the innocent Lamb of God—

"Whose genial power shall overwhelm earth's iron race,

And plant once more the golden in its place"—they were, generally speaking, obedient to their parents while young, and when they reached the years of accountability, they usually obeyed the gospel if it had been properly taught to them.

But when the S. S. was organized and the churches of Christ went madly into digression with it, the interest began to gradually drift from the two divinely ordained institutions—the home and the church—to a human society. And the result has been most appalling and disastrous.

It has been said that we oppose a method of teaching, and that the way to solve the question is for all to learn that God has not given any one method of teaching to be used to the exclusion of any other. But we use as many methods of teaching as any religious body of people on earth—we use every method used by inspired men. But since organizing classes is neither teaching nor a method of teaching, their solution has failed. We are not opposed to using methods in teaching—what we oppose is an institution separate and apart from the church, doing the work of the church.

The church is "the pillar and support of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15). It is the institution through which God's will is to be made known. "Unto Him be glory in the church.—Eph. 3:21.

God's ways are always best. Man's ways always fail. When Israel walked in God's ways, they prospered. In their own way, they failed. Then, O Israel of God! "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way; and walk therein" (Jer. 6:16).

When leaders in sectarianism begin to see the evil effects of the Sunday school movement, it is high time for some among us to return from their mad rush into it, and stop their journey to Babylon, led captive by Satan at his will; and begin again to build "upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone."—Eph. 2:20.

CLASSES IN TEACHING

By Paul Hays

There are three methods of teaching revealed in the N. T. They are: Conversation, the Lecture method, and Mutual edification. Under these main heads may be mentioned, informal investigation, and discussion, correspondence, reading, and commenting, singing, exhorting, etc.

The formal asking and answering of questions is not revealed as a special method, at all. There is no intimation of a Class system. The Old Testament does not mention it. The 'school of the prophets' is a figment of the imagination. Sons of the prophets associated themselves with older prophets in religious work and worship, and doubtless used the 'edification' methods named above.

Younger preachers associated themselves with Christ and apostles and evangelists, and learned in the field of soul saving, and ministry to the needy. This was practical, and not merely 'theoretical' training. There was an immediate, and thrilling, need for what they were 'inquiring into'.

In the New Testament, the Learner asked ques-

tions, and the teacher answered them. This was no cut and dried, interdenominationally prepared 'soup' or 'hash', but development, proportioned to the burning need, as the need arose.

Any questions asked by the teacher were incidental and lined up under the 'conversational,' instead of Public edification. The questions asked by the Learner, were asked in public assembly, where all were gathered in one place, and one speaking at a time. The women were not allowed to ask such questions.

There was no special effort made for the children, in the New Testament assembly. Sinners were taught by preaching. The Home is God's school for children, and sinners are exhorted to obedience, and the New Birth,—rather than learning to be 'good' sinners. We have no authority to train sinners before they 'enter Christ.'

It is utterly impractical and unscriptural to separate the people into the 'classes recognized by the Scriptures.' The apostles taught all classes together. Anything else would be 'personal' and offensive.

The gospel is for 'accountable beings.' All classes need to hear the 'whole counsel of God.' Each needs to know the others duty, in order to 'mutual edification.'

The only apparent exception to this is the 'strong meat' for those of full age. But we have no example for forming a class of 'meat eaters.' We judge that this was served in a conversational way. Strong meat does not pertain to Christian living, but has to do with 'speculative,' Providential, and heavenly things, and is for those who are fully acquainted with 'the knowledge of good and evil', both in theory and practice. Heb. 5.

Classes, unless arranged solely by the teacher, are "organic", and constitute a new and human organization. If arranged by the teacher, they constitute an audience, and should be taught by the Lecture method. This obviates confusion, and helps to keep the women silent in the church. Even 'two or three' assembled for edification or worship, constitute an assembly, and come under the direction of 1 Cor. 12.

Human methods are always a substitute for the divine. Classes are a substitute for the Home, and the Pulpit. They pervert the child, the woman, and the sinner. They call for 'literature', pictures of divine characters (idols), picnics, Christmas, prizes, 'music,' baby talk, plays, emulation, disorder, separate contributions, dismissal from the Lord's work and worship. They are Modern, and cannot be bound on the church.

R. R. 4, Box 15, Fresno, Calif.

CALIFORNIA CHURCHES

Brethren should not move into a new locality without making inquiry about the nearest church of Christ. If you are thinking of coming to Calif., the following information concerning the churches having no Sunday School, and using one cup in the Communion, may be of interest to you. I am giving the name and address of a correspondent for each congregation:

BARD—Elder Cooper, Bard, Calif.

EL CENTRO—Seventh and Brighton Streets. T. S. Stark, 437 Holt Ave., Elcentro, Calif.

TEMPLE CITY—Main Street. N. E. Kellems, Temple City, Calif.

MONTEBELLO—138 South Fourth Street. C. E. Holifield, Montebello, Calif.

LOS ANGELES—3535 Siskiyou Street. D. E. Nichols, 3207 Garnett, Los Angeles, Calif.

LONG BEACH — Frances E. Williard School. Tenth and Freeman Streets. Jake Ridling, 3603 E. 10th Street, Long Beach, Calif.

TAFT—Ford City, Addition—A. J. Johnson, Taft, Calif.

WASCO—Elmer Wood, Wasco, Calif.

DELANO—East Part of Town. J. A. Scott, Delano, Calif.

If you know of any brother in the state of Calif. who may not be near a loyal church, let me know, and I shall see if we can establish one near him.—J. D. Phillips, Montebello, Calif.

THE DANGER OF DIGRESSION

A retrospective view will show the danger of departing from the "Old Paths", and should cause us to cling all the closer to the word of God in all that we teach or do. Some do not seem to realize the danger of a single departure from the Bible way of serving God. Many reason that just one departure is a "very small matter and not worth mentioning"; not realizing that just one sin, no matter how small and seemingly insignificant, is enough to cause one to be lost. Just one unforgiven sin is enough to cause us to be banished forever from the glory of God. Listen, "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (Jas. 2:10). Beware of just one departure from the Bible way!

It was just one departure that marked the beginning of the downfall of the early church, and gave rise to the papacy; thus the dark ages and bloody persecutions of the true followers of the Lord. But its influence did not stop with the development of the "Mother of Harlots." All the protestant denominations in Christendom have risen as a result of that first departure. For it stands to reason that if there had never been a first departure, there could never have been the second, third, etc.

Take a look at the so-called Christian Church of today. It was just one departure (organizing the Missionary Society) that marked the beginning of the downfall of a goodly number of the Church of Christ, and the beginning of another apostate church. Not content with one departure, others quickly followed; viz., instrumental music, aids, the pastor system, suppers, shows, etc., until now it just about leads all others in departures. Some of the leaders in this church have begun to become alarmed at the rapid speed they are traveling, and are now trying to call a halt, but do not seem to be having much success.

A look at the Linwood Christian Church, of Kansas City, and its pastor, Doctor Burris Jenkins, ought to be enough to cause all who are tempted to take one step in departing from the Bible way, to pause, and think twice before they ven-

ture the first step. In a recent issue of the "Springfield Daily News", we are informed that the membership of this church is 3900, the largest Protestant denomination in Kansas City. It is further stated that some of the leaders in other Christian churches are protesting against the actions of the said pastor and his congregation. In reply the pastor is quoted as saying; "Actually, the action comes from those who take the fundamental position; who want to maintain rigidly the doctrine of baptism by immersion only and the like. In order to be a church for all, we decided as long as 12 years ago we should not be sticklers about baptism. They may come by immersion, sprinkling or without either." But this was traveling a little too rapidly for some of the leaders. But I note again from the same articles: "Doctor Jenkins has been active for many years in church and civic affairs. He has sponsored boxing & held classes at his church in the art of fisticuffs under the direction of the Rev. Earl A. Blackman, his assistant, known as the 'fighting parson.'" But what next. I noticed sometime ago in the same periodical where lessons in modern dancing were being given in the basement of his church, showing pictures of those taking the lessons, dressed (?) in abbreviated bathing suits. All this in the name of Christianity, eh? How does it look? Only recently I heard the Doctor delivering one of his so called sermons over the radio, in which he stated that he could see no reason why Protestants, Catholics, Jews, et al should not meet together to worship. A little too fast for some of his brethren, but they are following, nevertheless. He informs them that he and his church represent the progressive wing of the Christian Church.

I warn you, brother, that one step in sin leads to another.

—Homer L. King.

REVERENCE

Reverence, in short, is respect or honor for God and mankind. Thus we read, "Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that can not be shaken, let us have grace whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe." Heb. 12:28. This teaching assures the Lord's people that the kingdom which we have received (not going to) "cannot be shaken, or destroyed." In view of the above we are to "have grace (favor) whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God (not man or men) with reverence and awe." (fear). This reverence, respect, or honor, must be given to God through Christ. Hence, "and whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him." Col. 3:17; Acts 4:12. Then how careful God's children should be in whatsoever we do or say. We ought to so deport ourselves both in "words and deeds" as to contribute the reverence or respect to our Creator which He requires of all of His followers. Reverence and fear are sometimes identical. Thus it is said, "This is the end of the matter, all hath been heard, fear God, (not man) and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. Heb. 4:1. "Fear-

ing God and keeping His commandments" is giving Him the reverence or respect through our Lord which He has demanded. Children are to reverence or respect their parents in honor to God and His word. "Furthermore we had the fathers of our flesh to chasten us and we gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of Spirits and live?" Heb. 12:9. Solomon said, "My son, hear the instruction of thy father and forsake not the law of thy mother, for they shall be a chaplet of grace unto thy head, and chains about thy neck." Prov. 1:8:9. "Children obey your parents in all things for this is well-pleasing in the Lord." Col. 3:20. Eph. 6:1. From the foregoing it is evident that our heavenly Father intends for children to reverence or respect their parents. It is also enjoined that husbands and wives reverence or respect each other. When this is fully complied with, then the children will be encouraged to have more reverence for their parents. Therefore it is written "Nevertheless do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself and let the wife see that she fear (reverence) her husband." Eph. 5:33 Again, "Ye husbands in like manner dwell with your wives according to knowledge giving honor unto the woman as unto the weaker vessel, as being also joint-heirs of the grace of life, to the end that your prayers be not hindered." 1 Pet. 3:7. Thus we see that the husband and wife must walk and work together 'in the Lord,' by having that reverence for each other they should. They will then be instruments in the hands of Jehovah for good and not for evil, influencing others into the Way of Righteousness. Finally, "That the aged women likewise be reverent in demeanor (behavior) not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, teachers of that which is good." Titus 2:3-8. "The aged, both men and women, are to take the lead and set the right example before the younger, in so doing, 'The Great I Am' will get the reverence which He is entitled to, or that is due Him.

More to follow.

Joseph Miller,
1004 N. Lambert Street.
Brazil, Indiana.

CAMP MEETING — JUNE 21 TO JULY 6

Brethren at Junction, Cleo, Roosevelt, and Menard will hold a camp meeting at 6-Mile Crossing on the north Llano river at the forks of the Old Spanish Trail and Menard road 6 miles above Junction, Texas.

Preaching by Jas. T. White of Lometa, Texas, and J. Ira Grantham of Kempner. A fine camping ground and beautiful scenery. Come and help us and be helped. Bring your neighbors. Tell others of the date—June 21 to July 6—and place—6-Mile Crossing, 6 miles above Junction, Texas. Come and have a spiritual feast of good things with us.

TRUTH FUND

Irvin Boss ----- \$1.50

For your Printing Needs, communicate with Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

Lometa, Texas,
April 1, 1930.

My book on the "communion" — Its Name, Form, Design is now off the press. The price is 25c per copy, \$2 per dozen and free to all who do not have the price that want to read it, all post-paid.

Two articles on the "NAME" that is in the book have already appeared in THE TRUTH. To all we say, read the balance of the book on "form" and "design" before criticizing the articles that have appeared in the paper on "name."

It will be better understood why we made the arguments that we did for the name, for we were seeking a name that would designate a scriptural form and design. Address all orders to Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

CONCERNING CALIFORNIA CREEK

To Brothers Harper, Pursley, Musgrave, Osterloh, Smith, Phillips and Fenter, I, E. F. Morgan, feel the least of all disciples who am not meet to be called a disciple because I persecuted the church. Four years I've spent in the service of Satan, believing I was serving God all the time. I had a clear conscience; was bold as a lion; had no fear of any man that opposed me. Thanks to God who spared my life.

I ask you each to forgive me of every word I've said (orally or written) against you and the cause you're fighting for; also every act and deed unbecoming a child of God. And I promise to spend the remainder of my life upholding, defending and building up that which I tried so hard to destroy. My only consolation is "I did it through ignorance," I was deceived. God reward the deceiver according to his works. I have come out from among the faction in the schoolhouse, and now stand with the true and tried, the faithful little band with the true cause established by my dear father more than twelve years ago, which with the help of Brother Pursley and other faithful men of God still stands through the years of struggle. Thanks be to God, who gives the victory through Jesus Christ. This will suffice till I write each personally or meet face to face. I say forgive me, and I will in time remove every doubt that might retain.

Your humble brother in Christ,
E. F. Morgan, New Castle, Texas.

"YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE"

(Continued from page 3)

hearted, and we need not expect "these perilous times" to bring us anything but a hard fight. Brother Bond has done as well as any of the others that have tried. The main trouble with their arguments is, they mix the figurative with the literal. And I could argue just as sensibly thus: 1. Herod is a fox. Lk. 13:32. 2. A fox has four legs. 3. Therefore Herod has four legs.

Cowan is especially bad at this. But we shall try to exercise patience.—Ed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We are now located at 908 W. Emma Ave., Springdale, Ark. Please remember the change and avoid delay in correspondence. Geo. M. McFadden.

MISSION WORK

Two baptized, one restored, and church to work at Bickel's, Apr. 7. Antioch church near Sulphur Rock sent \$3.20 to use in this mission field, and we hope others will assist in sounding out the word in this neglected field where precious souls are famishing for the want of the word of life. Address me at Mountain Home, Ark. Walter W. Leamons.

GOD'S COMMAND

Paul commands women to be silent "in the churches," 1 Cor. 14:33-37; 1 Tim. 2:11, 12. And Peter says, "Likewise ye wives be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they may also without the word be won by the conversation (conduct) of the wives." 1 Pet. 3:1. This should take place in the home, for Paul says, "And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." To "sing" and to "speak" are different things. Did you ever hear women hold a conversation and sing at the same time? That would be impossible. "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted." This does not include the women. And the prohibition for the women not to "speak" does not include singing, therefore the women may sing and "keep silence," so far as speaking is concerned. The speaking is unto the church, but the singing is unto the Lord. Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16. Brotherly, A. J. Thompson, Sabinal, Texas.

P. S. I am eighty years, six months, and seven days old this 24th day of March, 1930, and this may be the last I can write for the paper. Be strong, brethren, and hold up the hands of Brother Harper. "God be with you till we meet again." —A. J. T.

JUST ALIKE

I have had nine debates with the S. S. advocates and four with the CUPS advocates; and they run so parallel in their arguments that when you meet the one, you have met the other. At least that has been my experience in debating with them. Just a few of their didges now by way of illustration: The S. S. advocates go to Jacob's well, where Jesus talked with a woman, and she went into the city and told the "sweet story," for their women teachers "in the church." And the CUPS advocates go to Jacob's well for cups in the Lord's supper. And of course they drank the well, for we drink the cup, you see.

The S. S. advocates go to Acts 2 for classes and "daughters" as teachers "in the church," and the CUPS advocates go to Acts 2 for a great multitude of believers that made it impossible to ob-

serve the institution of the Lord's supper with one cup to drink from.

The S. S. advocates go to Rom. 12:1,2 to find a "reasonable service" to teach the children in a class, the young folks in a class, and the old folks in a class—in fact it is "reasonable," they say, to have as many classes and teachers as is needed to teach in the most effective way, and the "class system" is that way, as has been proved by experience and study. And the CUPS advocates go to this same scripture for a "reasonable service" in observing the Lord's supper, and a great multitude makes it reasonable to have cups to drink from.

The S. S. advocates go to Philippians 4 for "woman to conduct any service that a man can; and ability is the only limitation." And the CUPS advocates go to the same chapter for the use of cups and find them in "My God shall supply all your needs," and they need the cups to be "sanitary," and to keep from holding the congregation after a long sermon, you see. (And the Sprinkler needs sprinkling to keep from wetting his clothes and taking cold."—Ed.)

The S. S. advocates say they have no Bible example or command for the classes and women teachers, but this just "a Christian liberty." And the CUPS advocates say there is no Bible command or example for the cups in the communion, but this is just "a Christian liberty." I know it, for I have had to meet it in both. (Yes, and I know it, and have Clark's correspondence to show for it.—Ed.)

The S. S. advocates say the regulations for the church in the 14th chapter of 1st Cor. for women not to teach in the church are not for us today; and the CUPS advocates say what if Jesus and the disciples on that occasion did use one cup and Paul gives just one cup, telling them to "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 11:27), now "circumstances are quite different." And so they go, hand in hand. —Bob Musgrave.

MISSIONARIES FOR CUBA

Four preaching brethren of the churches of Christ are making their arrangements to open up Missionary work in the island of Cuba; namely, Frank Morrow, Ernesto Estevez, Richardo Jimenez, and Dr. W. W. Stone.

The first three are living in Tampa, Florida, and all speak and sing in the language of the people of Cuba. Bro. Jimenez's parents reside in Cuba. He was in missionary work in Tampa for the Methodists for fifteen years, until about two years ago, when he was converted to the Christian faith. He is an able preacher. We appeal to the brotherhood to contribute to this work, as we are all hampered financially.—Dr. W. W. Stone, Palacios, Texas.

If this is real missionary work after the New Testament patterns of faith and practice, it should receive our hearty support. We should like to know something more of the men as to what they propose by way of building up churches and caring for them, and whether Bro. Stone is to accompany them to Cuba and inspect their work. Tell us something of Bro. Morrow, just what he pro-

posed to put into these churches when established, whether he will speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where it is silent.—Ed.

"If, to have the will of God done on earth as he wishes it to be, it is necessary to begin all over again, let us begin on unquestionably apostolic lines. I would rejoice to see working again now the spiritual forces that we know were employed so effectively and blessed 'in the beginning.'"—Ben J. Elston, in C. L.

To begin again would be useless so far as all who start reaching the goal is concerned as long as the spirit of "lawlessness" prevails among us. We would no more than get started again until there were some that would not "walk in" God's ways. Of what use to Israel to start from the Sea of baptism (1 Cor. 10:1) again so far as reaching the "promised land" was concerned as long as the spirit of rebellion prevailed among them? Nothing. And the best thing for us to do now is to warn the people of not going in God's ways and get as many to be faithful as we possibly can. It will be a "fight of faith" for every one. But how precious is the trial of faith (1 Pet. 1). More precious, valuable, than gold, yes, of more value to us than the whole world. How carefully we should walk in God's ways, avoiding all questionable paths! Let us, dear brethren, now resolve from this on to be working on "unquestionably apostolic lines." Can't you say, Amen; and take your stand with us? Do you realize what a loss to you it will be to fail to enter into "that rest" which remains for the people of God, Heb. 4?

"If we could get things right in the home, there would be less trouble in the school, church and state."—Thaddeus S. Hutsin, in C. L.

Yes, but your "Sunday School" breaks up God's appointment for the home as effectively as the M. Society does that of the church. Can't you see it?

"IN THE RUINS OF SODOM"

"Five miles north of the Dead sea, in Palestine, searchers find ruins of ancient Sodom. Sodom and its sister city, you remember, were destroyed by heavenly wrath because they were wicked, according to the legend.

"The story is borne out to some extent by the searchers, who find evidence that the city was burnt down in very early times, long before Christianity appeared on earth."—The Los Angeles Record.

Yes, Sodom was destroyed by torrents of fire and brimstone, rained down from heaven, on account of its great wickedness. Perhaps Sodom was the most corrupt city that ever existed—they practiced sodomy, perhaps the lowest thing in the way of immorality a man can do: men who commit this sin go below the beast.

Sodom was destroyed by heavenly wrath because of corruption. And searchers of the present time have found ruins of the old city, and hence it is not a myth as some have sneeringly said. This discovery is but another indication that the Bible is true.

—C. E. Holifield, Montebello, Calif.

THE TRUTH

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

STRAINING OUT THE GNAT

Jesus, in speaking to the scribes and Pharisees, said, "Ye blind guides, that strain out the gnat and swallow the camel." Matt. 23:24. The scribes and Pharisees were very strict religiously, as we see from Acts 22:3. They were continually trying to ensnare Christ in his teaching, as we see from Mt. 22:15 and Mk. 12:13. Our Lord, knowing their hypocrisy, gave them the above striking rebuke, calling them "blind guides that strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. The gnat is a very small insect, while the camel is a large animal. And it seems by this figure of speech that Christ uses here that those scribes and Pharisees could see something small about someone else more readily than they could see some great error in themselves.

In Mark 7:3-5 our Savior gives the same teaching as this in substance, pointing out the same kind of characters. Hence it appears that such persons were able to see some very little things, but were overlooking the big ones. They could behold some very small faults in others, but did not notice the big ones in themselves. Paul, in Rom. 2:1-4 rebukes the above practice thus: "Wherefore thou art without excuse, O man, who-soever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou that judgest doest the same things," etc. And from this it is seen that one should not pass judgment upon another when he is guilty of the same thing or something worse. This lesson offered by the Savior and by Paul is a pointed one that is useful to all right-thinking people, according to the above teaching. Self should be righted first, (see 2 Cor. 13:5; Rom. 2:21-24), then the other fellow may not look so bad. The most of us emphasize more or less one point about all of the time. They do not seem to be sensitive of "Straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel." "Nor do they seem to know that they have a 'beam in their eye.'"

I have heard some complaint about "so much teaching and writing on the cup—cup—cup to the neglect of other duties." And this may be true, but the same complaint can be safely made of other things as well. I am free to admit that the whole counsel of God must be declared, and not just part of it. But there are times that call the emphasizing of some thing in order to maintain "the Faith which was once for all delivered to the saints. Suppose one church or even one preacher in the church today should begin to teach sprinkling for baptism, would not the papers and the pulpits and the street corners be filled with this

issue? And would not the debaters among us be issuing their challenges to that church or preacher to meet the issue? And it would be those who favored the sprinkling that would be complaining about "so much teaching and writing on baptism—baptism—to the neglect of other duties." And they would quit taking the papers with so much "fussing" in them. And they would let the preacher preach in their house if he would promise not to say anything about the "baptism question."

What shall we do?—just open our mouths like little birds and swallow whatever anyone sees fit to drop into them, and be "carried about with every wind of doctrine?" When instrumental music and the societies were advocated and practiced, there was a good deal of preaching and writing done on these things, and rightly, too, that the truth of the Bible might not be neglected, and the echo of these are occasionally heard after the lapse of more than a quarter of a century. Both sides have had their say, and it was left to the people to consider. And they must face the judgment on these things. If they want the Book, they know what it says. If they do not want to take what it says, the way is open to them: and so both come to judgment. We drift along in many things without considering whether in them we are after God or man. If preachers will clear their skirts and stand guiltless before God, they will "preach the word" (let it hit whom it may), and "reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with all longsuffering (patience) and teaching, no matter who kicks up about it, for thus they do the will of God. 2 Tim. 4:1-3; Matt. 7:21; Lk. 6:46; Jno. 9:31. No one should think that just because a congregation uses no organ, no Sunday School, no "Pastor," no cups, that this is all that is necessary, for if the other parts of the worship are not in keeping with the Word, God will not bless. Jno. 4:22-24.

We must worship "in spirit and in truth." This is to do in our worship what the Holy Spirit has revealed in and through the Word, the gospel. It revealed: "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers, "after they were baptized and taught to observe all things Christ commanded. Mt. 28:20; Acts 2:38-42. And thus Faith is to be shown or proved by works, as James tells us. Jas. 2:18, also 2 Cor. 13:5. When the worship is not in keeping with the N. T. is it of Faith? Let the faithful so teach, live, and work, looking carefully let there be any man that falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled. Heb. 12:15. "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the Faith; prove your

own selves. "Let us draw near to God, not with lips only, but according to his revealed will, and pray and act for the UNITY of Christ's disciples. Joseph Miller, Brazil, Ind.

SHAKING THEM IN

The trouble with that doctrine is like all made doctrines, it does not harmonize with the Bible.

Now you take Acts 2, beginning at the 41st verse and reading down to the end of the chapter. They would have it read like this: 41. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized and went into the Christian Church, and about five years later they heard a gospel preacher and then went into the true church about three thousand souls. 42. And they did not continue in the apostles' doctrine, but went off after the commandments and doctrines of men and did just as they pleased for a few years, then after hearing a gospel preacher about a week finally decided they would go up and let the preacher shake them into the true church. 44. And part that believed were together in the Church of Christ that had a Sunday School and part went into the Christian Church until they heard a loyal gospel preacher who shook their hand and added them to the true church. 46. And they continued not daily with one accord, but the several factions did just as they pleased for a number of years, when a loyal preacher got them to lay down their differences and come together by shaking the hands of the ones who had been stiff-knuckled. 47. Praising God and having favor with part of the people. And the Lord added them to the true church after they had lived in some kind of a digressive church for about ten years, that is, when a loyal preacher came along and took them by the hand. And then Matt. 28:19 would read like this: Go ye therefore and baptize all nations, teaching them. It would make nonsense of I John 1:7 and the rest of the New Testament. Acts 2:47 says, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but Jesus said, "teach."

I do not believe that if a man or woman had been taught enough to "obey from the heart that form of doctrine" that the Lord would refuse to add him or her to the right church, but as "God is not the author of confusion," I believe when anyone has been baptized and goes into the wrong church, it is evident the Lord had not had anything to do with it; for he does not do things in any such way.

I do not believe that a man who knows enough to preach the gospel, God's power to save, would be so ignorant of God's word that he would not know what church was right; and if he did and told the new convert the truth and the new convert was too stubborn to go into the right church that the Lord would add him to the church later, on that kind of baptism just because some preacher shakes his hand.

I have written the above in the interest of what I believe to be right; and if I am wrong, someone please show me where and why I am wrong. W. B. Jameson, Sapulpa, Okla., 149 So. Cedar St.

THAT REJOINDER

Bro. Smith thinks he has proven that Jesus drank of the cup. We will examine his proof. He says, "Moffatt gives it—I will never drink the product of the vine again till the day I drink it new within the realm of God."

Brother, are you quite sure that Jesus had not drunk wine during the feast he had just been eating? or at any other time prior to that feast? If you can prove that Jesus never had drunk any wine before he took the cup and blessed it your proof would still be only an inference.

In John 11:23 Jesus said to Martha: "Thy brother shall rise again." Had Lazarus been dead and arose some time before? And in verse 24 Martha said unto him, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." And in Matt. 20:19 and Mark 10:34 Jesus said the Gentiles would scourge and crucify him, and the third day he should rise again. Had he ever arisen from the dead before?

Webster defines sup 2. to eat the evening meal; take supper. And "sup" is used meaning the evening meal by the Savior in Luke 17:8. And Paul's language in 1 Cor. 11:25 implies that Jesus had supped before he took the bread and cup and gave thanks for them. The Am. Revised says "after supper."

Matt. 28:27: "And he took the cup, and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it." Did Matthew say that he drank of it? No. Mark 14:23: "He took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it." Not a word about his supping it. Nowhere does the Scripture say that Jesus supped from that cup.

When Jesus broke the bread, it was a physical act, showing what he did. Acts 20:7 is figurative, meaning a part for the whole. Webster defines broken—violently separated or fractured; sundered. When the nails were driven through his hands and feet, the flesh was violently separated, put asunder. When the spear pierced his side, the parts where the spear went were disunited, put asunder.

I am glad that Bro. Smith manifested a Christian spirit in his rejoinder. I have no intention of discussing the subject further. With kind and good feeling toward Bro. Smith, I close. A. J. Jernigan, Elk City, Okla.

PREACHER AND FAMILY WANTED

We want a preacher with a family to locate at Hartshorne, Okla. We have the Christian Church and the Sunday School Church, but we want a church built up according to the New Testament pattern; and no cups, Sunday School, Missionary Society, or organ man need apply. We have all sorts of trucking. This is a mining country, and the mines and large rock crusher furnish work. There are three members of the church here. Address Walter Gray, Box 684, Hartshorne, Okla.

MISSIONARIES FOR CUBA

Relative to the missionaries for Cuba as questioned by Bro. Martin, I would say as to how the churches are to be built, we are to build strictly on the New Testament plan. We are to "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent." Yes, Bro. W. W. Stone is to accompany the missionaries to Cuba and be personally in the work. About Bro. Morrow, he, as I understand, is not to go to Cuba when the rest of the missionaries go, but is to remain in Florida and to be engaged there to help plant and report the Cuba mission. Bro. Jiminey's parents live in Cuba and I understand are anxious for this mission work to be established there. Bro. Morrow, I understand, is a loyal and able preacher of the old Jerusalem gospel. These Tampa preachers are not digressives in any sense. Dr. W. W. Stone.

DEBATE AT GRAHAM, TEXAS Beginning August 21st.

Brother Harper and Brother Cowan will meet in discussion at Graham, Texas, beginning August 21, 1930, on the following propositions: 1. "The Cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. Cowan affirms and Harper denies. 2. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. Harper affirms and Cowan denies. All are invited.

WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURES?

Since we profess to stand on "the Bible and the Bible only," we should always be willing to ask, What saith the Scriptures? when a matter of contention arises. "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent"—"A Thus saith the Lord" for every doctrine and practice in the church—"prove all things"—"speaking as the oracles of God"—these sayings strictly followed will settle every question now disturbing the peace of "the church which is His body."

In Heb. 10:25, Paul says, "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together as the custom of some is." He did not say, "Some of you assemble on Lord's day morning, and the rest of you assemble in the evening." Neither did he say, "Some of you show the death of your Lord this morning, and some, this evening."

But Paul says, "If, therefore, the whole church be come together into one place." 1 Cor. 14:23. This shows that the whole church, or congregation, should assemble to show the Lord's death.

The practice of some showing the death of the Lord at 10:30 a. m. and some in the same congregation showing His death at 7:30 p. m. does not look like "the whole church come together into one place."

The purpose of an extra meeting to observe the Lord's supper on the Lord's day is evidently for the benefit of those who work on the Lord's day, and I think the extra meeting is prompted by good motives; but a good motive in the absence

of divine authority is not sanctioned by Jehovah.

Brethren should get a job that will not keep them away from the Lord's table at the time set for "the whole church to come together into one place" (1 Cor. 14:23) "to break bread" (Acts 20:7) "upon the first day of every week" (Greek text, 1 Cor. 16:2). As many jobs as can be found in these days of activity, I hardly think any brother is justified in staying away from the Lord's table in order to hold a job, when, as a matter of fact, most brethren can get a job that will not keep them away from the Lord's day assembly if they only try. And there is no authority for the church to set two tables on the first day of the week. Let us follow "that which is written."

We do not know that Sunday evening can be properly called "the first day of the week," or any part of it, for the Jews counted days from sun set of one day to sun set of the next day, making Sunday begin at sun down Saturday and end at sun down Sunday. If the Lord still counts time that way (and where is the evidence that any change has been made?) it is a sin to have the Lord's supper on Sunday night, for the first day of the week is then past.

Jesus says, "Are there not twelve hours in a day?"—John 11:9. This would indicate that "the first day of the week" is a twelve-hour day. And since a day in the New Testament began at 6:00 a. m. it must have ended at 6:00 p. m., counting twelve hours to the day as Jesus did.

So if either of these hypothesis is correct, I see no authority for night meetings in which the Lord's supper is observed. Besides, such a practice in the church gives an opportunity for the weak brethren and sisters to spend the Lord's days in pleasure, and assemble in the evening "to break bread." I have seen some bad effects of it, and we ought to shun it as much as is possible. Brethren, "Be sure you are right, then go ahead."

—I. L. Gibbs, 1109 Clea Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.

ELK CITY, OKLA., MEETING

Bro. Homer L. King will begin our meeting at Elk City, Okla., June 1, and Bro. Sam L. Shults will be with us to assist in the singing. We are making preparations and are expecting a good meeting. Brethren at Colter, Sentinel, Carpenter, Hammon, Reydon, Berlin and other points are invited to attend and assist in the meeting.

—Bob Musgrave.

MEMPHIS, TENN., MEETING

Brother Harper, who has just closed a very interesting and successful meeting and debate at Palestine, Ark., will hold us a meeting in Memphis, beginning May 19 to run indefinitely. Brethren who can do so are invited to attend and help us.

A. H. Pinegar, 3564, Faxon Ave., Memphis, Tenn.

TRUTH FUND

B. F. Chastain \$1.00
J. D. Perkins 3.00

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

RELIGION AND COMMON SENSE

By J. D. Phillips.

In the "Biographical Sketch" of Thos. W. Phillips, written by his son, Thos. W. Phillips, Jr., and published in "The Church of Christ," I find this paragraph (p. 22):

"In March, 1866, Mr. Phillips, sitting in the lobby of a Philadelphia hotel, overheard a stranger, who had picked up the morning paper announcing the death of Alexander Campbell, remark, 'Alexander Campbell was the first man that ever tried to reconcile religion and common sense'."

However strange it may seem, to some, that "Alexander Campbell was the first man," or, at least, one among the first in modern times, that tried "to reconcile religion and common sense," it is, nevertheless, true; for during the long period of the hierarchial rule of the popes and cardinals, during the awful period of the dark ages, known in the prophecies as "a time, times and a half"—"forty-two months"—"1,260 days"—in all, 1260 years—reaching from the dictatorship assumed by the pope in 533 to the end of the French Revolution in 1793—the people were kept in ignorance about the ways of Jehovah, for the light of the sciences, the scriptures, brooded over the face of this sin-cursed world, culminating in the Reign of Terror—of Satanic terror!

The renowned Luther, Zwingli, Huss, et al, among the "Morning Stars" of the Reformation, did much to clear away the fog of ignorance and superstition; but the church was in ignorance during the days of these bold men; and it was not until in 1809 that an effort was made to throw off the yoke of Babylonish bondage and build "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Eph. 2:20.

Huss and Wycliffe said, "The Pope is not 'another God upon earth'." Luther said, "We shall teach justification by faith, having denounced the one claiming to be 'His Holiness, Lord God the Pope'." Campbell said, "Let us leave Babylon, and get back to Jerusalem; that is, Let us leave the creeds and speculations of men, and get back to the primitive gospel preached by Paul and Peter.

So you see a movement was started by Huss and Wickcliffe to lead the people out of Babylon

back to Jerusalem. The first step was to denounce the Pope of Rome, and the last one was to recognize and acknowledge Jesus as "the blessed and only potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords." 1 Tim. 6:15.

The Reformers from the days of Huss to Campbell were in sectarian bondage. But the Campbells tried to reconcile religion with common sense. "Back to the Bible"—"Where the Bible speaks"—"Let us restore the ancient gospel with the order of things taught in it"—"the word of God as the all-sufficient rule of faith and conduct"—these are some of the favorite expressions among them. Their movement was not strictly a reformation, but a restoration, backed by religion and common sense: these two reconciled. It was a religious desire that made them plead for the unity of the faith of all professed Christians. It was common sense that led them away from human creeds, confessions of faith, etc., to "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent."

The religious world owes much to the Campbells for their present enlightenment. We never lose any time in reading their writings. I wish the Gospel Advocate or the Firm Foundation would make a reprint of the fearless journal, The Millennial Harbinger, edited by A. Campbell, and that we could get our brethren to read it. This would get us out of many of the strictly sectarian ideas so prevalent among us, and create within us a desire to return the Jerusalem.

THE ATTITUDE

"Some people seem to think because we teach that the proper attitude in prayer is kneeling, we hold that God will not hear the prayer of the man standing. Listen, brother, the proposition is not "praying standing," but standing up to pray; not whether we may pray sitting down, but sitting down to pray. The question is not, Can a man pray acceptably on horse-back, but should we get upon a horse in order to pray. Neither is it: Can a man pray acceptably lying down, but should we lie down in order to pray. Hezekiah prayed lying down on his bed; Paul and Silas prayed with their feet fast in the stocks; the thief prayed upon the cross; but these are all special cases and not one of them is held up as the attitude of worshippers.

But we should feel sorry, indeed, to know that God would not hear the prayers of his faithful children so circumstanced that they were unable to kneel; in such cases let the man upon the sick bed pray, but upon approaching the sanctuary, whether in the closet or in the field, or in the silent grove, or in the public assembly, bow down and pray as the scriptures direct. If an householder were to call his friends to a feast, would he ask the guest when sitting to rise and stand up to eat? Should we happen at the river or the seashore when the assembly were kneeling in worship, would we stand up like as many posts and go through the form of worship? Or if in the carpeted chapel and the beloved Paul would say, "Let us bow before the Lord in prayer,"

would we sit and gaze over the audience? And do such, advertising their irreverence, really pray? I seriously doubt it. But were we to see an audience of Christians bow down upon their knees during prayer, and at the conclusion hear everyone say, audibly, "Amen," we should not hesitate to say that was acceptable worship."

The above was copied from the pen of our beloved Bro. A. Ellmore, as it appeared in his book, "Sermons and Sayings." I thought it worth passing on to the readers of The Truth. If Bro. Ellmore has not "hit the nail on the head" in the above, then, I, too, am in darkness on the attitude of prayer. It does appear to me that all (sisters and brethren) would feel like, at least a part of the time, humbling themselves sufficiently to bow down upon their knees in prayer to the Giver of life and every good gift. I am sometimes made to wonder if some ever do really pray to their God. It seems difficult for some to realize that the Lord demands that everyone should really pray. Hear Him! "Pray without ceasing," "Draw nigh to God and He will draw nigh to you," "Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God and he will lift you up," "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted," "And this is the confidence that we have in him, if we ask anything according to his will he heareth us," "Watch and pray that we enter not into temptations." I feel certain that no one will ever enter heaven at the end of a prayerless life. Brethren and sisters, let us pray more and in that manner and way that will be acceptable to our God.

Brotherly in the Lord,
Homer L. King.

WHO SHALL WE FELLOWSHIP?

By Paul Hays.

Undoubtedly, God is a "free moral agent." He can save whom he pleases. But if God has not bound himself (by his word), he has, at least, bound us. We are not "free." We are bound to obey these conditions (especially if we know them),—and we are bound to limit our fellowship to those who claim (at least) to have accepted the conditions of salvation.

But all Sectarian or party tests of fellowships should be ignored. We may not judge people's word, or their "hearts," if they have accepted the Lord on his own terms, as we agree are written in the Book.

We are scarcely able to judge the amount of knowledge, repentance, faith, or fidelity, of any man. We are astonished to learn that folks in Bible times, learned enough in a single hour, to take them from heathen ignorance, to full salvation.

We are also forced to acknowledge that a large percent of the church membership, in New Testament times was very imperfect. The Church at Corinth was very faulty, but they are called the "Church of God" in Corinth.

But it is well to consider that they were newly converted from heathenism and had not a Bible in every home as we have. But we can learn from

the Lord's word to them that we ought to be patient and loving and helpful to the "babes in Christ," while they are learning to walk.

Yet we are taught to "rebuke" their sins, and withdraw from such individuals as persist in sin and ungodliness. All churches are made up of a "mixed multitude," which sadly hinders the work and worship of the Israel of God.

At our peril, do we continue to fellowship (especially without rebuke) the unconverted and the backslider. Shall we for the sake of Numbers (and what we call "success") harbor the immoral, and even those who have lost their faith in the fundamental truths of the gospel?

On the other hand, shall we refuse to fellowship those whom we expect to meet in Heaven? It is a scandalous thing to grant that a man is good enough to go to heaven, and not good enough for our (puny) companionship. Secretarianism is Heresy.

Let us not forget that Salvation is to get rid of Sin,—not only the guilt of sin, but the Practice of sin. From John the Baptist's first cry of Repentance, to John the Apostle's revelation of the last Plagues, God is trying to get rid of SIN.

Shame on the Preachers, and Churches, that have ceased to cry aloud against Sin, and to warn the world of Judgment, and of Hell-fire! The church is not a play-party,—and "there is no peace to the wicked, saith my God." "Is not my word like as a FIRE, and like a Hammer that breaketh the Rock in pieces?"

Nineteen hundred years have rolled by, since the Son of God suffered on the Cross, as the awful penalty for sin, but "the savor of Life" has become a "savor of Death." Gratitude, and Repentance, have given place to Lukewarmness and a "seared conscience."

Preachers and Churches are apostatising from "the Faith," and are turned unto "fables," and "science, falsely so-called." There is "A Wave of Crime!" Fear is not preached,—and we are denounced for preaching on the Prophecies, of impending Judgment.

The apostles (at the last) faced conditions similar to our own. But they did not forsake the churches. But neither did they fellowship their sins. There was a stern warning that God would "remove their candlestick." (Not even an apostle could do that). "The Lord knoweth them that are his." When Babylon becomes utterly corrupt, judgment is imminent.

We should "join nothing," since the Lord has added us to his Church,—and our names are in the Lamb's book of life. But, as ever, we should seek to fellowship baptised believers, in any thing is right, according to God's holy Word. We "belong to Christ," and we do not "belong to a Denomination," (that we should obey it.) Yet we are members of "the one body" (that includes all the saved), and all of us "subject one to another" (in the things appointed of God).

We have a Church-wide membership and a World-wide Commission to preach the gospel. Let us not be "too narrow," nor too Broad. Let Love be joined to "loyalty,"—and let us "judge our-

elves" more strictly than we judge others. (If this essay sounds mixed, remember that we are dealing with a mixed situation). May the time be hastened, when the Lord shall "sever the wicked from among the just". Amen!

Route "D," Box 15, Fresno, Calif.

METAPHORICAL MUSINGS

By C. D. Moore.

"Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many." Drink what? Drink of "this fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:29). What is this fruit of the vine? "This is my blood." Blood of what? "Blood of the new testament." What occurred to His blood? "It was shed." For whom was it shed? "For many" (and that means all, 2 Cor. 5:14, 15). Why was it shed? "For the remission of sins" (Mat. 26:28).

What does the phrase, "blood of the new testament" mean? Animals' blood was the blood of the old testament, and in contrast, the blood of Christ is the blood of the new testament. Animal blood could not take away sin" (Heb. 10:4), but the blood of Christ "cleanseth from all sin" (1 Jno. 1:7). It may be that the wine they drank at the Passover supper signified the blood of the animal (lamb), the flesh of which they ate. But they did not dare to drink of its literal blood. Neither can we drink the literal blood of our "Lamb," Christ.

But Paul says, at Cor. 11:25, "This cup (fruit of the vine) is the new testament in my blood." Is what? "Is the new testament." Where is the new testament to be found? "In my blood." That is, in His blood we see the new testament or testimony. The new testament is in His blood, not in the blood of the animal, which was the blood of the old testament. See Heb. 9:8-20.

In the "fruit of the vine" we see His blood, and in His blood we see the new testament. It is about the same as saying that His blood contains the new testament. Like Ephesians 2:15 says that the law of commandments was contained in ordinances. The ordinances reflected the law. In the ordinances was seen the law. In His blood is seen the new testament. The old testament "stood in" carnal ordinances, including the blood of goats, calves, etc., while the new testament "stands in" the blood of Christ. See Heb. 9:10-14.

While we are at this point, let us get another lesson "in the blood." See Heb. 10:25-29. Paul says for Christians to not forsake the assembling of themselves together on the day appointed, and warns them that if they wilfully do so, there remaineth no more sacrifice (blood) for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries, such as wilful sinners. To back that declaration up, he reminds them of the fact that they who despised Moses' law (which, as to blood, "stood" only in the blood of calves, goats, etc.) died without mercy upon the testimony of two or three witnesses.

Then, in contrast with that awful punishment for sinning against a law that stood only in the sanctity and strength of animal blood, he warned them that a "much sorer punishment" awaits those who trample under foot the son of God, and count the "blood of the (new) covenant an unholy thing," etc.

Now, what is the "blood" of the new testament or covenant? Literally, it is Jesus' blood: but He said, "This (fruit of the vine) is my blood of the new testament" or covenant.

Thus we see what a terrible thing it is for a member of the church to manage to not meet and eat of the bread—His body or flesh, and drink of the fruit of the vine, His blood of the new testament. So many do not seem to see the new testament in His blood: yet Jesus said: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." We live now and eternally on His flesh and blood, if we make them our food and drink. On the other hand He said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." See Jno. 6:51-56. How essential then, to eat of the "bread" (His flesh), and drink of the fruit of the vine, which is His "blood of the new testament"—His blood in which is the new testament, "by which ye are saved if ye keep (it) in memory" (Cor. 15:2). And He said: Eat this bread and drink this fruit of the vine in memory of me. So let us all do and live.

AS I SEE IT

Just a few remarks on the friendly criticism by Bro. W. A. Berry in the Truth of April first headed "As I See It."

I was glad to see his effort to substantiate the position taken by most people in their confused observance on Lord's Day of the sacred and divine cup and loaf. The good brother states that there is no reference to the Lord in remembering us in 1st Cor. 11:24-25. If he is right, how do we grow in Spiritual life by eating and drinking the communion, if he has no memory of us in it? If we have no mental connection with him how can we have any Spiritual connection with Him? When did the Lord forget His children that assembled to worship Him?

I asked the question in the article the brother was referring to "to answer this one way or the other and not break the fellowship of mental communion." Now the brother says "none whatever." All right—no Spiritual connection, no Spiritual life. Yet he says we grow. He must mean we grow naturally by eating a hearty Lord's supper as there is no Spiritual connection on the part of the Lord in memory.

The careful observer will notice at the conclusion of the article he admits my contention on the "name" when he states that when the ordinance that he calls by different "terminology" is carried out right it IS A COMMUNION. Brother, if it is that, call it what it is and we will have no dispute over "terminology."

God bless you, Bro. Berry, for the good confession. I would be glad if all that had read the article on "The Name" would send and get the tract

on the communion of which the "Name" articles were only a part.

Any article that will not stand out against all criticism that can be brought against it, is not worth anything to the man who wrote it or to the reader. If all writers to the paper would be sure that they have studied the question on which they are writing before they send the article in we would have less criticism and more sound teaching. I would have reviewed the article sent in by Bro. Henry but did not think it necessary as he admits in his concluding remarks all that I contended for and if that creed is too narrow for him or anyone else, they can have as broad one as "terminology" can give them. But remember that I was not the one that narrowed down the creed to "communion." Bro. Berry said that was what it was when done right and so say all.

Your brother for the way that leads to life,
Jas. T. White.

ITEMS OF INTEREST

There is much to cause happiness; yet some things cause sadness. One of these is that our congregations are not having the truth preached as much as they should—no preaching helped and encouraged except, perhaps, one short meeting where the church is already established. Our preachers should be kept busy if we expect to see the cause of the Redeemer grow and prosper. The truth, the seed of the kingdom, preached is what makes the harvest of souls. We must be constantly fed both physically and spiritually. And it is important to know that for physical health and strength there must be a well-balanced ration, and man must have this food regularly. But why should we be so dull in caring for the spiritual man? Why be so long from one meal to the other? It was through preaching constantly and "everywhere" that the cause was established in the beginning, and I dare say that it will be through preaching that every congregation is maintained and developed.

From what I can learn from the writings of the early Christians and from the word of God the apostolic churches had ministers known as Bishops that labored in word and doctrine. These preached the gospel and successfully defended it by exposing the arguments of infidels, replying to them and thus shutting the mouths of such.

I have thought for years that our old preachers, men past fifty, should be Bishops over congregations and be supported by the church. "Old men for counsel, young men for war," in the good fight of faith. Let our younger men serve as evangelists and let all be guided by faith and love; then watch the cause grow.

I appeal to every leader and teacher in the church, and suggest that we make a more determined effort to have the torch of truth held high in each community. We must have the "pastor system" of the New Testament. We must be constantly fed if we maintain our strength. Let us have the word "in season and out of season." Let us learn that a plain presentation of the truth will

draw men and women to Christ. We have several hundred preachers that should, yes, I say MUST be kept busy preaching. Thousands will then hear the truth. And no one can estimate the good done. Think over these things, and write me. I am ready to do my part of the preaching. W. T. Taylor, Rt. 1, De Leon, Texas.

HARPER-JONES DEBATE AT PALESTINE ARKANSAS

Brother Harper met W. F. Jones of the Methodist church here, beginning May 8, 1930, on the following propositions:

1. The Scriptures teach that immersion in water is baptism. Jones denies. 2. The Scriptures teach that sprinkling and pouring is baptism. Harper denies. 3. The Scriptures teach that Faith, Repentance, Confession, and Baptism are conditions to be complied with by the sinner before Remission of sins. Jones denies. 4. The Scriptures teach that Salvation comes direct from God to the sinner through the Baptism of the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit. Harper denies.

The speakers conducted themselves in a very becoming manner, and we feel that this was a great victory for the truth. It was decidedly in our favor from the beginning, and those holding with Mr. Jones did not attend very regularly and some quit entirely. We think this a good way to get the Bible teaching before the people who honestly want the truth. Ryan Bennett.

DEBATE AT LORENZO, TEXAS, JULY 1, 2, 3.

Musgrave and Cowan will engage in debate at the above mentioned time and place for three days or more on the following propositions:

1. The Scriptures teach that in observing the Communion that one cup (one container only) is apostolic. Bob Musgrave affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

2. The Scriptures teach that in observing the Communion two or more containers may be used in the distribution of the cup is apostolic. J. N. Cowan affirms; Bob Musgrave denies.

"THE TRUE CHURCH"

is the title of a 4-page leaflet, envelope-size, and is one of thirty or forty leaflets of free tracts which I am distributing, and which are intended to enlighten without inciting opposition. The writer will be glad to send samples of these leaflets and cards to those who are interested in the distribution of printed preaching. Don Carlos Janes, 2229 Dearing St., Louisville, Ky.

"Let us be done with trying to be individuals, parents, congregations, by proxy."—Ben J. Elston, in C. L.

Right, brother, but you know "History repeats itself. Following the Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things, launched by Stone, Campbell and others, men of worldly ambitions crept in among us and again began to mar the New Testament" order of things, as A. B. Barrett tells us in C. L., Mch. 18, 1930.

OBEDIENCE TO GOD

"Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself: that where I am, there you may be also." John 14:1-2-3. How hard it is sometimes for us not to let our hearts be troubled! But when the desire to do God's Will is properly "planted, nourished and watered" in the soul of mankind, this command is easily obeyed.

While reading of the passing of good old Brother Trott "just as the sun went down," I remembered very vividly the going down of the sun on Dec. 5, 1929. Six months and one week before that day God saw fit to bless our home with a baby girl, the perfect embodiment of angelic purity and innocence it seemed to us. When the sun went down on that day, my wife and I hovered near a little cradle and prayed to God, the giver and taker of life. He took the sweet spirit of our baby into more competent hand at eleven forty-five that night. Our only child was gone and with it went the complete happiness with which God had blessed our home. During the dismal, lonely and heartrending days that have followed it has dawned upon us and now I gladly proclaim, "Our home is represented in heaven."

What must we do to go where our baby is? We must hear. Christ said, "He that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them I will liken him unto a wise man." Luke 6.

We must believe. "Verily, verily, I say unto you. He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John 6:47.

We must repent. "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of your sins." Acts 2:38.

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

We must be baptized. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved..." Mark 16:15-16.

We must give "all diligence and add to our 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.

We must walk in the Spirit. Gal. 5:16. "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.

We must worship one Lord, subscribe to one faith and participate in one baptism. Eph. 4:5.

Whatever we do in word or deed we must do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him. Col. 3:17.

We must keep ourselves unspotted from the world. James 1:27.

If and after we follow these and all other divinely inspired commands we shall have our gar-

ments spotless white in which to meet not only our own precious baby which has gone on before but we shall also meet, with approval, that "Holy Child of Bethlehem, the Messiah" who shall never allow us to suffer our child taken from us any more and we shall never cease to do obeisance at His Great White Throne and to sing the song of triumph and praise to Him.

Professed Christians, are you really a Christ-like being or are you just bluffing? Do you compromise with the devil and make short though fatal departures from "that which is written?" Do you think you can render excuses, alibis, and other devilish and man-made pretenses, with any hope of success with them at the Throne of Justice? Do you love God? If so, serve him. If you say you love him and do not his commands you are a liar. God said so. The time to wake up and prepare your soul for the Final Examination is now. Remember that Christ will know whether you have done his commands or not, and he will not ask "why" and give you a chance to "palaver" and beg and promise. We had better wake up!

Jeter E. Whigham.

NOTICE

DATE OF CAMP MEETING CHANGED.—

The camp meeting announced to be held at 6-mile crossing, six miles above Junction, Texas, June 21 to July 6, will be held there June 28 to July 13, 1930, just one week later than at first announced in The Truth of May 1st.—Jas. T. White.

Isaac Smith, Sentinel, Okla.—We are getting along fairly well since the Phillips-Johnson debate on the cups. Are not bothered with false teachers any more. I think it possible for Bro. Phillips to be with us again in a meeting, and if any one wants to try to defend the cups, just let us know and put up your man. All we want is just what the Bible teaches. Bro. Bob Musgrave preached for us a short time ago. We think he is a good preacher. We think "The Truth" is the only paper now that is not bidding for popularity. It tries to please God, and not man. Send me sample copies with each mailing. I give them out and find the people are glad to get them. I would be so glad if Johnson, Cowan, Knight, and others would unite with us on the Bible, and not slip off like the S. S. brethren did.

J. M. Andrews, Gilbert, Arizona.—I am now devoting all my time to preaching the Gospel of the blessed Son of God. Have lately been at Deming and Alma, N. Mex., and expect to go wherever there is a brother or sister that wants help to establish the cause. Just write me at my home address. The Apostle says, "Always abounding in the work of the Lord."

NOTICE OF MEETING AT LOCO, OKLA.

Members of the church of Christ at Loco, Okla., have secured the services of Bro. Sam L. Shultz, of Lexington, Okla., to hold their meeting to begin August 1 and continue two weeks. All brethren that can are invited to attend.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JULY 1, 1930

NO. 12

"SHAKING THEM IN"

(This reply to Bro. Jameson was crowded out of our last issue, June 1, in which his article appeared.)

The brother says:

I do not believe that if a man or woman had been taught enough to "obey from the heart that form of doctrine" that the Lord would refuse to add him to the right church, but as "God is not the author of confusion," I believe when anyone has been baptized and goes into the wrong church, it is evident the Lord had not had anything to do with it; for he does not do things in any such way.

There is but one church of which Christ is the Head; and when one "obeys from the heart that form of doctrine" (Rom. 6:17), the Lord adds one to this church (Acts 2:47.) Hence everyone that has "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine" has been added by the Lord to the right church. And no matter what one may have done after this that is contrary to the will of God, one gets forgiveness through the law of forgiveness to the child of God. Acts 8:22; I John 1:9. If one "goes into the wrong church," the Lord had nothing to do with such a thing, not any more than he had with any other wrong. When one did right in "obeying from the heart that form of doctrine," the Lord added one to the right church; and when one did wrong in any way after that, one must avail one's self of the law of forgiveness to the child of God for pardon. And there is no evidence in the word of God that a sin committed after baptism indicates that one did not "obey from the heart that form of doctrine in being baptized."

When one has believed, repented, confessed Christ, and been baptized for the remission of sins, let Bro. Jameson say that one has not "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine," if he feels equal to the occasion. He may be able to go into every man's heart, but I do not think he can. I know it says "teach," that is "make disciples," or "preach the gospel." And I know what the gospel requirements to the sinner are before remission of sins. And I know that the Book teaches that when the sinner has sincerely complied with these requirements the Lord adds him to the church of Christ by remitting his sins.

Hear the brother again:

I do not believe that a man who knows enough to preach the gospel, God's power to save, would be so ignorant of God's word that he would not know what church was right; and if he did and told the convert the truth and the new convert was too stubborn to go into the right church that the Lord would add him to the church later, on that kind of baptism just because some preacher shakes his hand.

"go into the right church." This means, if I get what the language says, that one goes into the

church, the right church after one is baptized. This I deny. In God's act of forgiveness when one "obeys from the heart that form of doctrine," one is placed by the Lord in the right church. And one cannot get into the right church, the church of Christ, in any other way. The only question, then, is, Has one obeyed the gospel requirements? And I contend and will affirm that when one has sincerely believed and repented, confessed Christ as the Son of God and been baptized as directed in Matt. 28:19 and Acts 2:38, one has. And no sin that one may commit thereafter will make it necessary according to God's word for one to be baptized again. And all the wrong things, be they called church or what-not, that one joins after one becomes a child of God, should be dropped and the wrong will be forgiven according to the promise of forgiveness to the child of God. Ed.

HAIR SPLITTERS—A Reply

I have just been reading an article in the Gospel Advocate of March 20, 1930, entitled "Splitting Hairs," in which "hair-splitters" are severely condemned and "rail-splitters" are highly extolled. The Savior said, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs nor cast your pearls before swine." I understand that "dogs" and "swine" are used figuratively to teach that there are some people who will no more appreciate pearls of truth than swine appreciate literal pearls; and there are people who have the tearing and rending nature of dogs, and when you try to teach them as the Savior taught they will not only not accept it, but will become irritated and try to harm you. How sad it is that people will do so!

I am not sure that I understand the application the brother makes of the figures he uses "hair-splitters" and "rail-splitters" as it applies in our religious life. He says, "I have great respect and admiration for a rail-splitter." But he says, "From all kinds of hair-splitters, young or old, big or little, male or female, bond or free, good Lord, deliver us."

Now, if speaking thus is "speaking the things that become sound doctrine, then we are sure of the fact that we shall hear that welcome: "Come ye blessed of my Father" if we are counted as one of "rail-splitters" in the kingdom of our Lord and Master. But if we are of the "hair-splitters" we are divided from the "rail-splitters" only to find our place on the left with the "goats." Hence, I should like very much to know how to avoid becoming a "hair-splitter" and how to become a "rail-splitter" in the kingdom of God.

But if the brother gave any directions as to how we may know these things, I failed to get it. True, he gave Lincoln as an example of "rail-splitters."

But religiously, one author puts him down as a deist. And Webster says a deist is a freethinker. Another says he was a Presbyterian. Another says he was a Liberal in religion. I know that it is a very popular thing to be a Liberal in religion. But the Savior and his disciples suffered persecution and death because they could not be thus popular in serving God.

I have always admired the great Lincoln for his kindly deeds; and I think Lysias was praiseworthy for taking Paul from the mob and delivering him safely in Cesarea; but can either be taken as a model in religion for us?

Now from the severe language used by the brother in regard to "hair-splitters" and their awful doom, it seems to me that he should at least have announced some clear-cut principles or teaching from the Bible as to what constitutes one a "hair-splitter." But if the Bible gives such instructions, the brother did not give one reference to it. True he gave what the Savior said about tithing mint, anise and cummine. But if this makes "hair-splitters," the Savior approves of "hair-splitters," for he says, "These ought you to have done and not to leave the other undone." and this is no key to unlock the mystery on "hair-splitters" vs. "rail-splitters." And if doing and contending for the small things of God makes one a "hair-splitter," then the Savior was one, for he said, "not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled. 'Jots' and 'tittles' evidently stand for the very smallest things in the law. And James was surely a "hair-splitter" too, for he says, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all."

I want to say to the brother: You gave a list of your own makeup that people do that makes of them "hair-splitters," but from your own statement one could not determine just what to do, for you say "I am not saying that some of the things mentioned above are not important and should be determined carefully by the Scriptures..." If you cannot determine just the things that make of us hair-splitters when we do them and contend for them, and just the things that should be "determined by the Scriptures," how could you expect of us who are not teachers and who are just honestly and conscientiously trying to learn to do the things that we should do in order that we may stand approved of Him who gave us the pattern we should follow when trying to worship or serve Him? You say, "There are those among us who are constantly finding fault, kicking and quibbling about little things..." I once lived in a small town where there was no church that did not use instrumental music. The members of the church there treated me nicely. They tried to get me to come on in with them and be one of them. They used almost the identical arguments and sometimes the very same words and phrases, to prove to me that I was wrong in opposing as "little" a thing as an "organ," that you have used in this article about "little things." One brother said, "Why be so conscientious about lit-

tle things? Lay aside your conscience and come on to church with us and in just a little while you will get so you won't feel right when you go where they don't have the instrument." You know this has been their plea. And many have been deceived by them.

You did give one example of a hair-splitter and said postively, "He was just another hair-splitter." If I understand it, he is condemned as a hair-splitter because he believes and contends for his belief, that it is right to offer thanks before the bread is broken. The Savior did it just that way (Luke 22:19,) and He said, "I do always the things that are pleasing to Him" (His Father). John 8:29. But you say, "These hair-splitters are a contentious lot." The apostle Jude says, "I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." Then it is surely right for us to be "a contentious lot," if we contend for the right thing. What is the right thing to contend for? The faith. What faith? The faith delivered to us. Who delivered this faith? The Savior. How? By his life and teaching. Then if we contend for the things that He did and taught, are we not safe in being a "contentious lot?" "They will stay with you till the cows come home and the sun goes down on the most insignificant matters. They will split hairs with you about fermented or unfermented wine; the common or individual cup, you say. According to your judgement, these are the first of the most "insignificant matters" that "they will split hairs with you about," but you did not tell us which side is condemned as hair-splitters; the ones that contend for grape juice and individual cups, or the ones who conscientiously believe that we should be able to give Scripture for everything we do as service to Him and call for the Scripture that would assure them that they would be doing service acceptable to Him when they used grape juice and individual cups in the communion. Is it unreasonable and sinful for people to want to do in their religious services just what the Savior did and taught? If we do and contend for just what the Savior did and taught, are we not walking by faith? Is not 'faith' one of the "weightier matters" mentioned by the Savior? But grape juice and individual cups are mentioned as some of the "most insignificant matters"; then why were these "insignificant matters" ever agitated or introduced? I can remember very well, and I believe you can too, when no one even thought of writing an article about these "insignificant matters." Why? Because these "insignificant matters" had not been introduced. I believe myself that these matters are very insignificant as to the benefit they are to anyone. But I believe that these matters are very significant in some respects. First of all, I believe that the introduction of these "insignificant matters" signifies a lack of faith (one of the weightier matters mentioned by the Savior.) I believe that it signifies that some believe that to observe the Lord's Supper as it was observed "in the night in which he was

betrayed" will make drunkards of people. I believe that it signifies that some believe that to observe the Lord's Supper as it was observed "in the night in which he was betrayed" is a menace to society and a medium through which communicable diseases are spread. I believe that it signifies that some think that others are filthy, unsanitary and not fit to commune with. I believe that it signifies that some are not obeying the plain command, "in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves."

In 1925, I wrote an article on the elements of the Lord's Supper and it was published in the Advocate of Dec. 10, 1925. A brother did not believe some things I had said in this article and wrote me and sent me two propositions which he had signed and asked me to sign them and debate with him the two propositions. I wrote him that I was no preacher, that I was only a country practitioner and that my time was practically all taken up with my practice and that I had never written an article for publication before. I told him that I had no interest in the matter except to be just right on the subject, that if he would send me the Scripture that would prove that I was wrong, I would gladly give it up. He wrote me shortly afterwards that he did not care to debate the subject. Since then he and I have been corresponding at intervals. A few months ago he wrote me and said that he wanted to publish an article that he had written in leaflet or tract form and asked if I cared if he used some things that I had said, with his article in its publication. I wrote him that I would be glad for him to do so, if he thought it would do good, and that I would help bear the expenses of its publication. He had the work done and sent me a hundred copies complimentary. I am sending you one of these tracts. If you will have this letter published in the Advocate and give Scripture to prove that anything that I have said, either in this letter or in tract, is wrong, I will appreciate it very much. I will surely not "stay with you till the cows come home and the sun goes down." Long before the sun reaches the zenith even while it is yet in the eastern horizon and the cows are yet nipping the dewy grass of early morn, I will have quit arguing.

Truly and fraternally yours,

A. J. TRAIL

ARE WE DIGRESSING?

"There are none so blind as those who will not see."

"Teach a man against his will, and he's of the same opinion still."

Do brethren really want "The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace? Is it possible to have it, except by taking, and holding God's word at just what it says? How can there be unity except by holding to the unit?"

Several religious papers, and many preachers have as their motto: "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent," but it cannot be truthfully said that they carry it out any more.

Innovation after innovation has wrought havoc with the church until we can no more call the pot "blackie." There must be a cleaning up in the "camp of Isarel."

If it be possible, let us pull the beam out of our own eyes, and see how far we have gone out of the way that was marked out for us by the Holy Spirit; get back to the old paths, and walk therein.

We bombast the Methodists for having three water baptisms, and then follow suit with three ways of taking the Lord's Supper. We give the Digressives "Hail Columbia" for introducing instrumental music to "assist in the worship, and then go them one better by introducing a half dozen ways for appointing elders and deacons. They ordain them the Bible way, "we" appoint them "my way," "your way" and no way.

The only difference in their "Pastor System" and ours is, they say Pastor, "we" say Minister in the announcements.

No, the kettle cannot call the pot "blackie" any more. O, that God would send a couple of "maids" to scrub them both up, that we might "worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness" again as of yore.

There are hundreds of preachers today who have climbed over the walls, or have slipped out of the "back door" of the city of God, the New Jerusalem, and are out in the woods eating Crab Apples, and telling their hearers they are sweet and "just as good as those growing on the Tree of Life inside the City.

How shall we get them to return? "Ring the bells of heaven?" They will not hear. Tell them they are on the wrong road? They will turn and rend you. Pray for them, plead with them in tears? They will mock you.

May God raise up a Campbell, a Stone, a Smith, a Franklin, or put His Spirit into the heart of some of our great and good preachers to call His people out of Babylon, that we may "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. "Eph. 4:1-3.

"If ye love me ye will keep my words."

E. A. LOWRY,

Dayton, Tenn., Route 5

May 16, 1930.

WANTED

I want a place to make my home with an aged couple that believes in the Bible and the Bible alone. Where they go to church each Lord's day. I would prefer a place somewhere near my present address. I would want to make my home with them as one of their own. My reason for wanting to leave my home is that I can't attend church and live as the Bible teaches us to. If there is anyone that is interested in helping one that loves the Lord please write me.

MABLE PARKER,

Breckenridge, Texas.

P. O. Box 835

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL J. D. Phillips

MR. STONE CHALLENGED

In a recent issue of the Christian Worker, Mr. C. C. Stone, a Roman Catholic, replied to some things Bro. John T. Hinds had said in that publication. He concluded his article by saying:

"J. D. Phillips, of Montebello, Calif., one of the Editors of 'The Truth' (so called), published at Sneads, Fla., is one who needs to read carefully 2 Peter 1:20."

I have read "carefully 2 Peter. 1:20" and I find it does the Catholic cause no good, for it says: "No prophecy of the scriptures is of private interpretation." This certainly cuts the Pope—"that man of sin," "the son of perdition (literally, destruction)"—out of any claims to the right to interpret the Prophecies.

Mr. Stone evidently did not like some of the things I have written on the Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation—the ones that concern Roman Catholicism—and he wishes to discredit what I have said by insisting that I learn that "no prophecy of the scriptures is of private interpretation"—trying to make it appear that no one can understand them.

Now, to show Mr. Stone that I am not afraid of my position on these Prophecies, I hereby challenge him to deny the following propositions:

1. The Roman Heirarchy is the Empire of the Eleventh Horn of Daniel's Sea Monster. (Dan. 7.)
2. The Roman Heirarchy is "that Man of Sin" and "Son of Perdition." 2 Thess. 2:3-7.)
3. The Roman Heirarchy is the Two Horned Beast. (Rev. 13:11-18.)
4. The Roman Heirarchy is the "Babylon of Rev. 17.

I will debate this matter with Mr. Stone either orally or in writing, he to furnish a medium for the discussion while I furnish one. If he will get "Our Sunday Visitor" or some other Catholic paper to open its columns for the discussion, we shall be glad to run it in "The Truth."

THE MEETING NEAR FRESNO, CALIF.

I recently held a mission meeting at Port Washington School, ten miles north of Fresno, Calif.,

with the help of Bro. Paul Hays, which resulted in several baptisms and restorations and the establishment of a sound congregation which will meet in the school house every Lord's day at 10:30 a. m. They will have no Sunday School and use one cup. The Church is composed of fifteen good members, all heads of families except one young man. The church is in a good farming country, and any brethren wishing to move to a good community where they can be a help in the work of the church, would do well to investigate this place. Bro. W. D. Hamet, Route 1, Fresno, Calif., can give you the desired information.

WORK FOR "THE TRUTH"

It is now "big meeting time" when all the preachers are in the field "preaching the word." We can double the subscription list soon if all the preachers will "get in the harness" and work to that end. The paper is badly needed now as it is the only paper in the world that "contends earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." "The Cup Question" is being "threshed" out thru its columns and hundreds have been benefitted by it. So do all you can to get new subscribers. I got five new ones at the new congregation near Fresno.

BROTHER HARPER IN THE WEST

Bro. H. C. Harper, our publisher, is now in the West holding meetings. The brethren who have not heard him in a series of meetings do not know what they have missed, for he is one of the very best teachers we have. He is second to none. Write him and maybe you can get him for a meeting. Address him at Sneads, Fla.

DON'T FORGET THE COWAN-MUSGRAVE DEBATE

This debate will be held July 1, 2, and 3 at Lorenzo, Texas, and every one who can should attend it. If anybody can "put the cups in the Bible" Bro. Cowan can. And if anybody can meet Cowan on the question Bro. Musgrave can. Remember the date—July 1, 2, and 3.

REMEMBER THE COWAN-HARPER DEBATE

This debate is to be held at Graham, Texas, beginning Aust 21st. Bro. Harper has been trying for five years to get Bro. Cowan to debate the Cup Question with him. Bro. Cowan said in a letter: "For four long years I have evaded a debate on the 'cup' question, though I have been pressed often to debate it." We are glad that he is now in the notion of debating this question. Be sure to attend it, brethren Bro. Harper's wonderful knowledge of the Greek language enables him to go to the bottom of this question, and you will be missing a great deal if you do not hear this debate.

MEDITATIONS ON PENTECOST

The eighth of June has passed. A forcible reminder to one who is trying to "Work out his own salvation with fear and trembling," to look behind

him, to his past teachings and practices, compare them with the teaching and practice of the church in the beginning, or, even one hundred years ago, and see "Where we are."

If we are following "steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and the prayers, "can we not know it? Would it not pay us big dividends to cast away pride, prejudice and preference and humbly bow to the authority of our exalted King? What shall we gain here or hereafter by our substitutions, and man-made devices for the worship of our God? We hear from heaven in thunder tones: "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Can we claim to be loyal when year after year new things are being introduced into the church worship and practice?

I do not wish by any means to cause ill feelings, nor will I among those whose hearts are right, and who are trying to use the Bible as a guide, but my duty to God, and my fellowman, impels me to point out, upon this nineteen hundredth anniversary, some of the things which are separating the Church of Christ from the love and approval of our God, whom we all wish to please.

I do hope and pray that you brethren will not scoff at these things and turn a deaf ear to them, but as sensible men and women, as men and women who wish to be saved, who want the truth, and are not afraid to acknowledge it and receive it, altho it may come from a simple child like me, and that you will "search the Scriptures" and compare our teaching with inspiration.

1. We are wrong in the present manner of selecting and appointing elders and deacons. Please read Acts 6:1-6; also Acts 14:23. Here we see the "multitude" or all the disciples did the choosing and the Apostles appointed or ordained them. For evangelists, see Acts 13:13; 1 Tim. 4:14. These things are done any old way and no way today. Shame to men who claim to "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent."

2. We are wrong, and "ape" the denominations in "calling" some one to preach for us, and have them preach a "trial sermon" before we will accept them. Whereas if we followed the Bible method, we would train them up in the church, ordain them when they were competent and send them to preach. Acts 13:1-3.

3. We teach the Bible in a modern Sunday School, which we copied from the denominations, and not only that, we teach the very lessons they suggest, thus "scrapping" the Bible.

4. Even the prayers in the church have been formalized by many thoughtless and worldly preachers asking the people to BOW their heads instead of asking them to kneel. Another copy.

5. The sermon must not exceed 45 minutes, and must be on the subject about which all agree. No "reproving, no rebuking, no controversy. Another ape. "Reprove, rebuke, with all long-suffering and teaching. "Declare the whole counsel of God."

6. One hour is given to "International Lessons," 5 minutes to telling people how to be saved, (and it must be snappy) and TEN minutes to the Supper and contribution.

7. "All congregations, who would preserve their lives from the deadly microbe Satan discovered a few years ago, especially those who can afford it, had better use individual cups," "Just as well, cause you don't drink the cup nohow."

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake and gave to his disciples, and said: Take eat; this is my body. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave to them saying, Drink ye all of it." Matt. 26:26-27. "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed and break, and gave to them and said: Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it." Mark 14:22-23. "And he took bread and gave thanks, and brake, and gave unto them, saying This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22:19-20. Paul in 1 Cor. 11:24-25, gives it in almost the same words as Luke, but he warns them against eating and drinking unworthily. How many have condemned their souls to death in this manner. Now just what was the trouble with those people? HEAR IT! SELFISHNESS! They did not want to commune with others. The Devil thought we had all forgotten that incident, and here a little while back, he said: "Say you people who speak where the Bible speaks and are silent where the Bible is silent, listen; don't you know that science has discovered a harmful bug in everybody's mouth. And you get it by drinking after people. So if I were you I would have everybody use his own cup." But some one who just had sense enough to follow Jesus without hesitancy or doubting, says, "Jesus used only one cup, thereby making the contents one, representing the one life he gave, as the one bread represented his one body. Also the one body, (Christians) partake of it as one, hence there is no individuality about it." "But Big D. says, "O, they just drank the contents, and not the cup. You might as well eat the fruit as look so hard at it." "Why yes said a weak sister, I don't like old John's whiskers nohow. And there's Molly Coddle, she dips, and Jim Wishbone he smokes, so Henery les you and me try to get these purty little cups we seed when we went to the city to see Safrona and Sam." "O. K." says Dad, and they did.

When Jesus comes to reward his servants, what shall the harvest be?

Yours for the old paths,

Dayton, Tenn, R. 5
June 10, 1930.

E. A. LOWRY.

OUR HELPERS

A Sister in W. Va. ----- \$ 1.00
Brother in Mo. ----- 1.00
Brother in Texas ----- 10.00

CONTRIBUTION

Bro. W. T. Jones, under the above heading, replying to Bro. C. F. Reese, states that "Bro. Jas. T. White comes along to assist you, and he makes himself ridiculous by his explanation of a joint fellowship." Bro. Jones knows as every reader of the article referred to know that I made no attempt to defend Bro. Reese but said that I supposed Bro. Reese was able to take care of himself but had not seen fit to answer Bro. Jones.

Now listen, Bro. Jones, don't you know that the bread, cup and money are "material parts of the fellowship? Now listen again, don't you know that the singing, teaching and prayers are the mental part of the fellowship? Now really, Bro. Jones, did I ask you to lay your singing on the table? No, you know better if you know anything. I asked you to put the material things together and you know that I did. Now I want to ask you if you take Matt. 6:1-6 for your rule of action. That seems to be the rule laid down for the closet and shut door, Matt. 6:2. If some one should see you praying in public, they will call you a hypocrite. How about your fellowship in prayer?

Now get your box and bore a hole in it, place it at the door of the building where the brethren meet, then slip up when no one can see you and drop your coin in it and slip away so you will not be seen, Matt. 6:1. If some of the brethren see you stalking up to your box of fellowship they might think you were going to the mourner's bench or acting the hypocrite.

Talk about ridiculous, now Bro. Jones, did you ever in all your life see one of the brethren sound a trumpet before placing his fellowship on the Lord's table, Matt. 6:2? You know the Lord was describing hypocrites. Do you really think the Lord was describing the assembly of the saints of God? There is not a hint of the assembly in Matthew 6:1-6.

There is not a hint of the fellowship of the body of Christ, either mentally or materially. What do you mean? You must be using Greek; no one can tell what you want done in the assembly. It is all Greek to us; speak plain English and tell us what to do with our contribution, prayers, singing and teaching—not to be heard or seen by each other. Help us out; we don't know any better than to sing and pray and teach and fellowship in the presence of each other. I say, tell us. We thought we had a right to walk up to the Lord's table, to put His things on His table. We even thought we could eat at it but if we cannot walk up to it without going to the mourner's bench, I say again and again, tell us how to do. It will be "ridiculous" if you do not tell us.

Yours for sound speech,
JAS. T. WHITE,
Lometa, Texas.

NOTICE

We had no issue for May and June 15. Time will be extended.

PREACH THE WORD—Paul, 2 Tim 4-2

Christ to the apostles says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mk. 16:15. Hence in preaching the "word" the "gospel" was preached; and so Peter says "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." I Pet. 1:25.

Now, do we preach the word, the gospel, in the way the apostles did? I am sure some of us at least do, while others do not. And to set before you in the best possible way my ideas along this line, I shall state that I heard one preacher criticizing another adversely for quoting so many passages of Scripture in his preaching, contending that the brother was not preaching the gospel while he was quoting the Scriptures. Is that so? I think not. I once heard a Methodist preacher read a portion of the first chapter of Acts, and I thought sure we were to hear a good old-fashioned sermon on the Holy Spirit; but lo, my disappointment when he selected the word "power" and gave us an academic lecture on the word. Did he preach the word? I say no. The first year that I lived in Oklahoma, I heard that a brother from Gunter Bible College would preach at Woodville. Hungry for a good gospel sermon, I went to hear him. But like the Methodist preacher, he selected a word—"Adversity"—and gave us a scholastic lecture on it. This did not satisfy my hunger. In fact I knew about all I wanted to know about adversity. Did he preach the "word," the gospel? In the sense that Paul used "word" he did not.

There is a tendency among preachers as we drift away from apostolic practice to drift away more and more from apostolic preaching; and the tendency is the more noticeable among College preachers. It is much easier to please churches as they become more worldly to give them academic lectures, and let them drift on, than it is to preach the "word" and "reprove, rebuke, with all long-suffering and doctrine." You can make yourself popular with them by lecturing, and will soon be in great demand among them if you keep it up. It would not do to "reprove and rebuke" their sin and lukewarmness if you expect to be in favor with them and hold your job. Academic lectures on general themes, if not long, are well calculated to enhance your popularity, and popularity insures you constant employment among the rich congregations. And what better could a time-serving minister desire? Such dread investigations. Just let us alone. But back to the preaching of the "word." Was the preacher right in condemning the other for quoting so much Scripture? No; the brother who thus preached was simply following the apostolic pattern. The few brief sketches we have of the early preaching show a repleteness in quotations from the Scriptures. Peter quoted from Joel 2:28-32; also from 16, 110 and 132 Psalms, and in Acts 3 he quoted from Duet., Lev., and Gen. And the apostolic writings are full of Scripture quotations. It is easy to learn their method of preaching by seeing how they established their contentions. Paul

made over sixty quotations in the book of Romans. And if we will read closely the Sacred writings, we will find that all the writers freely quoted the Living Oracles of God. And we are bound to see that the brother who used passage after passage to back up his message he was getting before his hearers was right in so doing.

Paul says the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation. Ro. 1:16. And Peter says, "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Isaiah has this to say of God's word, "It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper whereunto I sent it." Isa. 55:11. And these being facts, how are we to convert men to Christ if we do not use the power God has placed in our reach and commanded us to use? We can't convert men to Christ by resorting to fables and other human contrivances. We must preach God's word and let it accomplish what God pleases. In our efforts today we must imitate the apostolic pattern; and when we do, like results will follow. Then, brethren, let us be apostolic in our preaching. Give the people what the "word" says. "To the law and to the testimony" said God's prophet. And let us give the people passage from God's holy Word after passage, and leave the results with God. Our popularity with the people is of no importance. Let us stand approved before God. Let us hide "self" and extol God and Christ before the dying millions today. Preach the word.

W. T. TAYLOR,
Route 1, De Leon, Tex.

THE "CONTAINER BRETHREN"

Who are they? Our brethren who use a plurality of drinking cups in the communion sometimes refer to the brethren who believe in the use of one drinking cup in the communion as the "container brethren." But let us see who really are the "container brethren." The use of more than one drinking cup is the thing that is causing the contention and the division. A part of the brethren are willing to use but one drinking vessel, while a part of the brethren insist on the use of two, four, six, or one for every member; even to the dividing of the body of Christ. Thereby saying by their actions, at least, "We love these containers better than we do our brethren and the unity, for which Christ prayed." Who are the container folks; the ones who are willing to give them up and use but one, or the ones who insist on them to the dividing of the body of Christ? Talk about "sticking to the container," these brethren seem to love the containers so well that they must have a plurality of them if it does cause division!

They will tell you that it makes no difference about the number of drinking vessels used in the communion, but just try to get them to give up one of them, so that good brethren may worship with them, and see whether it makes any difference with them. Their customs are as unchangeable as the "law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." They decide on the number to be used, and it is up to you to submit to the custom

or get out. Is that "making a law where God has made none?" Worse, for it is making a law that sets aside the law that God has made. We mean to place the responsibility right where it belongs, and that is with the ones who are setting up their customs against the law of God to the dividing of the church.

Submitted in love,
HOMER L. KING.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., June 2—I closed a series of meetings with the faithful brethren in Harrodsburg, Ind., the 25th, ult. The meetings resulted in four being baptized into Christ and the church seemingly strengthened. Brethren, from Bloomington, Unionville, Spencer and elsewhere, assisted much in the work.

So far as I was able to learn, the church in Harrodsburg is at peace, and getting along just fine. They have not become infatuated with the innovations that are disturbing the church in so many places. They have not found it necessary, nor "convenient" to install the class system of teaching the Bible, instrumental music, various aids, a plurality of drinking cups in the communion, or any of the many other innovations that have been introduced into the church with the inevitable consequence of division and ultimate loss of reverence for God and His word. May God help us all to be satisfied with a "thus saith the Lord" in all that we do and teach, that we all may be one.

I am now in a meeting with the faithful brethren in Elk City, Okla., having begun two days past and expect to continue some ten or twelve days longer, then to Healdton, Okla., for a series of meetings, then to Fouke, Ark., the first Lord's day in July.

BRO. WHITE'S REPLY TO "AS I SEE IT"

I did not say there is "no spiritual connection" with Christ in the Lord's Supper. After quoting 1 Cor. 11:24, 25 "in remembrance of me," and the Diaglott "for MY remembrance," Bro. White asked, "Do we do this to remember Him or do we do it for Him to remember us? I gave Thayer, "Eis ten anamnesin—to call me (affectionately) to remembrance, "showing that they were required in this to remember Christ by the language used. Did he disprove this? No, but asserts that if this is true, there is "no spiritual connection" with Christ. But as a matter of fact there are other Scriptures that teach that Christ has spiritual connection with us in this. Matt. 18:20; 26:29.

And as to the term "communion" applied to this institution, since it is applied in the Bible to other things, just as "breaking of bread" (Acts 20:7; Acts 27:35) is, why limit us where the word of God does not? Breaking bread, communion, and Lord's Supper are each used by inspired men to designate the same institution. Why bind us to one? As well seek to bind us to one designation for the children of God, as I see it. And I say the one who seeks to limit us to the term "communion" for this institution, is the one who narrows

the creed, and so narrow that he condemns inspired writers for using other terms for the institution, as they do. W. A. B.

GOD'S MEASUREMENT

And there was given me a reed like unto a rod; and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. Rev. 2:1.

We cannot escape God's measurement. This scripture is being carried out; and I know that there are some who want to come up to God's measurement—some who are demanding a "Thus saith the Lord" for every item of our faith and practice. They are making an honest effort to get back on apostolic ground of true, acceptable worship. Others seem to think they can get by with some of man's inventions. But from a careful study of the Bible we are bound to conclude that for our work and worship to be acceptable to God it must be absolutely in obedience to divine command or apostolic example.

We find the terms of salvation from sin plainly stated and reiterated—Faith, Repentance, Confession, and Baptism, and by obedience to these divine mandates from him who has "all authority in heaven and on earth" one is brought into covenant relationship with God, as a son, where one receives the remission of all past sins, and becomes a "new creature." And being thus brought into the family of God as his children, "sons and daughters of the Almighty," they are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, to work in the vineyard, where they must labor for their own salvation and for the salvation of others.

Here is where there should be exercised more care, lest our labor be in vain—labor and no reward. Every point of doctrine and practice should be constantly measured by the word of God; hence Paul admonishes, "Be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is," that we may not "run uncertainly." And "walk circumspectly," always on the watch, and earnestly contending for the faith delivered unto the saints. Jude, v. 3. Notice: "the faith," not speculations and philosophy of men. What saith the Lord? What has he commanded? What examples of inspired men? Look at the assembly as divinely regulated (1 Cor. 14). Look at the home (Eph. 5). Look at the communion—"one loaf" (1 Cor. 10:16). Look—Are you looking now?—at "the cup," "this cup," to drink from. Dare you change these? Look at "the church in their house." Rom. 16:5; 1 Cor. 16:19. Not big assemblies, but scattered about in touch with the unsaved, and able "to exhort one another."

I want the church and the world to know where I stand in this day of humanisms. I believe the Bible was given as our guide, and as such is absolutely perfect, being the words of an eternal King, an absolute Monarch of earth and heaven, with "all authority" in things divine, what was commanded by Christ Jesus, our Lord and Redeemer. And may God help us to be more careful in handling his word, more pure, more faithful, more courageous in the fight of faith, and to re-

member that we are servants and not the Lord, that we may worship God as we should. W. T. Taylor.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The discussion on the "Wine Question" will begin in our next issue. Get word to all you can, so they can get the first installment. This is a discussion by Bro. Hewitt Smith, of Brookhaven, Miss., and T. E. Smith, of Wesson, Miss.

HATCH, NEW MEXICO

We meet each Lord's day at Salem, few but faithful. I preach at Arrel each third Lord's day. The Lord willing, I will be at Lake Valley the first Lord's day in June to begin a meeting. Those wanting meetings in New Mexico, Arizona, or western Texas, please address me at Hatch, N. Mex. I am willing to go to any destitute place to establish the cause there. J. B. DANIEL.

MEMPHIS, TENN., MEETING

On June the 8th we closed our tent meeting in Hollywood addition with good interest and lasting results for the upbuilding of the church of Christ in Memphis. Brother Harper, who has held meetings here for three years past, did some of the best preaching we have ever heard, and we are confirmed in our faith to stand against all innovations on the New Testament faith and practice. The brethren in this city who have "gone beyond the things which are written" have shown their weakness by refusing to meet us in open discussion of differences, when requested both publicly and privately to do so. Now listen, you preachers who stand for a "Thus saith the Lord," we are anxious to have you stop in passing and have fellowship with us. Look up my residence phone number and call, and some one will come for you. Don't fail to do this.

A. H. PINEGAR,
3564 Faxon Ave.
Memphis, Tenn.

NOTICE

I wish to give notice to all loyal brethren that the Church of Christ that stands strictly for the word of God for our faith and practice meets each Lord's day in Pomona, California, at the Boy Scouts Building on East Monterey Street, and we invite all brethren to be with us. D. A. MacCallum, 155 E. Monterey St.

REPORT

Bro. Frank Lilly and I are in a meeting at Enoch, ten miles from Morton, Texas. Five have been baptized to date, and one restored. Others expected soon. Splendid crowds and fine interest. This is a mission point. To God be the glory. We are encouraged to press on as never before. The clouds of evil seem to be giving way, and New Testament Christianity will now have a better chance. H. C. Welch.

A. W. Fenter, Pt. 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.

Vol III.

SNEADS FLORIDA, AUGUST 1, 1930

No. 12

HARPER—COWAN DEBATE AT GRAHAM, TEXAS. AUGUST 21, 22, 23, 24

Four days, two sessions of two hours each, each day, beginning at 10 a. m., and 8 p. m. Cowan affirms: "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. Harper affirms: the word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

DISCUSSION AT LORENZO, TEXAS

This discussion passed off pleasantly with Bro. Musgrave in the lead, affirming "The Scriptures teach that in observing communion, that one cup only (one container only) is apostolic." He showed that Christ "received a cup" which contained "the fruit of the vine" (Luke 22:17; Matt. 26:29), and said "divide it among yourselves" (Luke 22:17), or "Drink ye all out of it" (Matt. 26:27), which they did, for it says "And they all drank out of it." (Diaglott) He built an impregnable wall around his proposition, Scripture upon Scripture, which Brother Cowan was not able to tear down. In fact Brother Cowan admitted that a church that uses "one cup only (one container only)" is apostolic as taught in the Scriptures. And Brother Cowan's reputation as a debater made his defeat all the more manifest, for he found himself unable to refute a "Thus saith the Lord," and the people could see it.

He affirmed "The Scriptures teach that in observing the communion two or more containers may be used in the distribution of the cup of the Lord is apostolic."

He left his proposition and put in his time on irrelevant matter, and tried to work Bro. Musgrave in the lead; but Bob held him to the issue, demanding the Scriptures that show that the use of "two or more containers" is apostolic. He showed that Cowan in meeting Sommer demanded just one Scripture for the classes and when produced he would quit the debate. Bro. Musgrave just drew a circle on the board and told Bro. Cowan that when he put just one Scripture in it that mentioned "two or more containers," he would quit the debate. The circle remained unfilled until the close of the debate. Brother Cowan was forced to remain in the lead where he belonged and fail. There was no help for him in the Bible, and all could see it. He tried to shift the issue to what the cup is several times, but Bob drove him out to the issue "two or more containers to distribute the cup" every time; and told him finally that he had a proposition signed with Bro. Harper to debate that issue at Graham, Texas, beginning Aug.

21 and that would be a good time to debate it. This debate will be pleasant history for those who heard it and stand for one cup as opposed to "two or more" or "individual cups," which are fast going into the S. S. churches and, the non S. S. churches, too. In fact in California and West Virginia they are resorting to the state law to try to force all churches to put in the individual cups. And we may expect individual loaf for each to follow. I want to say that we gave the "two or more containers" preachers and brethren that attended the debate a challenge to meet us again if they thought Bro. Cowan had sustained his proposition, but we could not get them interested enough to take it up. Let us give the brethren who want the truth a chance to hear "both sides." Bob has the "sword of the Spirit" ready to use on any of the "Container" boys. Ten or more preachers were in attendance, but I did not get all the names. Among them was "Charlie" Watking, for whom I advertised some time ago, but I could not get him to sign up for debate.

"Come, let us reason together."

J. S. BEDINGFIELD, Lorenzo, Texas.

"YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE,"

Rom. 12:2

This 5th article comes by my having some allotted space I did not consume, and Brother Harper having used more. And for this privilege I am truly grateful to him.

1. We are commanded to drink the cup of the Lord and Harper says, truth-fully too, "drink means to swallow a liquid;" so it does not make good sense to talk of drinking a literal cup; "cup" then is used figuratively by inspiration; and wine is the liquid to be "swallowed." So we are compelled to conclude wine, the object, is likened to a cup, by speaking of it as though it were a cup,—a metaphor.

2. He exclaims in one breath "cup" is used literally and in the next, it is used figuratively. Contradicts himself.

3. If "cup" as he says is used to suggest to the mind what is in it, then it is used literally and could not be a metonymy as he claims. Wrong again.

4. The term "cup" does not "suggest to the mind what is in it," not in the remotest sense. The Savior's words makes known to us what the liquid was, to be used and the only way we can know. Matt. 26:29. "Cup" would suggest to the mind, any other liquid as readily as wine, so wrong in this.

5. Thou art the man that "mix the figurative with the literal."

6. He says I did not show another way to "drink the cup," than for each congregation to drink from one literal cup. I showed by Paul's statement, "The cup of the Lord and cup of Devils" had the same meaning, and by Daniel and Jere that Idol Worshipers, used cups in drinking wine in honor to their Gods and you my dear reader, remember the slurring words he flung at inspired men, and their writing. "Your Dan. 5:4, Jere 52:19," No, according to Brother Harper, Daniel did not know how Idoliters worshiped. He'd rather take man, than inspiration, when it's against him. Wrong here.

7. His false claim has forced him to declare that in a plurality of churches, "there will be cups of the Lord," and the same false claim will, to be consistent, force him to declare they drank the cups of the Lord which is absolutely false. Every congregation from Jerusalem down to the present time, have drunk "the cup of the Lord," the wine, though they have used many drinking cups. Say did they drink the cups of the Lord?

8. He is still calling on me to show where a congregation can use two or more drinking cups. I have amply shown how, but will give it to him another way; maybe he will be as the Dutchman, says "convinced by his own convincing." Now where you find in God's Book authority for using a plate for the bread, you will find authority for cups; for the plate and drinking cups, come under the same rule. When he answers the above, he will see where he is wrong again.

9. He wants me to try to commune and dispense with the literal cup and thinks this is proof that literal cup is the Lord's cup or a part of it at least. Now let him try to commune and dispense with someone to get the "Lord's cup," ready for the participants; when he can dispense with the latter, I will agree to dispense with the former, and if drinking cup or cups being necessary in the communion, makes them a part of "the Lord's cup," so the necessity of some one or ones, to get the communion ready would make them a part of "the Lord's cup." So your "indispensible" proves too much, therefore it proves nothing. So wrong in this.

10. We drink the "cup" actually "swallow" it—the wine—hence we do not drink only a part of the "Lord's cup" as he teaches—"it takes the cup" literal cup—and the wine to constitute the Lord's cup, but the literal cup, just cannot be drunk with the wine or without it.

11. Again he says, "The literal cup, is indispensable in the communion." So is some one to get the cup to the assembly, See.

12. Why didn't he try his syllogistic nonsense with his assumed literal cup, as "the Lord's cup."

Because it would have looked as silly as his Foxy nonsense syllogism.

13. He knows and everyone knows that my major and minor premises are absolutely true, notwithstanding his statement that my record "is false" for the wine alone is the "cup of the Lord." And you contradict your own statement—my second premise is "false" when you say "cup

is the name of a solid," but we are commanded to drink the "cup." Drink means to swallow a liquid, hence we cannot obey the command since cup is a solid. Then we must say that cup is here used figuratively or say there is no sense to the command." So we are agreed "cup is here used figuratively," and can not be literal. Therefore the figure of speech "cup" is applied to the wine, and has no reference to a literal drinking cup as you claim, whatever. You should use "ignosanus" sparingly.

14. Yes sir, I am "goverened by reason, good judgment, and what little common sense I possess in determining what the word of God teaches, aren't you? Though in your assumed one literal cup argument you depend a good deal on common nonsense

I suppose when one takes an opposite view from Brother Harper; he would not dare to say it was "unreasonable," for fear he would "assume the role of a dictator," but would not hesitate to brand such, as an "ignoramus."

I am glad he seemed to get some consolation from the "two" that passed judgment in his favor, but I do not think I would be a very competent judge if I should pass judgment before I had heard the conclusion of the whole matter. I can truthfully say I am glad of this friendly exchange of our views on this, for I have been much strengthened in the faith that I am right, and that Brother Harper and those with him, on "the one cup only service" is wrong. And in conclusion will say whenever Brother Harper, or any of his faith on this question, are "spoiling for a fight," and no one else will dare put on the gloves; just ring 607 W. Chestnut St. Bloomfield, Iowa, and if alive and God wills, I will respond.

Brotherly
A. J. BOND

REPLY

Bro. Bond had a chance to debate a proposition, but refused. I am yet "spoiling for a fight," and will meet him in either oral or written debate on the matter and affirm that "A church of Christ can 'Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent' and use one drinking cup in the communion service," and if he will add "s" to the word 'cup' and affirm it, I will deny it. A church that cannot "Speak where the Bible speaks" for its faith and practice, needs to "repent," for it has "fallen." Rev. 2:5.

Bro. Bond has effectively shut off any debate on this question, for he says, "The plate and the drinking cups come under the same rule," and that "where you find in God's Book authority for using a plate for the bread, you will find authority for the cups."

Then there is none, as every Bible reader must know; and he has completely bottled himself up as did the organ advocate when he humped on the tuning fork. If the plate is in Bro. Bond's way, we say come on, brother, we think more of your fellowship and of the unity that will make believers (John 17:21) and will enable us to "walk

worthy of the vocation" wherewith we are called (Eph. 4:1-4) than we do of any plate. Will you meet us on this ground, or is this just a subterfuge? Had the organ man stuck to his "same rule" as the tuning fork, I am sure there would have been no division over "the instrument," for what real Christian ever thought more of a tuning fork than he did of the unity his dying Savior prayed for? Did they put out the organ? No. Will they put out "the cups"? Now comes the test of faith in "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." How much will Bro. Bond endeavor? None, it seems. And the organ man, after admitting this "same rule" as the tuning fork, afterwards found that the Bible requires mechanical music, as in psallo, for instance, thus making every church a "fallen" church that did not have this kind of music. And Bro. Bond has stultified himself in like manner by finding in "his Daniel," et al. that the Bible requirement to "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 10:21; 11:27) means to drink from "cups." And thus makes every church apostate that does not use "cups." They must drink the cup," and this means drink from "cups," as he now finds, as the organ man found "the instrument" in psallo. And this "find" seems to make him "stronger," but I do not see how he can now "commune with Bro. Harper in Florida with one cup."

Let us notice his number: 1. "Metaphor." No, but metonymy. (See Thayer and every other N. T. Lexicon. 2. Yes, "cup" is used both literally and by metonymy in the N. T. with the communion. (See Thayer, et al.) 3. No, cup cannot be used literally and by metonymy in the same place. 4. True, the cup does not suggest the kind of contents in it, it merely suggests the contents. 5. I have the highest accredited authority for the literal and figurative use of "cup" in the Lord's supper. 6. See introduction here. 7. Yes, each congregation that drink from the cup as God directs, "drink the cup of the Lord." For "How can one 'drink this cup?' By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (N. L. Clark) And by the Lord's arrangement there will be as many as there are congregations. All one needs is sense enough to number: One and one are two. 8. See the "plate" introduction here. 9. This is not a case of what is necessary in preparing the Lord's supper, but what is necessary in eating the Lord's supper. They must drink this cup. "How can one 'drink this cup?' By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." Then they cannot drink what "it contains" by drinking what they contain. "The container and its contents" both are involved in this kind of metonymy, the container being named and the contents being suggested. 10. We do not "actually" drink the cup; we drink what it contains, and thus "drink the cup," "cup" being here used by the figure of speech known as metonymy. To "actually" drink the cup, we would have to liquify it and drink the liquid. 11. See 9. 12. "Cup" is not used "literally" in "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:21), for they are here to "drink the cup," and can do this only by drinking what it

contains. And in a syllogism using it "literally" we would have foxy nonsense," or Bond stupidity. 13. Why say "literal cup" when there can be no such thing as figurative cup? Why not talk sense, and say cup used literally, or cup used figuratively? Cup used by the figure of speech metonymy gives the name of the container (cup in this case) and suggests its contents, and anybody but an "ignoramus" can see that both are "referred" to in thus speaking. Your dictatorship appeared in reducing your 50,000 where you could worship in one item as the Bible speaks and not allowing us to reduce so we could worship in every item as the Bible speaks. We take common sense but not as a substitute for divine revelation to put things where the Bible is silent, to the division of the church. I, too, am glad of this interchange of views. Somebody is grossly ignorant, and if it is I, I am ready to be taught. "Come, let us reason together," that we may see who is wrong. If we really want the truth, we should have no fear to have the light turned on. Let us stay with the Bible, and have no more division. Let us keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Ed.

ATTENTION, PLEASE

The first proposition on the wine question is about completed now, and we are anxious to have it go to press as soon as completed. And it is thought best to run it all in one issue of the paper instead of issue by issue. This will require an enlarged issue, and extra funds must be raised to get it out. We are now starting a fund to do this, and all donations will be acknowledged and notice given when there are sufficient funds received. Send to "The Truth," Sneads, Fla., and say for "special edition."—Ed.

We ask our writers to withhold copy on this question until the debate has been published. We now have some copy on the question, but the debate pretty well covers all the ground, and this will save so much repeating. We will keep your copy or return it if you so request us. The debate pretty well exhausts the question. Then the other man takes the lead, and the debate is much shorted as the limit of words is much less.—Ed.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—Our meeting at Elk City closed June 15th with five baptized and one confessed wrongs and began his Christian duty again. Bro. Homer L. King did the preaching, and we thought enough of him and his Christian living among us to arrange with him to hold us another meeting next year in June. The brothers and sisters were much encouraged by the firm stand for the Bible taken by Bro. King and his sound gospel preaching. I was able to spend the time at home with my family during the last week of the meeting, and I never enjoyed a meeting more in my life.

"When you need Printing you need us." Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. PHILLIPS

THE CONCORDANT VERSION AND THE LORD'S DAY

Mr. A. E. Knoch, 2823 E. Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., has out a new translation of the New Testament Scriptures, which he calls the "Concordant Version." I have examined this version carefully and like it fine with the exception of one thing.

Here is the bad feature: Every time "the first (day) of the week" is mentioned in all other versions, Mr. Knoch's translation has it "one of the sabbaths." Consequently the following passages read: "And on one of the sabbaths let each one of you lay aside in store."—1 Cor. 16:2.

"The first (day) of the week" in all versions except the Concordant, and "one of the sabbaths" in the Concordant Version, is translated from "MIA (or MIAN) SABBATON."

Now, let us test Mr. Knoch's translation, by the authorities on the meaning of Greek, and see if he is correct.

1. Macknight says: "kata mian sabbatooon signifies the first day of every week."

2. Young, in his Anyletical Concordance, says *mia* in these passages (Acts 20:7 and 1 Cor. 16:2) means first, and *sabbatooon* means week,

3. Robinson says (Lexicon, p. 740: "Sabbaton." "b)meton. i. q. a period of seven days, a week. . . Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2."

3. Liddel and Scott say, in their excellent Lexicon, that *sabbaton* sometimes means "a week."

4. Berry says (Lexicon, p. 88): "(2) a period of seven days, a week."

5. Pickering says in his Lexicon that *sabbaton* sometimes means a week.

6. Thayer, who stands at the very top of Lexicographers, his Greek-English Lexicon being the standard, says (Lexicon, p. 566): "Sabbaton . . . seven days a week. . . The pl. is used in the same sense in the phrase *e mia ton sabbaton*, the first day of the week . . . *kata mian sabbaton*, the first day of every week, 1 Cor. 16:2."

Again: "*mia sabbaton* the first day of the week, Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19

Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2."—Thayer, p. 187.

7. Bullinger, in his excellent work, entitled "Figures of Speech," tells us that *sabbath* (*sabbaton*) "is sometimes put for a whole week." And he gives Acts 20:7 and 1 Cor. 16:2 as examples.

"Shabbath" in Hebrew, "sabbaton" in Greek, and "sabbath" in English, all mean the same. Usage gives any expression its meaning The Hebrew word "Shabbath" in the Old Testament, as well as the Greek word "sabbaton" in the New, sometimes stood for "week." In expressing the 70 weeks" of Dan. 9:24, "Shabbath" is used in the Hebrew text.

I know of no other translator that translates "MIA SABBATON" "one of the sabbaths." And I know of no Lexicographer that agrees with Mr. Knoch in his translation of these words. People should be slow, indeed, to accept a translation that goes contrary to the very highest authority on the meaning of Greek.

THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF MESSIAH

By PAUL HAYS

That Messiah existed before coming into the world, to sit on David's throne, and to be ruler in Israel, "from the river to the ends of the earth,"—is manifest from several Scriptures:

(1) The prophet, Micah, declares that his "goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." He must, then, have been in the beginning with Elohim.

(2) Isaiah gives his name as "Immanuel." He must, then be at least a representative of God, in the flesh. And to be a fair representative, he must have come from God.

(3) In Isaiah, he is called "The Everlasting Father" He is not his own father, but he might be the Father of Creation, if God by him made the worlds. He is "The Everlasting" one, and therefore pre-existent.

(4) That Immanuel was in the beginning with God is manifest from the language: "Let Us make man in Our likeness." It shows another associated with God in creation.

(5) The name Elohim is plural, and shows that God was not alone in creation. Angels had no such pre-eminence, (as to wear the name of God) and we were not created in their image.

(6) The Scriptures declare that no one could see God and live. But Moses and the elders of Israel, and others, did see some one who is called God, and did live. We conclude that Immanuel did exist in the beginning with God, and is called God.

(7) He is called the "Son" of God. "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way." "Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, and what is his Son's name, if thou canst tell?" (He was with his Father, when he established the ends of the earth.)

All this is no reflection on the Unity of God, for the authority of the Father is supreme. There is no discord in the unity of Elohim, as there is among the gods of the heathen.

ANNUAL PROTRACTED MEETINGS

It seems that the churches of Christ have drifted into a custom of calling an evangelist into their communities for the purpose of assisting in the annual series of meetings, thinking that when such has been accomplished they have fully discharged their duty in "sounding out the word." There are a few congregations that try to have two protracted meetings per year, but usually both of these meetings are conducted in the home community. If there are congregations that do not follow these customs, they must be "few and far between."

I think I can hear brethren saying, "What is Bro. King driving at anyway, doesn't he believe in holding annual protracted meetings?" Listen, brethren, the question is not, is it right to have a protracted meeting at the home congregation, but is it right to stop with that? Is it proper and in harmony with the spirit of the gospel to have all the preaching done where there is an established congregation, while there are thousands of people around us who have never heard the gospel in its purity and simplicity, and who are perishing for the "bread of life"? To ask such a question, is to answer it. Many of these people are honest-hearted, and would "gladly receive the word" if someone would carry it to them. The evangelists cannot do much of this kind of work without the aid of the congregations, but the evangelists are not putting this work before the congregations and insisting on it as they should.

Again, the brethren retort, "We are not able financially to hold these mission meetings." In some instances, this may be true; but most of the congregations could support two meetings a year, and wherever they are able to do this, at least one of these meetings could and should be conducted in communities where there is no established congregation; but where a congregation is not able to support more than one meeting per year, let them cut down the home meetings to one every two or three years, and send the preacher out to other communities for at least half of the meetings, and see the cause of Christ prosper as it should. Of course, we all enjoy having the meetings right at home, where it will be convenient for us to attend, but is it not somewhat selfish to want all the preaching done right at home, while thousands all around us are in darkness, concerning the true light? There are but very few congregations so situated, that could not find plenty of communities within a radius of twenty miles for these mission meetings, and in such cases, a great many of the members could attend these meetings, assisting in the song service and otherwise.

Another custom, that some of the churches and preachers have drifted into, that to my mind is out of line with the scriptures and very inconsistent, is the monthly preaching. These churches and preachers will tell you that they do not believe in the "pastor system" of hiring a man to work with them all the time, but some of the congregations will hire a man to preach once a month to them—hire him for the year; and these preach-

ers will find four such congregations, that are willing to hire them at a stipulated sum to preach every Lord's day. Do tell me what is the difference in principle of having a "pastor" all the time and a fourth of the time? The only difference that I can see is that the man who gives all his time to one church could do a better job of "pastorating" than the man who tries to "pastorate" for four congregations. Let the congregations send these men out into the field to hold meetings, instead of paying them to do the work that God ordained should be done by the elders, and let these preachers give seven days of the week to preaching the gospel if they would be supported for their labor. Why should a church pay a man to come, and worship God on Lord's day? Back to the Bible, brethren!

HOMER L. KING.

ONE CUP IN COMMUNION

The Apostle Paul, in the tenth chapter of first Corinthians, clearly makes the Lord's supper not only a type of the physical body of Christ, but also a type or symbol, of the spiritual body of the church. "We being many, are one loaf."

Is it not just as true that we who are Christians are "one blood", spiritually, in, and with Christ? If so, is not one cup as essential to the symbology as the one loaf? Is not the whole institution a picture lesson of Unity? Someone has said that the Individual cups are a fit representation of the present divided state of Christendom.

This thought is not a new one. Ignatius, in the first century said: "For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his blood which is shed for us is one. One loaf also is broken for all and one cup is distributed among them all." (Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol 1 page 81.)

One meaning of the Supper is 'Communion' or fellowship or joint participation. Who does not know that drinking from the same cup is the closest fellowship? It is said that the Orientals count that man the closest friend, who has partaken of the same cup of wine. It meant to them what the common 'pipe of peace' meant to the American Indians. One who had participated was henceforth immune from persecution or pillage.

I do not hesitate to drink from the same cup with my wife, or close relatives, because I love them, and they are partakers of my affection. But we are brethren in Christ, and together partake of one cup with our Betrothed. 'Individual Communion' is a misnomer.

Speaking of the one cup in the original institution, our Lord said: "All of you drink (Greek, ek) out of it." This makes it a matter of conscience to every one who esteems it a duty to follow the word of the Lord. And Paul, rebinding (since Pentecost) says: (1 Cor. 11:28) 'out of the loaf let him eat, and out of the cup let him drink.'

There be many nowadays who plead for liberty to keep abreast of our own times. But what about the liberty of God's children to do what is written? And did not the Holy Spirit know more nineteen hundred years ago than the most up-to-

date Microbe could possibly digest?

I strongly suspect that the fellows who advocate this modern innovation, will soon speak of the loyal 'one-cup' brother as a 'weak-brother.' Weak in sophistry, he may be, but weak in faith, he cannot be, for the Bible is all on his side.

But, so be it,—if he is weak, what are you that are strong going to do about it? Will you make this your Motto: "If cups make my brother to offend, I will partake of them no more, while the world stands." Dare you withdraw from, or boycott, or despise one of these little ones who believe in the words of Christ and his apostles?

We might be able to sing without 'conscience of the organ' but cups are an integral part of the worship of every worshipper. I must 'touch, taste, and handle' whether I would or not, or refuse to partake. You who make the Lord's supper a special test of fidelity to Christ must wake up to the seriousness of the situation.

I do not enjoy being called a crank, or a hobby-rider, or a factionist, but it is a question of loyalty to Christ, and I would even dare to be a 'fool' for His sake.

Like Luther, I must say: "God help me, I cannot do otherwise."

PAUL HAYS

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., June 18, 1930—I closed a series of meetings at Elk City, Okla., the 15th, inst., which embraced three Lord's days. Considering the many disadvantages, we had a good meeting, which resulted in five being baptized and one brother being restored.

Elk City is the home of our beloved gospel preachers, Brethren Bob Musgrave and A. J. Jernigan, and it was quite a treat to me to be associated with them in the work of the Lord. We were glad to have Bro. Musgrave with us during the last week of the meeting. I was very favorably impressed with these men, as being clean morally and true to the Book—men who are willing to "contend earnestly for the faith" at the risk of being unpopular and of losing the support of those who are not satisfied with the Bible way, but they need no commendations from me to the readers of The Truth.

I am now in a meeting at Healdton, Okla., which began the 16th., with a full house and much interest. We all anticipate a great meeting here; will report later. On with the work of the Lord!

IN THE WORLD BUT NOT OF THE WORLD

By FRANK JUDY

Christ said in the Sermon on the Mount, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also." In speaking of love, He said: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy, but I say unto you Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that spitefully use you and persecute you."

Christ rebuked sin and preached with boldness, but did not try to enforce the things which He taught by means of legislation. It is rather difficult to see how a Christian police officer or prison guard could carry out his duties without using physical force, but if it is understood that the Christian is to be in the world but not of the world, and not to take part in Caesar's affairs, the difficulty is very much simplified. Jesus evidently meant the Sermon on the Mount for His own disciples, and not for those who continued to enforce the laws of the land, or those who try to serve God and Mammon.

Many Christians who desire to live as the world lives, have tried to explain away the force of the Sermon on the Mount and others have simply ignored it, and go on with malice in their hearts and continue to give evil for evil.

The apostle Peter said: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light. . . . Dearly beloved I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." 1 Pet. 2:9-11.

In Hebrews 11:13-14, we have the following: "These all died in faith, not having the promises but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country." If we are foreigners and aliens in the country in which we live why should we try to make and enforce its laws?

As Christ prayed in the garden of Gethsemane, He said, in regard to His apostles, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Jesus was not of the world—we don't read about Him or the apostles changing or enforcing Civil laws, even tho many reforms were needed in regard to political matters. Can we as Christians afford to depart from His example and take part in the quarrels and disputes of the war-lords of the earth? How often nation has been pitted against nation, while Christians on both sides have prayed to the same God for victory.

The Savior rebuked James and John, for asking Him if they should call down fire from heaven on the Samaritans, and told them that they knew not what spirit they were of. Do the preachers who urge men to go to war know what spirit they are of?

God commanded the Israelites to go to war, but many things were tolerated and even commanded under the Law of Moses, which would be wrong for us. Polygamy and slavery were common among the children of Isarel, but that does not make it right for us. We should be under the "Prince of Peace," the great love giver, and not under Moses, the law giver.

The victories of the Old Testament were largely Zgained by force of arms, as when the Israelites took the promised land from the Canaanites, but what has the Christian soldier to do with that

kind of conquest? His sword is the sword of the Spirit, his breastplate is the breastplate of righteousness, and his feet should be shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace. The apostle Paul said: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds," 2 Cor. 2:4.

In writing to the Corinthians Paul said: "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?" If the Christian is not to go to law before the courts to settle a difference with a brother, how can he take the sword to settle international disputes and to punish offenders in this or that nation? What have we to do to judge the world?

Jesus not only taught us to love our enemies, by word of mouth, but also by His example. When He was on the cross, He prayed for His enemies, and when Peter cut off the ear of the servant of the high priest, Jesus told him to put up his sword. Furthermore when Stephen was about to be stoned to death, he also prayed for those who were ready to take his life.

"PENTECOST"

Pentecost means the fiftieth day, thus we read, "Even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days, and ye shall offer a new meal-offering unto Jehovah." Lev. 23:15-16. This was the second yearly feast which followed the Passover. This feast was for the Jews and belonged to the Old Covenant. Pentecost came on the fiftieth day, that is after the forty-ninth Sabbath, hence, it came on the first day of the week. Lev. 23:15-16. Pentecost is a New Testament expression and is only mentioned three times in the new Testament. See Acts 2:1; 20; 16; 1 Cor. 16:8. Under the reign of Christ the Lord's people are not commanded to observe the fiftieth day (Pentecost) as were the Jews under the Law. God's children under the New Testament are to "meet upon the first day of the week." Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1, 2; Heb. 10:25. And not wait until the fiftieth day or "nineteen hundredth day." Or Pentecost as the Jews did. So away with the Confederacy of the Union with the Christian Church or any other man-made arrangement. I warn all of the faithful of God to have no alliance with the above movement or any other unscriptural practice. The most so-called followers of Christ would rather be doing something God hasn't authorized than to hear and do that which our Savior has commanded. Let us all "Give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away from them." Heb. 2:1. Let all who believe, teach, and practice that which is bound and commanded by the New Testament "Continue in the faith," Col. 1:23, "and if it seem evil unto you to serve Jehovah, choose you this day (not the "nineteen-hundredth Pentecost") whom ye will serve, whether the Gods which your fathers served that were beyond the river, or the Gods of the Amorites in whose land ye dwell, but as for me and my house we will serve Jehovah." Josh. 24:15. So may the Israel of God be as Joshua was and

serve Jehovah and not go into league with the "enemies of the cross of Christ." See Phil. 3:18-19. Let us tell them as Nehemiah told his enemies when they invited him to "Come, let us meet together in one of the villages in the plain of Onon. But they thought to do me mischief." Neh. 6:2. But Nehemiah responded, "And sent messengers unto them, saying, I am doing a great work so that I cannot come down. Why should the work cease whilst I leave it and come down to you?" Neh. 6:3. So let us not leave the work of the Lord (for it is great) to join in with those who are doing "mischief" to the cause of Christ. No, we "cannot come down" to them from our "High Calling in Christ Jesus." Phil. 3:14. May the dear Lord's people continue to "build up the waste places of Zion." Working "The Works of Him that sent me (us) while it is day, the night cometh when no man can work." Jno. 9:4.

"Who is on the Lord's side, where stand you?"

JOSEPH MILLER

1004 N. Lambert St.
Brazil, Indiana

DIVISION AND REASON

You may wonder why I selected two subjects so contrary one to the other and tied them together to write an article under; so I will mention some reasons.

First, man is supposed to be governed by reason and the church is to have no division in it.

Second, there is so much division and so little reason among the members.

Third, there are men, called elders, in the church that are bosses, ruling according to opinions that will not submit to reason.

Fourth, there are men called evangelists, in the church who play between vice and virtue and deceive nearly all.

Paul asked the Thessalonians to pray for him and his coworkers that they might be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men. I want to say that some of the most unreasonable appear to be the most reasonable because of their cunning, craftiness, by which they stir up the pride in people which is the prince of confusion, and the thing that blinds man's judgment, corrupts his manners and guides his mind wrong. It shadows love, destroys principles, introduces error and vice which can deceive under the guise of virtue and cause men to suffer more to be damned than to be saved.

Paul told the Corinthians that they were carnal because there was every strife and division among them. The carnal mind is not subject to God's law therefore it sets up opinions, differing, without proof that any are right, and because of the absence of reason pride boasts opinions until they become walls of separation, and by continued use become the judge, the law and the rule of right.

Therefore I want to cry aloud, back to the Bible; Come, let us reason together with the Lord, for he is a mighty counselor. Quit you like men, be ready to give an answer to every man that asks

a reason for our hope and be sure it is a Bible reason.

If this was done, division would vanish like mist before the morning sun; but those are the unreasonable who are taught by their own imaginations and believe themselves to be a different species and—well I hate to say it, but it is a fact they really become such loosing participation with their kind and dwindle into the brute. See Jeremiah, 10:14. Every man is brutish in his knowledge; every founder is confounded by his graven image; for his molten image is FALSEHOOD and there is no breath in them.

Now turn to Isaiah 30:1. Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me; and that cover with a covering but not of my spirit, that they may add sin to sin. Read on and note the eighth, ninth and tenth verses. Now go write it before them in a table and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever. That this is a rebellious people lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord, which say to the seers, see not, and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits.

Paul said in 1 Cor. 10, that the things which happened in those days were our examples. That is they were as types of what would be in our time such as he mentions in his second letter to Timothy instructing him to preach the word, be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts, shall they heap to themselves, teachers having itching ears, and shall be turned unto FABLES.

I know you haven't done this, but I want you to take hold of the word and turn the light on the bunch that claims to be the church of Christ, just take a good look through and through and use reason instead of will, for reason can bring inclination over, but inclination can never change reason.

Dryden said, "Reason was given to curb our headstrong will" I think his proverb is true and if we would use it, opinions would be stopped at their source and divisions would not grow.

Byron said, "He who will not reason is a bigot, he who cannot is a fool, and he who dares not is a slave." It is too bad to be in either class, so let's reason and think deep into the will of the Lord.

Reason is the glory of human nature and makes man the prince of creation. It is to the intellect what the eye is to the body and like the eye it has to have light that it may serve its purpose therefore God has given the light also, which is his word. Let's turn on the light where it is needed and quit saying to the seers see not.

God has provided for every creature and every created thing glorifies God by fulfilling his will. Jesus said consider the lilies of the field how they grow, etc., yet even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Inanimate objects are governed by a fixed law, the brute by instinct; but God gave to man the glory and power of reason and intended for him to be governed by it.

It is said that in all science error precedes truth, and perhaps it is so. I know it would be better to have it first than to have it last, and I am just wondering how this will fit our case; so I will close by saying that I am ready to preach the word anywhere.

QUESTION

Do the brethren believe it is right to support those who are "earnestly contending for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints?" Do they realize that "The Truth" is the only paper that can justly make that claim? Are these brethren who are giving their time to this work deserving of the support of brethren who want nothing but the Bible? If all would sacrifice just a little and send it to the office to help put out "The Truth," and thus help out a paper that opposes all unscriptural practices, what a work and what a rejoicing there would be! Errors in this age of iniquity in the church are overthrowing the faith of good brethren and turning them to "the commandments and doctrines" of men. Col. 2:21, 22.

My good brethren, let us stand by "The Truth" as never before, for the battle with error is now waging hot. The enemies of truth hate the paper, and well they may, for it stands and has stood for nothing but the church, the church in its New Testament grandeur. When others have sacrificed so much to make it possible for us to have "The Truth," let us show our appreciation by keeping it going. Brethren, when you read these lines, do not delay but act immediately and send in a donation to the fund to publish the paper. Just ask, What have I done? and what am I doing to help? The paper is worthy of any sound brother's support. Let us work for it in earnest. Perhaps you have but little, but if all help just a little, we can do wonders for the Lord. There will be much that all should know in the paper, and I am constrained to urge all to take it and help.

BOB MUSGRAVE.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., 7-1-30—I closed a good meeting with loyal brethren at Healdton, Okla., June 29, which resulted in twelve being baptized and seven being restored; one of whom was from the S. S. brethren. We have a splendid band of brethren at Healdton, and I enjoyed the work with them very much. Brethren Tom E. Smith and E. L. Landon (young preachers) reside at Healdton, and it was a pleasure to be associated with them in the work of the Lord. I hope to be with them again next year in a series of meetings.

OUR HELPERS

Tom E. Smith	\$2.50
E. L. Landon	\$5.00
O. C. Mathews	\$2.50
T. J. Watkins	\$1.00
Bill Milner	\$1.00
Homer L. King	\$3.00

Laycock Printing Co., Commercial and Publication Printers, Jackson, Tenn.

A. W. Fenter, Rta.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, SEPTEMBER 1, 1930

No. 13

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

First Affirmative

It should be, and is, the desire of every thoughtful, sincere and devout Christian to grow in grace and a knowledge of the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ; to gain an understanding of every principle of which the Christian religion is composed; to familiarize himself with every rule and regulation by which he is to be governed in his pilgrimage in order that he may be able to render intelligent, steadfast devotion and profitable service in the vineyard of him who is the giver of every gift, and be able to receive in the end of this present existence that gift which is the object of all God's provision toward us and the object of all our devotion to him—an eternal and glorified existence in the place prepared for the redeemed. Indeed, who would deny that we must know God's will in order to perform what is required of us in that will? We do not believe he has left us to guess-work in performing the will of Him whom we serve, but we know that in every age of the world God has spoken unto man, revealing the divine way. This was "In time past unto the fathers by the prophets," and He "Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son," of whom he said, "Hear ye him." It was through the Son that God gave the final way, perfect, and therefore unchangeable, and "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip."

We live in an age and in a land of unspeakable blessings and to a great extent unheeded opportunities. God's word is within the reach of all and how few of us really "Search the Scriptures daily," "studying to show ourselves approved unto God." Inasmuch as God has been careful to give us his "whole counsel" at the cost of the blood of his only begotten Son and untold suffering on the part of those apostles and other inspired men through whom he spoke, how can we expect to escape if we fail to heed the "things that are written" and neglect "So great salvation"? We know that "If a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully," and that we are "purified in obeying the truth." It must be admitted then that since "He that transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" then we cannot overestimate the importance of "earnestly contending" for every item of "The faith which was once delivered to the saints."

With these things before us and realizing the divided condition of the church which arises from

the introduction of things into the Faith which lack divine authority, I hope no one will discourage the effort which the opposing brother and I are engaging in: an effort to teach the truth upon one of the greatest blessings and opportunities in which Christians may participate. We know that our Lord gave us the Lord's Supper and commanded us to eat it in memory of Him. Should we not know then what constitutes the Supper? We realize that some have looked upon the question before us as unimportant, but Moses may have thought his disobedience at the rock an unimportant matter; Cain may have thought it a matter of indifference as to the kind of sacrifice he offered; and Lot's wife perhaps thought that merely looking back was a matter of unimportance, but each of these received a "just recompense of reward." And these things "are written for our admonition." Those who "despised Moses' law died under two or three witnesses," and our punishment will be worse if we despise the "perfect law of liberty," which was given by the Son. May we not hope then that this discussion will bring us to a more perfect understanding of the Lord's Supper, that we may have the opportunity of participating in its benefits? I want to impress it upon the readers at this point that this debate only deals with the Lord's Supper from one angle; only the nature of the drink element is under consideration and let us not forget there are other things about the supper which are essential to its value, but in this discussion we give our time to the issue as stated in the proposition.

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that "the fruit of the vine" of Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, and Luke 22:18 is fermented, alcoholic, and in unleavened wine, and is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

In fairness to the opposing brother, I must here state the counter proposition, which I shall deny, and which reads: The Scriptures teach that "the fruit of the vine" of Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, and Luke 22:18 is unfermented, non-alcoholic, and is unleavened wine, and is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

I am affirming four things of the fruit of the vine: 1. It is fermented; 2. It is alcoholic; 3. It is unleavened wine; 4. It is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

He also affirms four things of the fruit of the vine: 1. It is unfermented; 2. It is non-alcoholic; 3. It is unleavened wine; 4. It is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

You will see at once that my opponent is not denying all that I affirm in this proposition, and so far as this debate is concerned no proof is re-

quired to prove that the fruit of the vine is unleavened or is the drink element of the Lord's Supper. This is admitted at the start and my opponent so affirms, in fact, the propositions are identical with the exception of the words "fermented" and "alcoholic" in my proposition. From this fact, it is seen that the issue lies over the question of whether the fruit of the vine is fermented and alcoholic. So I shall endeavor to show that the element designated by this phrase in the passage referred to is fermented and alcoholic.

1. The phrase, "the fruit of the vine," was used by the Savior to designate the drink element at the eating of the last passover with his apostles and at which he instituted the Lord's Supper. Proof: "And they went and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22:12-20.

2. Jesus and the apostles lived under and observed the law of Moses. Proof: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not in any wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5:17-19.

3. The passover was a sacrifice in the feast of unleavened bread. Proof: "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed." Luke 22:7. "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover." Exodus 12:27.

4. When Israel entered the land of Canaan, wine was made a part of the passover offering. Proof: "When ye be come into the land of your habitations, which I give unto you, and will make an offering by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, or a vow, or in a freewill offering, or in your solemn feasts, to make a sweet savour unto the Lord, of the herd, or of the flocks; . . . The fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink offering shalt thou prepare with the burnt offering or sacrifice, for one lamb. Num. 15:1-4.

5. When God commanded that "wine" be used with the passover, he commanded an element which answers to the Saviour's expression, "The fruit of the vine." Proof: "Wine, the fermented juice of grapes." Webster.

6. "Wine" is alcoholic. Proof: "And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: and he drank of the wine, and was drunken: and he was uncovered within his tent." Gen. 9:20-21.

7. History unites in showing that "The fruit of the vine" of the passages referred to in the proposition is "wine." Proof: "This expression (the fruit of the vine) has been used by the Jews from time immemorial to designate the wine partaken of on sacred occasions, as at the passover and on the evening of the Sabbath." Schaff-Herzog. So we conclude that the fruit of the vine is fermented and alcoholic. Hewitt Smith, Brookhaven, Miss., Rt. 6.

First Negative --

In reply to the brother's first article in defense of his proposition, which reads as follows: The Scriptures teach that "the fruit of the vine" of Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, and Luke 22:18 is fermented, alcoholic, and is unleavened wine, and is the drink element of the Lord's Supper,—I want to call the readers' attention to some statements made by Bro. Smith that are hard to understand. He says he's affirming four things of "the fruit of the vine:" 1. It is fermented; 2. It is alcoholic; 3. It is unleavened wine; 4. It is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

Then he says that you will see at once that my opponent is not denying all that I affirm in the proposition, and so far as this debate is concerned no proof is required to prove that the fruit of the vine is unleavened or is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

Next he says, "This is admitted at the start and my opponent so affirms."

Bro. Smith, you have affirmed that the Scriptures teach these four things.

You further say that the propositions are identical with the exception of the words "fermented and alcoholic." "Therefore," you say, "my opponent is not denying all that I affirm."

I deny that the drink element of the Lord's Supper is in your proposition. You said you hoped no one would discourage the effort which the opposing brother and I are engaging in: an effort to teach the truth. So in your next article I expect you to define the terms of your proposition.

I call the readers' attention to the term that my opponent ignored in his proposition—**unleavened**. I PREDICT that before this debate ends that somebody will see the reason why the brother said he wasn't required to prove that the kind of element he's contending for is **unleavened**. If "The Scriptures teach," as he affirms, that "the fruit of the vine" of Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, and Luke 22:18 is unleavened wine," and he withholds that truth, will he not be "holding the truth in unrighteousness"? Rom. 1:18. You know that this term in your proposition taken with the other terms that your proposition contains, has been the issue between us here for some four years, and I want our readers to see that I'm discussing a **proposition**, and not **men**. With these preliminaries, I'll now begin my answer to

his first installment.

As a whole, I indorse all he has said by way of introduction.

In his first argument he says, "The fruit of the vine" was used by the Savior to designate the drink element at the eating of the last passover with his apostles. Do you mean to say that Christ used the phrase, "the fruit of the vine," to designate the drink element in the passover meal? If so, let me know in your next article. You offer Luke 22:13-20. Do you mean that the passover cup is in the 17th verse of this ch., and that the cup of the Lord's Supper is in 20th verse? I want to understand you on this, so make yourself clear in your next. Your second argument I think I understand. But where you said that Jesus and the apostles lived under and observed the law of Moses, what do you mean by "observed"? Do you mean that Christ came to this sin-cursed earth to subscribe to the practices and customs of the Jews? Right here I suppose we are going to establish the battle-ground between us. You offer Matt. 5:17-19, where Jesus said "I came not to destroy the Law or the prophets." I think I understand the point you are trying to make. You further quote where Jesus said, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." I gather from your argument and from your proof-text that God commanded "fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine" in the passover meal, and that this was one of the commandments that Christ spoke of, not to "break." Right clever tricks—just the way sectarian religion is proved. Now let the reader go to the 5th ch. of Matt. and he will see at once that these statements of Christ were in the sermon on the mount where the Savior was laying down general principles that should obtain in his kingdom or church. What did Christ mean when he said, "One jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled"? Bro. Smith would have us believe that Christ must drink "fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine" in the passover meal before the law could be fulfilled. Now let the reader go with me to the 34th chapter of Luke, and the 44th verse: "That all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning me."

Was it ever written in any of these that Christ should offer every offering that Israel was required to offer? or that he should subscribe to the practice of the Jews? Bro. Smith, here's some work for you.

In your third argument you say the passover was a sacrifice in the feast of unleavened bread, and used for your proof-text Ex. 12:27, "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover." Of course you are trying to jumble all these sacrifices together, that came during the seven days of "unleavened bread," and make no distinction between them and their design, in order to get the drink element in the passover meal. Right here I challenge special investigation: The "sacrifice" of the pass-

over came on the 14th day and the feast of "unleavened bread" on the 15th Lev. 23:5, 6. I want to call the readers' attention to the fact that the order prescribed for the passover meal hasn't yet been mentioned. But we will take it up in our next article.

I want to say at this point that the passover meal was a separate and distinct offering from all other sacrifices under the law of Moses, and carried with it a specific design.

In his fourth argument he says when Israel entered the land of Canaan, wine was made a part of the passover offering. Let the reader keep this well in mind all through this discussion—that God commanded Israel when they entered the land of Canaan to drink "fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine" in the passover meal. So say Bro. Smith. One special thing I want all to keep in mind, and that—whatever proof-text he offers where wine is commanded, it is to be drunk according to his position in his fourth argument where he says wine made a part of the passover offering, and cites Num. 15:2-5. Question: 1. What translation are you reading from, Bro. Smith? I want you to answer this question in your next article. My Bible doesn't read as you have it. Something is wrong somewhere. Let the readers turn to Num. 15, and read from the 1st to the 5th verse and see that he failed to give us the full meaning of this text. Why? Because he failed to give the 4th verse, which has as much to do in qualifying the meaning of his text as do the ones he quoted. The reader can see that the "sacrifices" in his proof-text carry with them three things: If it was a lamb, there was a "meat" (meal) offering commanded of a tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of oil. I'll say right here that this sacrifice is a separate and distinct sacrifice from the passover lamb. Why? Because (1) it was an offering by fire, (2) it had a different bread commanded, (3) its purpose or design was to perform a vow or make a sweet savour. Right on these points we are going to have some debating. God told Moses not to add anything to or take anything from his law. Question: 2. If you were back under the law, and were required to make that offering, and you would take the "wine" prescribed in your text and not take the "meat" (meal) offering commanded with the "wine," and use the "wine" in the passover meal, what would you be guilty of? You spoke of Cain's indifference as to the kind of sacrifice he offered. Question 3: What would be the difference in his sacrifice and yours?

In your 5th argument you said when God commanded that "wine" be used with the passover, he commanded an element which answers to the Savior's expression, "the fruit of the vine." Let the readers keep well in mind the proof Bro. Smith offers that God commanded "wine" in the passover meal, and also his proof concerning those things which were the practices and customs of the Jews which God never commanded.

So far he has offered one text in proof that God

(Continued on page Six)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
 J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
 Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips.

I am sure that our readers were glad to see the name of Homer L. King, of Lebanon, Mo., added to our paper, THE TRUTH, as an Editor. Brother King is true to the Book, and there is no disagreement between any two of the Editors of the paper on any vital point. We dwell together in unity, "keeping the unity of the Spirit in the uniting bond of peace."—Eph. 4.

Since the Lord commands His children to 'sing praises unto Him in the Church,' we agree that playing an instrument is not obeying the command to "sing," and hence we object to the use of mechanical music in the church.

Since the Lord teaches us that the Church is "the pillar and support of the truth," we agree that it is sufficient to do the work of teaching, and hence no missionary society is needed to preach the Gospel of Christ.

Since the Lord gave the specific command to "teach," and made no provision for classes, we agree that our teaching in the Church should be done by the brethren teaching "one by one that all may learn and be exhorted."—1 Cor. 14:31; Matt. 28:18.

Since the Greek text of Matt. 26:27, recording the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (deipnon), says, "And He took the wine-cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all out of it,'" we agree that the use of cups on the Lord's Table is an innovation upon the New Testament order, and hence we oppose it.

Now, since the Editors are agreed on all the questions now before the brotherhood, each one demanding a "Thus saith Jehovah" for his faith and practice, the brethren are assured that the paper, The Truth, will remain true to its due and rightful mission of restoring primitive Christianity.

Now who will stand by us with your means and influence in helping to put out The Truth, the only paper in the whole world that stands wholly and unflinchingly for "that which is written" in both doctrine and practice? "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 toward men.'"—Luke 2:13, 14. "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. "Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion!"

The Lord, through His prophetic word, has foretold the great apostacy in which the world is now overwhelmed; but the prophets have also predicted the restoration of primitive Christianity—the work in which we are now engaged. So rejoice, therefore, in hope, and patient in your wilderness tribulation, Oh, Church of God! for the time is coming when your primitive condition will be restored; "and they shall call thee, the City of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." "And the days of thy mourning shall be ended." "I, the Lord, will hasten it in its time." See Isa 60.

I did the preaching in a meeting at South Gate, Calif., which closed last night. Several were added by primary obedience, restoration, and transfer of membership, and a congregation will meet each Lord's day, 10:30 a. m., in the Auditorium, at 3314½ Post Street. They will worship as "it is written" and will co-operate with the Montebello and Los Angeles congregations in "sounding out the word." I shall visit them as I have time and opportunity and encourage them in building up the cause of Christ in their community.—J. D. P.

BROTHER COWAN'S CREED

The following CREED, written by Brother J. N. Cowan, and offered by him to the three congregations of the church of Christ in Roswell, N. Mex., is a fair sample of the sectarianism into which the supporters of the so-called "The Apostolic Way" is drifting. This is saddening to the hearts of faithful and holy brethren who have sacrificed much to build up that once loyal, now digressive, paper. Brother Harper, the only man on earth who is morally entitled to the ownership of that paper, (as well as others who stand for "that which is written,") has been bitterly persecuted by its supporters because he would not "drift with the tide" of digression, but started The Truth to check it.

Bro. Harper published this CREED more than a year ago. I am publishing it in this issue of The Truth because some brethren have accused us of misrepresenting him on this question. Furthermore, it will show the brotherhood just where Bro. Cowan stands on this question. I would correct the errors in it, but am afraid he would accuse me of changing his CREED.—J. D. Phillips. To the Brethren worshipping at First Street and Richardson Avenue, Greetings:—

I am very desirous of a union between all the members of the Church of Christ in this locality, viz: The ones meeting at 5th Street and at L. F. D. School-house, and those meeting at First and Richardson. I have conversed with parties on all sides, and think in position to name a common ground upon which all can work together.

The following manner of procedure will meet with the approval of practically all of the L. F. D. Brethren, if not all, and also practically all of the Fifth Street brethren.

First. Each one take the responsibility of teaching their children at home, thus eliminating the class system of teaching for the sake of unity. Believing that a greater amount of good can be accomplished working together in unity, than can be accomplished by the classes, and division remain.

Second. That in the communion service, only a sufficient number of cups be used to conveniently wait upon the congregation, say two, or four, as the occasion may require. That thanks be offered for the cup while in one container, then after the giving of thanks, it may be distributed in the other containers as an act of distribution. Also in case of one or more who be Tubercular, that such party or parties furnish their own cup in which a portion of the cup may be poured and from which they may drink, or if they prefer to wait until the last to drink, that will be their privilege. This will eliminate the use of what is called the "Individual Cups," which are objectionable to a great many of the brethren, and effect that union for which we pray, and accomplish far more good, than to retain the Individual cups and remain divided.

Third. That if such a union can be affected on the above basis, that from that time on, the question be dropped, and that no discussions ever occur publicly about these questions over which divisions has been maintained.

Fourth. That if you cannot accept the above arrangement permanently, that for the sake of avoiding confusion, and that we may all worship together the coming Lord's day, and that our present good meeting be not hindered by brethren going to different places to worship, which would make it impossible to have the great crowd that will be here from all over this country all together to hear another Gospel sermon on Lord's day morning, that you leave off the classes and individual cups for this day.

This is written without any attempt to argue the question, but for the sake of doing the greatest amount of good possible.

Your Brother in Christ,

J. N. COWAN.

Olney, Texas, Aug. 10, 1930.—To the church of Christ at Cal. Creek & J. Y.: I had been of opinion that Bro. (Ike) had made the proper acknowledgment, until Friday night when I had a special talk with him. And he caused me to be of opinion that he was under cover (of all his sins) yet dodged the thing he was accused of. Therefore I was deceived in him. And am asking you brethren to forgive me, of all I have said and done in defense of him. Also ask the prayers of all Christians that God may forgive me all the wrongs I have committed. I have said and done things, thinking that I was in defence of the truth, but was wrong; therefore I ask the forgiveness of all

the brethren that I have wronged everywhere.
 Andy Hodges, Olney, Texas.

ATTENTION

I have discovered a large body of "potters' clay" on my place. Have bored twenty-four feet into it without reaching the limit. Our state geologist has examined it, and says it will make brick, tile, stoneware, and possibly porcelain. If some brother with capital to develop this valuable deposit, will take hold of this with me, we can do a good, honest business, get some Christian families in here and build up the cause here and help support the truth in new fields of mission effort. Who will take advantage of this opportunity? Write me at Lafe, Ark., Rt. 1, W. T. Jones.

D. A. Jones, Atlanta, Texas.—Bro. Homer L. King closed a meeting here last July in which ten were baptized and one restored, and the church greatly edified. Bro. King is a Christian and a fine preacher. He had his family with him, and we enjoyed their help in the meeting and association in our homes. Brethren, don't be afraid to call brother King for meetings. He is loyal to the core. This was his third meeting with us and was the best. We were not in time to secure his help for a meeting next year, but had him book us for 1932.

M. R. McBee, Freeport, Fla.—Bro. Reynolds of Esto, Fla., closed a ten-days' meeting here, beginning July 24 and closing August 3. Five made the good confession and were baptized, making our number seven here now who meet every Lord's day at 10 a. m., as directed by the apostles. Rains prevented the attendance some. Bro. Falton Embry of Ky. donated \$1.00 to the support of this meeting, and Bro. Reynolds is worthy of all the support he gets, which is not much. He is seventy-six now and has a wife to support. He works out in the cotton fields, which ought not to be. Jesus said—I was sick and ye visited me not; was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; was in prison and ye ministered not unto me. Forasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these, ye did it not unto me. Where are our visitors today?

IMPORTANT NOTICE

In this issue you will find the first installment of the discussion on the wine question. Extra copies are being run for those who are not now getting the paper so that they can get each a copy if the subscription comes in too late to get this first installment. All are requested to let others know that the discussion will be carried in each issue of the paper until the six articles to the affirmative and six to the negative have been run; and then the other proposition on the subject will be run. We shall be able to furnish a few sample copies for distribution. Kindly send postage to the office for these. Get word by letter and in any other way that you can, especially by announcing it at meetings, so all can read this.
 —Ed.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., July 26, 1930.—I closed a good meeting at Fouke, Ark., the 17th inst. I found considerable digression in the church there, but the word of God seemed to have its power with the honest hearted, and we have hopes of the congregation taking the Bible way in the future. The meeting resulted in seven being baptized and three being restored. They asked me to return for another effort next year.

From Fouke, we went to Shreveport, La., and preached two nights. Had pleasant visit with the brethren there, with whom I have labored much in protracted meetings. There is slight prospect of a discussion with the S. S. brethren in Shreveport. I presented propositions to C. Y. Pettigrew, pastor of the Portland Ave. Church. He has not as yet accepted the propositions, but promised to meet me in October. I hope that he doesn't back out.

From Shreveport, we came to Atlanta, Texas, where we are at this writing engaged in a good meeting, which began the 20th, inst. Have baptized three and one has been restored to date. This is the third meeting for me with these good people, and we are having the best crowds and attention we have ever had. The family is with me in this work, and we enjoy their presence and cooperation.

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

(Continued from page Three)

commanded "wine" in the passover meal—Num. 15:2-5. This I have already showed to be a separate offering from the paschal lamb.

He offers for proof that "the fruit of the vine" is "fermented, alcoholic, and is unleavened" one of Webster's definitions of "wine." Webster also says, "The expressed juice of grapes." Bro. Smith, you should have given Webster's definition of "fruit," since the word "fruit" in the phrase we have in the proposition is the thing that we are trying to determine. No one denies that "fermented, alcoholic" grape juice is wine. Webster also shows that this kind of wine is leavened, not "unleavened," as you have it. So you and Webster come to "the parting of the ways."

In your 6th argument you say wine is alcoholic. No one denies that the kind you are contending for is alcoholic. But before this discussion is over we shall see that the Bible speaks of a different kind—"unleavened, non-alcoholic, and unfermented." To prove your alcoholic wine, you go to Gen. 9:20, 21, where Noah was made drunk. I'm glad you have begun to identify the drunkard's kind of wine with "the fruit of the vine" used by Christ—a bridge you'll never get over.

In your 7th you say that history unites in showing that "the fruit of the vine" of the passover is wine, and you offer Schaff-Herzog. But mind you this work did not say this "wine" was fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened, as you have it—not by a long way. Neither does it say that God commanded the use of "wine" in the passover. You close by saying, "So we conclude that the fruit of

the vine is fermented and alcoholic. Why didn't you also say, and "unleavened," as you are affirming in your proposition? Take it all, brother.

—T. E. Smith, Wesson, Miss., Rt. 5.

WRITTEN DISCUSSION ON THE CUP QUESTION

Agreement for the written debate between J. N. Cowan and H. C. Harper:

1. Both propositions already signed shall be discussed in the order signed.

2. Each disputant shall have six articles of not more than 800 words to the article on each proposition.

3. The negative shall reply within ten days after receiving the affirmative article, and the affirmative shall reply within ten days after receiving the negative article, provided that if a longer time is used the reply shall be accompanied by a doctor's certificate that the respondent was not able to do such work.

4. The tract shall not contain any preface or foreword, nor any other matter that in any way discusses the matter in debate, other than the articles of the debate.

5. The debate shall not be published in any religious paper prior to the publication of the tract, without the consent of both disputants.

6. Each disputant may have a copy of the matter from the press for his own proof reading, provided that no changes shall be made other than typographical errors, and provided the matter from the press is returned to the printing company within the time limit prescribed by them.

7. Each disputant agrees to distribute the tract to the extent of his ability.

(Signed) J. N. Cowan H. C. Harper.

HORN-SHELNUTT DEBATE

This debate was held in the school auditorium at Slocomb, Ala., beginning July 18th, lasting three days. Mr. J. Eli Horn (Russellite) affirming that, "Man is wholly mortal and unconscious between death and the resurrection. Brother W. L. Shelnutt affirming that "All responsible people who die in disobedience, will suffer eternal torment.

The writer of this debated the Kingdom question with Mr. Horn in October, 1929. We had signed Four propositions, but Mr. Horn claimed that he did not have the time at that time, to debate all Four of them, so we agreed to debate the Kingdom question at that time, and debate the other Two at some future date, so we agreed to begin July 18th.

Brother Shelnutt came down to moderate for me, and was expecting to assist in meeting before the debate, but was disappointed, so I told him that I would let him do the debating in my place, as Mr. Horn and I had agreed that we may substitute a man if we wished.

To say it was a victory for the truth, is to say it mildly. If the brethren anywhere are bothered with Russellism, just call for Brother Shelnutt, he will silence them as he did at Slocomb, as far as

debating is concerned. We left a standing challenge to debate with them for six days, but they said "they did not care to debate anymore."

W. H. Reynolds.

P. S. I am to engage W. T. Grider in debate on the Sunday School question sometime after the last of September. Will announce as soon as time and place are arranged.

W. H. R.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—After my debate with Cowan at Lorenzo and my meeting there in which five were baptized, I went to Floresville, Texas, where we had a splendid meeting: and from there to Washington, Okla., where we began the first of August; then to Pike City, Okla., for the rest of August up to the 5th Lord's day, when we are to begin a meeting at Phillipsburg, Mo., the home congregation of our preaching brother, Homer L. King, and shall spend the month of September in meetings in that state; then to Wichita Falls by the first Lord's day in October; then to Somerton, Arizona. I intend to do all in my power to get that loyal paper, "The Truth," into the hands of all who want the Bible way. Come, brethren, let us get behind the only paper that now "earnestly contends for the faith delivered to the saints." The fight with innovators is on in dead earnest, these preachers and churches "speak where the Bible is silent" on the organ, the S. S., and the Cups. Take the "sword of the Spirit" to them, and they fall in a bunch.

BROTHER WHITE'S BOOK

This treats on "The COMMUNION, NAME, FORM and DESIGN." This makes profitable and instructive reading, and I want to get these out among the readers of "The Truth," who want to follow the Bible. These are 25 cents a copy or \$2.00 a dozen, post paid, and free to those who have not the price but want to read the book. It matters not whether you agree with me in every detail that I may bring out, you will find food for thought and study, and all I ask of you is to read it candidly, and compare its teaching with the Scriptures.

Address Jas. T. White, Box 65, Lometa, Texas.

THE INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUPS

I have just finished reading Bro. L. J. Killion's latest in the Firm Foundation on the above subject and unless Bro. Harper intends to advertise his stubbornness by insisting on some plain statement, precept or example from the word of God, I cannot see for the life of me why he does not yield the point. Bro. Killion has marshalled the hosts of science, human wisdom, fashion and esthetics against the common communion cup and in the face of these, what showing, I ask you, has the man whose only resource is the threadbare and almost obsolete plea of "Thus saith the Lord"? Bro. Killion has produced ample testimony (such as it is) to satisfy any one except one of those old fogies who believe that the Scriptures thoroughly furnish the man of God unto every good work. And even at that, Bro. Killion has

overlooked several pretty good arguments. For instance, he failed to call attention to the "cuteness" of the little individual cups. What could be cuter than the little thimble-sized receptacles so neatly arranged on their tray? Nothing, I am sure, could come within a city block of it, unless it would be to preserve the unity by adding some equally cute individual plates with a miniature loaf on each. I suggest that this be at once added, and since the same arguments which are used for the one will apply equally well to the other. Bro. Killion has also failed to bring out much that might be said as to the popularity of the individual cups, and has scarcely touched upon its appeal to those who are very esthetic and perhaps but slightly religious. This is a progressive and scientific age and it is not to be supposed that people of this enlightened time are going to take any chances by following too closely to the example of Jesus and the apostles, who were densely ignorant on the subject of germs. Let Brother Harper go a-w-a-y back and sit down.

(G. A. Trott, in the Apostolic Way of July 1, 1913).

CUPS AND CLASSES

At my debate with Cowan at Lorenzo, Texas, last July, one of the leading S. S. brothers came to me and said he sure was glad he heard Cowan go to the "upper room" where Jesus instituted the Communion to refute the one cup, for if we have one cup as they did, we must go to the upper room also to be apostolic. So if Cowan gets to bucking my "classes," I'll just call his attention to Christ and the Apostles in the "upper room" and show that we must have our meetings in the upper room to be apostolic, for if we have just one assembly as they had to be apostolic, we must also have the upper room. But another brother said that would do no good, for we could not now get to the upper room because Cowan had worn out the stairs running up and down to defend his cups. Well, take him, you S. S. fellows, he stands with you on the stairs, and not "A Thus saith the Lord" for his Cups. He demands "chapter and verse" (See Cowan-Sommer Debate) for the "classes," and when I demanded the same for his "two or more containers" and drew a circle on the board and agreed to quit the debate when he put in it just one passage of Scripture that mentions his practice on the Cups as he had done Sommer on the classes, he left 'er empty, just as Sommer did. Bob Musgrave.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—My meeting with the brethren at Honey Grove, Texas, was a great pleasure to me. Before the brethren engaged me for the meeting, the brethren who have the S. S. and the Cups wanted a debate on these things so Bro. Martin asked me if I would meet their man, and as usual I said yes and sent propositions. This produced a change of heart in the cups and S. S. brethren—they did not want any debate, and they would not let me preach in their house. So we had the meeting at the Tabernacle. One fine

young man was baptized and three brethren confessed their wrongs and began their Christian duty again. They commenced meeting to worship as the word of God directs with twelve members, without the classes and the cups. They can read about singing (Heb. 2:12), about one teaching at a time (1 Cor. 14:25-28), about "cup" (not cups) in the communion; and they are built on the "rock," Matt. 7, and their house will stand. May God have all the glory.

A FALSEHOOD NAILED

In the Leader, Ira C. Moore says that one J. D. Phillips came into West Virginia, and preached for three congregations and that these three congregations have died and ceased to meet. Phillips preached at the South Charleston congregation, where he also met Ira C. Moore of the Christian Leader in debate on the "class and women teacher" (Sunday School, the Leader calls it) question, and where Moore was challenged publicly to defend the cups in the communion service, but refused to do so; and he preached for the church at Mallory Chapel and at Warden Chapel, and debated the Sunday School with Robinson (Reed) at Stamford. And these churches are all active and doing well, meeting every Lord's Day. If anyone interested will write R. H. Hazelton, So. Charleston, W. Va., and Frank Cobbs, Spring Hill, W. Va., and J. J. Warden, Beckley, W. Va., or C. H. Williams, Box 1025, Charleston, W. Va., they can get the truth if it is wanted.

Moore says he has more to write on this matter, and we suggest that he state to the readers of the Leader that South Charleston church is growing and doing well, having recently held a meeting which resulted in fifteen added to the church. And since this church is in Charleston, where Moore lives, we ask him to visit the congregation and give us the truth the next time he writes.

G. W. TERRY

Geo. J. P. Masser, Abilene, Texas—Last week in May I met J. J. F. Lockhart in debate which I enjoyed very much. He is an old debater. We debated two propositions. I am ready to go anywhere and preach "the word," as Paul told Timothy to do. I have been preaching the gospel for twenty-five years, and I know how it is done.

T. E. (Jack) Frost, Memphis, Tenn.—We have had two tent meetings in Memphis this summer. We have a standing challenge to those who advocate the Sunday School and cups. They have been asked to meet Brother Harper, but have refused. We want preaching brethren who stand for the Bible as our guide to stop over in passing and preach for us. I will come to the station for you. My address is 3264 Powell Ave. Just phone 4-3122.

Homer L. King, May 17, Lebanon Mo.—I closed a series of meetings at Wet Glaize, Mo., some fifty miles north of Lebanon, the 5th, inst., which resulted in five being baptized into Christ and about ten others coming out from the so-called Chris-

tian Church, who have promised to keep house for the Lord as He directs in the Bible. Two of those baptized came from the Baptist, but I did not ask them if they were "satisfied with their baptism." Bro. C. H. Lee, of Phillipsburg, Mo., was with me in this meeting, and assisted much in song, prayer and otherwise. He certainly is a "true yokefellow" in the work.

From the above place I went to Unionville, Ind., for a short meeting. Closed there the 15th, inst. without visible results. I found the church there divided over the use of drinking cups in the communion. It seems that some brethren love custom, unauthorized, better than they do the unity of the brethren. It is, indeed, strange that some will admit that you can worship God acceptably with one drinking cup in the communion, but will insist on the use of two, if it does divide the Church of Christ. In this, do they remind you of the beloved Bro. Paul, who said, "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." Not much, do they? Someone will have to account to God for this sad state of affairs.

I am now at Harrodsburg, Ind., in a series of meetings, having begun the 16th, inst., and expect to continue until the 25th, then to Elk City, Okla., the first Lord's day in June. From Elk City, I expect to go to Healdton, Okla.

Pray for me and the work that all may redound to the glory of the Lord.

Baskin, La.—Meeting held here by Bro. D. J. Whitten, of Stockdale, Texas, and worked up in this place by a citizen of Lincoln Co., Miss., and others, was a great success, there being 52 baptized. We want to highly endorse Bro. Whitten as a God-fearing man and a preacher that fights sin from every angle. We love him and expect to have him with us again in the early fall. We ask the prayers of all God's people. — Allen W. Martin.

E. L. Landon, Healdton, Okla.—Bro. Tom E. Smith and I closed a good meeting at Clemscott, Okla., July 31. Nine were baptized and three confessed wrongs. This was a mission meeting made possible by assistance from the churches at Healdton and Pike City. Bro. Smith and I expect to do more mission work this year, and we ask the prayers and co-operation of brethren to assist in the work. Let us "sound out" the word, as did the primitive church.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—I preached at Pike City the last Lord's day in July, and four young ladies made the Good Confession and were baptized. The brethren are assisting Bro. Landon and me in mission work and we have been much encouraged by results. We are putting "The Truth" into the hands of the people, for it stands for the Bible only in work and worship.

Printing by Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.
Publication and Commercial Printers

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, OCTOBER 1, 1930

No. 15

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

(Continued from Sept. 1, issue)

Second Affirmative

I am sure that if one should read my opponent's first negative article without first reading my first affirmative, the idea conveyed would be quite misleading. This is due to the fact that very little of the negative was in reply to what I said; quite a bit of it was devoted to misquoting what I said; more of it given to what the brother thought I meant, and some of it was a reply to what I said. I shall here state some things which are misleading to the reader.

1. The first statement of his first negative is devoted to a misquotation of the proposition I affirm. The word "is" between "and" and "unleavened" is left out.

2. I am accused of ignoring the term "unleavened" in my proposition. A reading of my first affirmative will show that I did not do this.

3. He says, "I predict before this debate ends that somebody will see the reason why the brother said he wasn't required to prove that the kind of element that he's contending for is 'unleavened.'" This statement leaves the impression, of course, that I am dodging an issue on the term "unleavened" and that this will be shown as the debate progresses.

Truly, "Before this debate ends," even before this affirmative article ends, in fact, just here the reader shall know why the issue over the term "unleavened" is not being discussed in this debate. In arranging this debate, as shown by the correspondence from which I quote, I signed the affirmative of, and submitted the following proposition: "The Scriptures teach that fermented grape juice (wine) is unleavened grape juice and that Jesus Christ used fermented grape juice in the instituting of the Lord's Supper." This proposition was rejected, and the propositions we have signed for the debate in which we affirm identically the same thing with reference to the term "unleavened" were demanded. I accepted those propositions and my affirmative is under discussion at present and I am not discussing the issue over the term "unleavened" for the reason that the proposition containing that issue was rejected and the ones we have signed contain no such issue.

4. He says this term with the others of my proposition has been the issue between the two factions here for four or five years. Until the middle of the year 1927, Bro. Smith and I were taking the element I am contending for together in the Lord's Supper.

5. In commenting on argument No. 2, in which

I said that Christ and the apostles lived under and observed the Law of Moses, he asks the question, "Do you mean that Christ came to this sin-cursed earth to subscribe to the practice and customs of the Jews?" Inasmuch as I said nothing to indicate that I made no distinction between the law of Moses and Jewish traditions, there is nothing to indicate that I meant such a thing and the question is out of place unless Bro. Smith himself knows no distinction between them.

6. On the above he says, "Right here I suspect we are going to establish the battle-ground between us." The battle ground is established in the proposition.

7. Commenting on argument No. 4, he says, "Let the reader keep this well in mind all through this discussion . . . that God commanded Israel when they entered the land of Canaan to drink 'fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine' in the Passover meal. So says Brother Smith. Brother Smith, or at least I, said no such thing. Notice here that he encloses the expression 'fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine' in quotation marks. A quotation from my proposition, you see, and again he left out that little word 'is.' That's singular, isn't it?"

8. Following this (No. 7) he offers a special thing for the reader to keep in mind relative to my position. You see, it takes a special effort to get folks to keep something in mind that isn't there.

9. Bro. Smith makes quite a bit of my leaving out verse 4 when I quoted Num. 15:2-5. If my first affirmative is printed as it is written, the reader will see that in the quotation itself I let it be known that I was leaving the verse out. If I had left this out just as Brother Smith left out the word "is" in quoting my proposition on page 1 of his first negative and in the quotation in reply to argument No. 4, he may well have asked the question, "What translation are you reading from, Bro. Smith?"

I think this is sufficient to show the readers why I am asking that they go to my affirmative articles to learn what I affirm, and when an alleged argument is stated and replied to in the next negative, be sure the affirmative contains that argument, otherwise, I may be thought to argue some things which I do not. I hope from this time on to be able to give all the space to the differences between us and I ask Bro. Smith to spend the time in endeavoring to show that what I have to say fails to sustain the proposition.

I shall now examine what Bro. Smith has to say in reply to my arguments.

1. He takes issue with me on my argument that Jesus fulfilled the law of Moses. I quoted Matt. 5:17-19, as proof. He asks the reader to go to Matt. 5, and see that Jesus was laying down general principles that should obtain in his church. Certainly he was, but the law of which he spoke in this scripture was the law of Moses and I'll venture the assertion that Bro. Smith will not deny it. He asks also if Christ was required to offer every offering that Israel was required to offer.

Every command in God's word is conditional, the conditions may not be stated, but are implied. No such condition obtained with Jesus as made it necessary for him to offer many of the offerings we find in the law. But my argument is, that Jesus and his apostles were required to keep the passover, because the conditions upon which men were required to keep it did obtain with them. As proof of this I cite: Ex. 12:43-49; Num. 9:13.

2. I contended that wine was made a part of the passover offering when Israel entered Canaan because it was a sacrifice in the feast of unleavened bread (a solemn feast) and Num. 15:2-5 so required.

Bro. Smith denies that the passover was in the feast of unleavened bread, challenges special investigation on the point, and I accept "the gauge of battle." "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover." (Matt. 26:17).

He further denies that Num. 15:2-5, applied to the passover because 1. "It was an offering by fire." So was the passover. "And thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of the Lord thy God: and the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar of the Lord thy God, and thou shalt eat the flesh." (Deut. 12:27) What sacrifice does this mean, Bro. Smith? 2. "It had a different bread commanded." I deny, please give proof. 3. "Its purpose or design was to perform a vow or make a sweet savour." Only one of these sacrifices is "in performing a vow;" another is "in a freewill offering" and another "in your solemn feasts," such as the passover.

I argued in my first affirmative that the law of Moses made wine a part of the passover offering and so "The fruit of the vine" became, by this law, a part of the passover. An old relic in the sectarian's tool chest of debating implements is—When an opponent presents an argument that contains the exact truth and you can't meet it, then misrepresent it by taking something from it or adding to it and attack the misrepresentation. To use Bro. Smith's phraseology, "Something is wrong somewhere" which caused him to say, "Let the reader keep this well in mind all through this discussion—that God commanded Israel when they entered the land of Canaan to drink "fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine" in the Passover meal. So says Bro. Smith." If I said that, he should be able to point it out. Now if Bro. Smith or anyone else will point out in my first affirmative where I said that God command-

ed Israel to drink wine or anything else when they entered Canaan, I'll quit the debate. No, the word "drink" didn't get in through an oversight, because he emphasized it for italics. We emphasize words which we estimate as specially important and the indications are that Bro. Smith thinks it of special importance to have me say something, or have the reader keep in mind all through this discussion, a saying of mine which I never uttered.

Again, "one special thing (notice, reader, that this is something special, W. H. Smith) I want all to keep in mind, and that is—Whatever proof text he offers where 'wine' is commanded, it is to be drunk (see, W. H. Smith) according to his position in his fourth argument where he says 'wine' was made a part of the passover offering, and cites Nos. 15; 2-5." Truly, "Something is wrong somewhere" and it lies in the fact that when I say that wine was made a part of the passover offering; when I say that wine is "The fruit of the vine;" and when I say that "The phrase 'The fruit of the vine' was used by the Savior to designate the drink element at the eating of the last passover with his apostles and at which he instituted the Lord's Supper, I state scriptural facts, and it becomes necessary to get some special things I haven't said into the mind of the reader.

I shall now notice another objection he raises and conclude this article. When I showed that wine was fermented and alcoholic by Webster's definition and scriptural showing that it produced intoxication in Noah, Bro. Smith said, "I'm glad you have begun to identify the drunkard's kind of wine with 'the fruit of the vine' used by Christ—a bridge you'll never get over." This reminds me that when the Son of man came eating and drinking, a bunch of selfrighteous Jews piped out, "Behold a man glutenous and a wine bibber" (Matt. 11:19) I gave this definition of wine in my first affirmative "The fermented juice of grapes." (Webster) Bro. Smith gave another "The expressed juice of grapes." A third may help understand the word. "Loosely, unfermented fruit juice used as a beverage" (International Encyclopedia) Question: Do you object, Bro. Smith, if I ask that we refrain from using words loosely in this debate? If so, why?

Syllogism: 1. Wine is fermented and alcoholic. 2. The fruit of the vine of Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; and Luke 22:18 is wine.

Hewitt Smith

Second Negative

My brother, you have not even made a respectable start. Your first duty as an honorable debater is to define the terms of your proposition. And you have ignored my reasonable request to do so. This is not an oversight on your part, for I called your attention to it. Do you intend to do it? If not, why not?

You correctly say that the battle-ground is established in the proposition, and that is where I found it. It reads: "The Scriptures teach that "the fruit of the vine of Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25;

and Luke 22:18 is fermented, alcoholic, and is unleavened wine, and that is the drink element of the Lord's Supper."

Here you are affirming that "the fruit of the vine—

1. Is "fermented; 2. is "alcoholic; 3. is "unleavened wine;" 4. and as such is "the drink element of the Lord's Supper," as mentioned in the Scriptures cited. And my unintentional omission of the second "is" in no way changes the meaning of the wording, and I will leave it to the professor of Logic in the University of Mississippi as to whether you are not in duty bound by this proposition to prove by the Scriptures that "the fruit of the vine" they mention is "unleavened wine," as well as "fermented and alcoholic." But you ignored this, stating that I was not denying all you affirm in your proposition. But I told you it was one of the main issues to be debated since it has been advocated here, and we want it proved if it can be done, and now the laboring oar is in your hands, so don't lie down on the job. Yes, we had for seventeen years used the non-alcoholic element here, until the other was forced upon us under protest: this much to clear up what you said, only.

Your next excuse for ignoring this part of your proposition is that a former proposition setting forth this issue was turned down by us, which does not at all excuse you from proving what you now affirm. We want more than just this issue to be debated; and the proposition you now affirm is the one to be debated, unless you back out and refuse to defend it. I shall not touch your syllogism until you at least try to prove your proposition by it. Prove the "unleavened wine" to be a "fermented, alcoholic" drink.

Vinegar is "fermented juice of grapes." Is this what you want? You affirm for "unleavened wine," and in doing so you admit that there is "wine that is non-alcoholic, for "unleavened wine" is unfermented wine. Does Webster give the meaning of Greek and Hebrew words of the Bible? Try him on "baptism." "Now come up to the line as a debater. Do you know the meaning of "loosely," as used by the author you quote? We can all see that you are not discussing the issue over "the term unleavened." And we can see that you are thus evading the proposition you signed to prove.

Yes, some accused Jesus of being a man "glutenous and a wine bibber," and some accused the apostles of being "drunken," Acts 2; but both missed it. A man can "come eating and drinking" without drinking "fermented, alcoholic" wine, wine that is leavened, not unleavened, "as you affirm in your proposition. And if you don't get to your proof, it will show that "Something is wrong somewhere." And all can see it. If you do not know that "unleavened" is an issue in this proposition as worded, just leave it to the professor of Logic, as I said. And I want the proposition just as worded, for it expresses the exact issue between

us, and is the very thing I'm trying to get you do defend.

He headed in at Num. 15:2-5 as a gap to get through to prove God commanded Israel after they entered the land of Canaan to use, drink, fermented, alcoholic and unleavened wine in the Passover and that this was continued on down to the time Christ ate it with his disciples. But I completely headed him off, and he falls back with, "say." He did not in so many words "say" it, but he was trying to infer it and to argue for it. If not, why did he quote from schaff Herzogg that "This expression, the fruit of the vine,, has been used by the Jews to designate the wine partaken of on sacred occasions, as at the Passover"? You so coupled this up that the reader would infer that the "wine" of Num.15:2-5 was drunk in their feasts, and not poured on the sacrifice as it actually was. Hence my reason for warning the reader, and this sounded the death-knell to your argument. What sense was there to his contention that Christ and the apostles kept the law of Moses if he did not want the reader to infer that in obedience to that law the Jews drank wine at the Passover? Will he explain? This is why I asked him what he here understood and wanted to convey by "observed," as applied to Christ and the apostles; but I got no answer. He would as well "quit the debate" if he is not going to take up his proposition and define its terms and debate it. Tell us how the Jews used wine in the Passover. He seems now to turn up his nose at the "customs and traditions" of the Jews for his proof, but if we do not watch him, here is right where he is going. Now let him find God's prescribed regulations for the Passover in the law of Moses and compare it with that of Jewish practice, and we shall see where he is without "custom and tradition." He seems to be getting uneasy because I am calling the reader's attention to his position. He talks of Christ's fulfilling the law. By the law was he required to drink, yes, drink fermented, alcoholic, and unleavened wine, as you have affirmed to prove was done by him? I do not deny that he ate the Passover. Question: Do you believe that Christ observed the Passover as required in the texts you cite in proof that he was required to keep it, Ex.12:43-49; Num.9:13? If not, when and by whom were the changes made?

You cite scriptures that prescribe a lamb, unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and not a bone of lamb was to be broken. I deny that the Passover was in the feast of unleavened bread only in the fact that the sacrifices offered during the seven days of unleavened bread were distinguished, and cited Lev.23:5-6 to show that the Passover was on the 4th and the feast of unleavened bread on the 15th; and this helps to understand the purpose or design of each sacrifice. This shows the importance of verse 4 in Num.15,—an offering by fire, which he admits; but says so was the Passover. Now get this: He says the Passover was an offering by fire. Let us examine (Continued on page 5)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL NOTES

By J. D. Phillips.

IS PETER THE "ROCK"?

In Matt. 16:18, Jesus says, "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

Peter's name in Greek signifies a rock, and hence the Roman Catholics say that he is the "rock" upon which the Messiah established His church. This theory must be believed to be a 'good' Catholic.

But let us study the meaning of the two Greek words from which "Peter" and "rock" are translated. The Greek word "Peter" is Petros, and means a stone, or a fragment of a rock. The Greek word for "rock" is petra, and it denotes a solid rock. And hence the meaning of the passage is, "THOU art Petros (a stone), and on THIS petra (rock) I will build my church."

Now let us study the grammatical construction of the language. "Thou" is in the second person, and "this" is in the third. Furthermore, "Petros" (Peter) is masculine, and "petra" is feminine.

Peter made a confession—"Thou art the Messiah." The truth contained in this confession is the petra (rock) upon which Jesus said He would build His church.

A GOOD SONG BOOK.

Since the world has gone jazz crazy, disciples of Christ should guard against this evil. But, with shame be it said, most of our song books are full of jazz. We should get away from the hop-skip-pity-jump songs, and sing "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs"—the kind that builds us up spiritually. Such songs can be found in "Great Songs of the Church," a book compiled by Bro. E. L. Jorgenson. I unhesitatingly recommend it as the very best book I have seen. It contains 450 of the best songs from the best books ever published. Send for a sample copy. The price is 65c.

TWO OPINIONS.

"The women commanded to be silent in the Church (I Cor. 14:34) were inspired women."—J. C. McQuiddy, in Gospel Advocate, Feb. 21, 1924.

"Turn to I Cor. 14:35. This epistle was written about the year 58 or 59. The possession of a spiritual gift would carry with it the right to use that gift. The Spirit would not work against himself by forbidding the use of his gifts. This forces the conclusion that gifts were not bestowed upon the women and that this lack of spiritual gifts is what made it 'shameful for a woman to speak in the church,' and 'permitted them not' to speak."—Ira C. Moore, in Christian Leader, June 24, 1924.

Here are two opinions, one right the reverse of the other. Both cannot be right. Both may be wrong. All God-fearing women should know that they are forbidden to teach and speak in the assembly of the church. I am sure that both these brethren are mistaken in their reasons as to why God so commanded, and that the correct answer is found in I Tim. 2:11, 12.

CHRISTIAN LIVING

It is paramount that we emphasize first principles (how to become a Christian), one church, the danger of digression, etc., but in our preaching, teaching and writing, let us not overlook the importance of giving some lessons on "Christian Living." The Church is as much in need of teaching and admonishing along this line as on any I can call to mind. Let us not just concentrate on one sin, as though that sin was the only one that would keep us out of Heaven.

There are three very essential things necessary to "Christian Living"; viz., wholesome food, pure atmosphere (environment) and healthful exercise. The spiritual life, like the physical, cannot be strong and vigorous, neither can it exist without these things.

1. Food.—The importance of proper food and the proper amount of food, cannot well be over estimated. One cannot be strong without a sufficient supply of nutritious food. Christ is that bread from heaven on which we are to feed, but how are we to get this bread?

In Jno. 6:63, Jesus says; "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Hence, we must feed upon the words of Jesus, and in order for us to do that we should study the Bible; for it is in the Bible that we have the words of Jesus recorded.

"How may I study the Bible?" says one. Study it systematically, as you would any other textbook, for it is just as systematically arranged as any textbook. Good may come from reading the Bible wherever it happens to fall open, but not the greatest good. It would be well to read it biographically, following the lives of Bible characters, such as Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, Christ, Paul, etc. It would be well to read it temperately, not overloading. Only as much as you can appropriate and turn into spiritual food, should be read at one time. We must read it regularly. Feasting one or two days, followed by a fast of several days will destroy the health of the body. To cram on Lord's day, and fast the rest of the

week, means poor health and premature death. And if we devote ourselves to the study of things plain and which are essential to salvation, we shall not have much time to stumble over difficulties. Such a study will bring Christ close to us, much as a mother draws her absent boy near her through her letters to him. We read His words of comfort and warning, and see the wonderful example He left us, and we become better and stronger in the Christian life.

The Lord's Supper, or Communion, is another source of spiritual food. Hear Jesus, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." As we gather, on each first day of the week, around the Lord's table, and view, and partake of, the bread and the cup, we are filled with gratitude, and the life is consecrated anew to Him who died that we might live. Let never a Lord's day find you absent, my brother, when it is possible for you to be there. It will give you health and strength.

2. Atmosphere.—A child may be strong and have plenty of food, but if the air it breathes is bad, the health cannot be good. This atmosphere may represent the environment, or association of life. It has been said, "If we live with the lame, we learn to halt." And Paul says, "Be not deceived: evil communications (associates R. V.) corrupt good manners." We are not only known by the company that we keep, but we are often made or marred by that company. It is almost needless for me to state that poolhalls, clubs, ball-rooms, picture shows, gambling dens, ball games, cardtables, the saloon, bad books, etc. are not conducive to spiritual life. We must not only shun such places and associations, but we must seek the companionship of the good and pure. Our bosom friends should be the friends of Jesus. "He that walketh with wise men shall be wise." (Prov. 13:20). Why not walk with Jesus? Oh, for a closer walk with Him!

3. Exercise.—But one may have good food and good atmosphere, yet, if he takes no exercise, he cannot develop, and must soon die. In the Christian life, as in nature, it is "do or die." The arm that is not used withers; the unused eye loses the power of vision, and so it is with every muscle or organ of the body. The beautiful waters of the Jordan, as they come rushing down from the mountains, are clear as crystal and full of life; but when they enter the sea and become inactive, they die. Let us learn a lesson from them.

Jesus' life was a life of activity. At the age of twelve, he said, "I must be about my Father's business." (Lk. 2:49). Later he said, "I must work the work of Him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work" (Jno. 9:4). There will be but two classes at the judgment: those who did and those who did not. (Matt. 25:31-46). Jesus said, "Not everyone 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).

The church is certainly in need of workers: ac-

tive, tireless, consecrated and strong, who can be relied upon to stand by the grand old Book, and obey its mandates; whatever the cost may be. Brother, may we rely upon you in this great work? Jesus looked out over the fields and said, "The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few." (Lk. 10:2). I know a number of splendid gospel preachers, who give but one or two months out of the year to preaching the gospel, while thousands are perishing for the bread of life. Let every man, woman, boy and girl, who have come into the vineyard of the Lord, find out that which they have the ability to do, and then work at that with all their might. Hear Paul, "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." (I Cor. 15:58).

—Homer L. King.

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

(Continued from page 3)

this now. What use did they make of the offering made by fire? See Deut. 18:1,2,3 that a portion was for the priest and the Levites. This required the breaking of the bones of the sacrifice. But in the Paschal lamb not a bone was broken. Hence it was not an offering by fire. When you get to moving God's sacrifices out of place, remember what was done to Nadab and Abihu. But he cites Deut. 12:27 as proof of his contention, and asks, what sacrifices this means. They were "burnt offerings," as it says.

He denies that the "bread" in the 4th verse, the one he skipped, is different from that in the Passover. Listen: Did Christ use the kind of bread given in Num. 15:4 in the institution of the Lord's Supper? If so, do you use the tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of oil in making the bread for the Lord's Supper? Keep in mind now that you make the same kind of bread, and to do this requires the same constituents. Tell us now.

Referring to what I said about the design of the sacrifices in Num. 15:2-5, your proof-text, you say only one sacrifice is in performing a vow. Which one is this? Another is in a free-will offering. Which one is this? Another is in your solemn feasts. Which one is this? Now don't forget this. I'm glad you're beginning to make distinctions in the sacrifices of your proof-text, and the further you go the less you will find for your contention until you get to zero.

You make some comments on the free-will offering. Let me point out that this offering could be used to perform a vow, as in Deut. 23: "That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform even a free-will offering, according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth," and when we get through with Num. 15:2-5, his proof-text, we'll find no place for the Paschal lamb. And when Webster gives "The expressed juice of grapes" he does not use words "loosely" as in

"unfermented fruit juice used as a beverage," which includes all fruits. If you are ready to come to words and definitions, I am ready to meet you. Answer this: Is alcoholic wine the only kind of wine from grapes? Yes, Noah drank wine, and the kind that intoxicates, having the toxin (poison), alcohol, in it, for he "was drunk." And Lot was made to drink such wine and whordom went with it. (Gen.19:32-36) And "Whordom and wine" (Hosea 4:11) are ranked as twin evils in the Bible. And this kind of wine is fermented, alcoholic, and is leavened, not "unleavened," as you are affirming. And this issue of "unleavened" is in your proposition. And the reader can now see why you are not taking it up. T. E. Smith.

DO YOU WONDER

Bro. L. W. Hayhurst, whose picture for some reason appears regular on the front page of the A. W., has recently agreed to meet me in oral debate on the cups, provided, however, that I can find a congregation that is divided on the question, and provided further that his brethren will allow him to represent them. Do you wonder why these fellows, like the S. S. brethren were, are requiring so much, yes, even more than the organ advocates did in order to enter a public discussion on their practice? Do you wonder why these cups advocates require more of us for a discussion of the cups than they do of a S. S. advocate or an organ advocate? Like the S. S. advocate and the organ advocate, they know the Bible is against their practice. They will debate, provided, and provided, etc., etc., etc.

REPORT OF HARPER-COWAN DEBATE Graham, Texas, Aug, 21-4

I had the pleasure of moderating for Brother Harper in this debate. The truth was well defended by Bro. Harper, and the debate clearly showed that those who stand for one cup to drink from in the communion stand on the Bible ground. The debate was worth a great deal to me. We who stand for one cup are ready to get behind our man and furnish half the places to have the debate repeated at other places over the country. And this was our public offer. But those who stand with Cowan will not put him up and furnish half the places. We have now had two debates on the question, and have furnished both places. When we ask them why they don't want it, they say, "We don't need it." And the Sunday School churches did not need a debate on that—and for the same reason. They need just one side of it, and they have arranged for teaching and preaching among the churches publicly and privately on "the cup question," "so you see, like all digressives, they need just one side of it. They can not stand for the Bible light to be turned on. It would spoil their game. But the Judgment is coming, and they, with all the churches, will meet it there, and on the Bible, too. Brother Harper made this plain.

Bro. Cowan affirmed for four sessions of two hours each that—"The cup" as used by Christ

in Matt. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same.

Bro. Harper affirmed that "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid."

Bro. Cowan soon ran out of material on his proposition and began to bring in personalities and also tried to patch up his defeat with Bro. Musgrave on the number of cups to drink from in the Lord's Supper. I demanded that the disputants be held to the propositions, But Bro. J. W. Kelly, who was moderating for Bro. Cowan demanded that Cowan be permitted to take his own course where he would, and since we had failed to provide a Chairman moderator as the rules provided for, I gave in to Kelly rather than stop the debate. But it soon was made clear that Cowan came to the debate to sling mud, even bringing up epithets he said Dr. Trott had used in letters he had, and letters about others which he read publicly, some of those being dead and some absent, with no opportunity of defense, to which Bro. Harper replied in a way befitting to meet such low-down tactics. Cowan surrendered his proposition, as Harper showed, when he answered the first question put up to him, namely, "What word in the Greek gives the name of the Lord's Supper?" It says, "And he took a cup," Matt. 26:27. Cowan answered, "Poterion." Harper then turned to Thayer and read, "poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel." So the name of the vessel which Jesus 'took' when he instituted the Lord's Supper" It says, "And he took a 'cup,' as used by Christ here was not 'the fruit of the vine,' all could plainly see. This not only overthrew Cowan's proposition, but it also established Harper's.

Bro. Harper then submitted the testimony of Dr. Ropes, Head of New Testament Greek, Harvard University, who, in answer to the question, "Are 'the cup' as used in Matt. 26:27, and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" says, "No. The contents of the cup and the fruit of the vine are the same." And in answer to the question, "Is the word 'cup' as used in Matt. 26:27 the name of a solid?" answer, "Yes." Now you do not wonder why Cowan tried to keep away from his proposition by a resort to personalities, even bringing in the dead.

Bro. Harper asked, "Do gennema and poterion mean the same thing?" Cowan answered, "Not the same." Harper then showed that gennema is the word for "fruit," in the "fruit of the vine," and that poterion is the word for "cup," the vessel which contained the fruit of the vine. are not "one and the same" by Cowan's own admission.

Bro. Harper then submitted this syllogism: 1. The cup as used in Matt. 26:27 was the name of the vessel which contained the fruit of the vine. (This by C's ans. to question 1.) 2. The vessel which contained the fruit of the vine, was not the fruit of the vine. (Axiomatic, or self-evident) Therefore, the cup as used in Matt. 26:27 was not the fruit of the vine.

Cowan submitted several syllogisms, all which Harper answered in one speech, showing the fallacy to be *figura dictionis*, and he cited C. to the page in the Logic, where he could see for himself. And Cowan fell again. Harper then asked Cowan to submit the syllogism that he had submitted to Bro. Musgrave at the Lorenzo debate, on what the cup is; but Cowan was done with syllogism.

He tried to escape by asserting that the "cup" in Matt. 26:27 is used by metonymy Bro. Harper then submitted the answer of Dr. Ropes, Professor of N. T. Greek, of Harvard, who, in answer to the question, "Is the word translated 'cup' in Matt. 26:27 there used literally?" answers, "Yes." And he submitted Thayer, the Standard Lexicon for N. T. Greek, who cites Matt. 26:27 under the literal use of cup. Cowan would not notice this, but fell to blackguarding about Rev. 17:4, as though Thayer had made a mistake in citing this under the literal use of cup. It seems that some would rather wade through a cesspool than to go the way of truth.

Bro. Harper then showed that he could admit for the argument's sake that "cup" is used by metonymy in Mat. 26:27 and still it would not make "cup" as then used there the same as the fruit of the vinne, for "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is present to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams, p. 200.

Then "cup," the solid, is named, that is, "cup" is the name of the vessel. And "The cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are not one and the same. Cup is the name of the vessel and is named to suggest its contents; and it is impossible for them to be "one and the same."

Bro. Harper then submitted this syllogism: 1. The Cup as used in Matt. 26:27 is used by metonymy. (Cowan's assumption) 2. In this kind of metonymy the cup is named to suggest its contents. ("3. Container and contents," Williams, p. 220) Therefore, the cup in Mt. 26:27 is named to suggest its contents.

But the cup was not its contents. (Self-evident.) Its contents was "the fruit of the vine," v. 28. Therefore, the "cup" as used in Mt. 26:27 was not the fruit of the vine. And Cowan went down again.

But he made another dodge, asserting that "the fruit of the vine" is the blood" (Mt. 26:28), and "the fruit of the vine is the New Testament," Lk. 22:20; I Cor. 11:25. But it was pointed out that this makes the "blood" the same thing as the "New Testament." Bro. Harper then produced Thayer, who says of these texts: "In both which the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" p. 15. Here "cup" is just as clearly distinguished from "wine" as is the "new covenant" from the "blood," showing that the wine when in the cup on the

Lord's table, is the blood; and that the cup containing wine, is the New Covenant. But Cowan, after accepting these Scriptures in his effort to make "the fruit of the vine" and "the cup" one and the same thing, now tried to make it appear that these texts were not inspired Scriptures, because the compilers of one Greek text omitted them. He fought hard to keep on his feet, but went down.

Bro. Harper asked, "Do 'drink this cup' and drink this fruit of the vine mean the same thing?" Cowan said, "Yes." Bro. Harper then showed that one could drink this fruit of the vine without drinking this cup; hence they do not mean the same thing. "How can one 'drink this cup'?" By drinking what it contains, and in no other way.—N. L. Clark. Drink the cup, "that is, what is in the cup." Thayer, p. 510. But if commanded simply to drink the fruit of the vine, one can drink it from any vessel whatever that contains it, whether a cup or not. And the "cup," if used, is not "the fruit of the vine."

Bro. Harper called attention to where Cowan had said, "If the Bible said one container, as it does one body, one faith, immersion, etc. I would say no more."

It was pointed out that Cowan admits that poterion is the name of the vessel which Christ took, and this is "a cup." It says, "And he took a cup," Matt. 26:27. And "a" means "one," therefore he took one cup; and the Bible as plainly says one as it says one faith, etc. Cowan was stuck. But he tried to get out by saying, I said "container." Yes, and "cup" here is a container, and one. And Cowan, in honor bound, should have no more to say. He has written his finis.

He went to Webster's "5. wine of the communion," under "cup." Bro. Harper then put two squares on the board, and put *baptisma* and "baptism" into one, and poterion and "cup" into the other; and said when Cowan goes outside of poterion for an idea of "cup" by Webster or anybody else, he goes outside of *baptisma* for an idea of "baptism" and must take "sprinkle" or "pour" as well as immersion. And for the same reason he can go outside of eis to get an idea of "for" in Acts 2:38 and take "because of," and is using sectarian "bunk" to bolster up what he cannot sustain by the truth. Poterion is defined "a cup, a drinking vessel." *Baptisma* is "immersion." — Thayer.

Bro. Harper then read from a letter from the "EDITOR" of "The New Standard Dictionary," under date of August 1, 1930, this: "There is a rhetorical figure called metonymy by which that which is contained in a vessel may be expressed by the name of the container. Accordingly, the wine in a cup is not a 'definition' of cup but merely a rhetorical use by which the container is used for the contained." Even by taking this "rhetorical use," cup, the vessel, is named to suggest its contents. And they, the cup, and its contents, the fruit of vine, are not "one and the same." Now let the cups churches get behind Cowan and

put him up if they want the light turned on for the people to see where the truth lies on "the cup question." H. C. Welch.

(Continued)

LET US WORK

Dear Brethren: I am in a position to do some preaching. I would like to be kept busy. If there was ever a time in the world's history when the church should use its full strength and fight in behalf of primitive Christianity, that time is now, when the world is flooded with every kind of religious "junk" in the form of digression and sectarian doctrine. Digressives and sectarians are exerting themselves with money and labor as never before, it seems, in behalf of departures from the Word of God. They are spending millions for fine church houses and for spreading their systems of error; while the church of Christ, as a whole, is spending only dimes. O, for a zeal and courage to "Contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints."

Brethren, let us push "The Truth," the only paper that stands four-square for a "Thus saith the Lord" for every item of doctrine and practice of the church. It should be put out every week, and if we will do our duty, it won't be long now until it is coming to us every week. Let us wake up, and work to this end while life is ours and opportunity is before us, and our children who are faithful will rise up to bless us for holding the fort for them against such dreadful odds. Brethren, act before time is no more for us. Do not let a few bear the heavy burden. You need the blessing that comes from the fight to "keep the faith." May God bless you. Let us work while it is day: the night cometh when no man can work. Humbly, your brother in Christ, W. T. Taylor.

OUR HELPERS

Chas. T. Cook\$5.00
A. J. Bond 1.00

Walter W. Leamons, Salado, Ark.—Since last report I have preached at Mt. View, Batesville, Rosie, Salado, Sharpe, and New Hope near Sulphur Rock, all in Ark. Seven were baptized and a number reclaimed.

Dr. W. W. Stone, Palacios, Texas.—I missed the date of the Harper-Cowan debate at Graham, Texas, and did not get to hear it—a great disappointment to me; but I saw Bro. Pursley there, and went to Grub Hill Schoolhouse and held a two-weeks' meeting, which resulted in 33 baptisms, and a number of restorations. The church was greatly edified and strengthened.

C. H. Williams, So. Charleston, W. Va.—The church here is doing well, meeting every payment on the house when due. If the Lord wills, I shall assist I. G. (my brother), in a meeting at Mallory Chapel the second week in Sept. I have conducted the funeral of Bro. Squire Vancamps, who for 27

years preached the gospel faithfully, dying at the advanced age of 86; and that of Sister Carpenter, who was 82, and had been a faithful member of the church for 65 years. We hope to stir up the churches to greater activity. We want that written discussion with Cowan, announced in the September 1st issue, sure. And we want Brother Harper up here this fall again to help us in the work. My health is not good, but I am doing all I can to build up the churches according to the New Testament pattern.

PASSED ON

Wire reached us from Dunbar, W. Va., Sept. 9, 1930, by Bro. I. G. Williams, saying, "My brother, C. H. Williams, passed peacefully into heaven at four A. M. this morning." The Cause has lost a valuable worker in Bro. Williams, and the South Charleston, W. Va., church a faithful preacher of the gospel. May the sustaining hand of our heavenly Father give strength to the bereaved ones to bear the sorrow that has come to them, and may they sorrow not as those that have no hope in Jesus. Bro. Williams endeared himself to all who knew him by his devotion to the Cause of Christ. His last report reached us just a few days before his death, and is found in this issue of "The Truth."—H. C. Harper.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Aug. 28, 1930.—I closed a meeting with the loyal brethren, in Sulphur, Okla., the 17th inst., which resulted in three baptisms and one restoration. This was my first effort with the Sulphur brethren, and I enjoyed the meeting very much. So far as I was able to learn the church was at peace and satisfied with the Bible way of worshipping God. They asked me to return for another meeting next year.

I am now in a series of meetings with the faithful brethren, meeting at Greenfield, New Mex. The meeting starts off pretty well, with good crowds and fair attention. I go next to L. F. D., near Roswell, then back to Missouri for two meetings. Pray for me and the work of the Lord.

G. B. Harrell, Floresville, Texas.—My meeting at Allum resulted in three baptisms, one of them a married lady.

NEW MEXICO NOTES

I assisted the brethren at Portales, N. Mex., in July, which resulted in two baptisms and one restored, and I hope that much good was otherwise done. Fine brethren at Portales, who have come through the fiery trials of innovations, but they will win if they will continue faithful.

The Lord willing, I am to assist the brethren at Hatch, N. Mex., in a meeting, beginning September 28, and continue two weeks.

Bro. Homer L. King closed a very interesting and profitable meeting with the church at Greenfield, N. M., with three baptisms and three restored, and the church greatly strengthened. This is my home church, and we have had a hard struggle here against innovations; but the truth is gaining with the people.

THE TRUTH

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

Vol III.

SNEADS, FLORIDA, NOVEMBER 1, 1930

No. 16

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

Third Affirmative

Bro. T. E. challenged special investigation on the point when I argued that the Passover was in the feast of unleavened bread. I accepted, and quoted Matt. 26:17, and that seemed to have made the investigation considerably less important, for he now says, "I deny that the Passover was in the feast of unleavened — only in the fact that the sacrifices offered during the seven days of unleavened bread were distinguished, and cited Lev. 23: 5, 6, to show that the Passover was on the 14th and the feast of unleavened bread on the 15th; and this helps to understand the purpose or design of each sacrifice." You denied it, Bro., simply because you were in error. As for distinguishing the sacrifices of Num. 15:1-5, that's exactly what you tried to prevent me doing, for when I argued that the Passover was a sacrifice in one of their solemn feasts and the scripture therefor included it, you said: "I'll say right here that this sacrifice is a separate and distinct sacrifice from the Passover lamb. Why? Because 1. it was an offering by fire; (2) It had a different bread commanded; (3) it's purpose or design was to perform a vow or make a sweet savour." (Emphasis in quotation mine). When I showed, in reply to No. 3 that different kinds of sacrifices were referred to in that scripture, you saw your feet slip again, just as they did in the "special investigation." Now he says, "I'm glad you're beginning to make distinction in the sacrifices of your proof-text, and the further you go the less you will find for your contention until you get to zero." Now listen, the next time one of your arguments fails, do anything you like with it except try to put it off on me.

In replying to his objection No. 1 above I quoted Deut. 12:27 to show that the blood of the Passover was burned upon the altar. It reads: "And thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of the Lord thy God: and the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar of the Lord thy God, and thou shalt eat the flesh." I asked, "What sacrifice does this mean, Bro.?" He answered, "They were 'burnt offerings,' as it says." I know people can be mistaken in the interpretation of Scripture, but I simply cannot comprehend the idea of any one failing to see the distinction between the "burnt offerings" and "sacrifice" of the above verse, when it plainly says to offer the flesh and the blood of the burnt offering upon the altar and offer the blood of the sacrifice upon the altar and eat the flesh. Suppose you submit this to the Professor of Logic along with our propositions (Yes, you

may submit our propositions to him, mine and yours, the word "is" in my proposition included, and ask him if I am not debating the issue), and ask him if the sacrifices in this verse are the burnt offerings "as it says."

I suppose Bro. T. E. will say in his reply he is glad I am beginning to distinguish the burnt offering from the sacrifice in Deut. 12:27. The next effort Bro. T. makes to sustain objection No. 1 is that a portion of the blood sacrifices was for the priest; this required the breaking of the animal's bones; the bones of the Passover lamb were not to be broken and so it was not an offering by fire. But "This is the law of the burnt offering, of the meal offering, and of the sin offering, and the trespass offering, and the consecrations, and of the sacrifice of the peace offerings," (Lev. 7:37), not the law of the Passover. I denied No. 2, in which he said, "It had a different bread commanded," and called on him for proof. As the statement is an unfounded assertion, he gave none. He does ask if I use the same bread in the Lord's Supper. If is used grits and gravy it would not be worth one cent to prove his statement. I deny that "It had a different bread commanded," so bring on the proof. As for No. 3, "It's purpose or design was to perform a vow or make a sweet savour," I disproved this by a distinction in the sacrifices referred to and now he himself makes this distinction, hence all his objections are unfounded, and the argument that wine was made a part of the Passover when Israel entered Canaan is established by the Scriptures. Bro. Smith does not deny that Christ and the apostles ate the Passover, and I am sure that he will not deny that in obeying this command of God, that they went according to the law. So when Peter and John prepared the Passover, the blood of the lamb was offered upon the altar by the priests and with this lamb they brought a drink offering of wine, the fruit of the vine. This drink offering was poured out upon the altar, as Bro. T. E. says.

Bro. T. E. is wrong again when he judges that I used Num. 15:2-5 to prove that God commanded Israel to drink wine in the Passover. I am proving exactly what Scriptures teach on the question, and he cannot meet it, therefore he wants to have me proving something else. He says, "I completely headed him off," but I have failed to get even a glimpse of him ahead of me except when he bobbed up in the road with something I did not say. Referring to the facts I laid down in my first affirmative he says, "You so coupled this up that the reader would infer that the 'wine' of Num. 15:2-5 was drunk in their feasts, and not poured on the sacrifice as it actually was." He can't attack the facts I laid down with effect and now he

is objecting to the way I "coupled" them up. I doubt not that when a study of God's truth reveals the fact that God commanded wine, the fruit of the vine, as a drink offering in the Passover, and His Son, Jesus Christ, drank the fruit of the vine upon that sacred occasion when he ate the last Passover with his apostles and instituted the Lord's Supper, they will infer that the Father and Son were united and used the same drink. Bro. T. E. knows this as well as I, hence he saw the necessity of sidetracking the conclusion of the reader. I understand Bro. Smith to refer to what is taught by Schaff Herzogg as to a custom. "Jesus Christ used this expression (The fruit of the vine) to designate the wine partaken of at the eating of the last Passover with his apostles when he instituted the Lord's Supper." (Hewitt Smith).

"The Jews have, from time immemorial, used this expression (the fruit of the vine to designate the wine partaken of on sacred occasions, as at the Passover and on the evening of the Sabbath." (Schaff Herzogg).

Every time God commanded a drink offering, He commanded "wine." But according to Bro. T. E.'s theology this element may have been non-alcoholic. God says, "And the drink offering thereof shall be the fourth part of an hin for the one lamb: in the holy place shall thou cause the strong wine (strong drink. R. V.) to be poured unto the Lord for a drink offering." (Num. 28:7. This conclusively proves two things: 1. That the drink offering was strong drink; 2. that by commanding "wine" he caused "strong drink" to be poured and therefore, in God's phraseology, "wine" is "strong drink," and cannot be otherwise.

Having traced the fruit of the vine in the Old Testament and found that in God's appointments it was fermented and alcoholic, I will say that all can learn from history of the use of the phrase itself (The fruit of the vine) is that it was a consecrated, poetical expression used by the Jews to designate wine and if this is true, the fact that Christ employed it in speaking of the drink of the Lord's Supper, and said nothing to indicate that his use of it was a departure from the then current usage of it among those with whom he was associated, certainly indicates that the element to which he applied it was fermented and alcoholic.

After the Lord established the church and the Lord's Supper was observed by His followers, the drink element, the fruit of the vine, was fermented and alcoholic. 1. In I Cor. 11:27-30, Paul teaches that the Corinthians drank the cup of the Lord unworthily. 2. In I Cor. 11:20-21, he teaches that the effect was that some of them were drunken. From the fact that God commanded the use of wine, the fruit of the vine, in the feasts under the law; because of the fact that Jesus used wine, the fruit of the vine, in instituting the Lord's Supper, and because of the fact that the church used wine, the fruit of the vine, under apostolic sanction and because wine is fermented and alcoholic; this being proven by its definition and usage, it is not strange that the consent of the learned and common sense of all others who read the Bible unite in the conclusion that the element

Christ appointed was fermented and alcoholic.

Bro. T. E. though, contends that there is wine which is not fermented and alcoholic. He asks, "Is alcoholic wine the only kind of wine from grapes?" Just remove the word "alcoholic" from your question and I am sure you will cease to be confused. Now if you wish to rescue your element from the loose use of language, you are welcome to the task. I do not know that you will be any worse off, for you might as well get your use of the word "wine" completely away from Webster's definition as to have him say in plain terms that your use of the word is a loose use of language. Bro. T. E. says that "whordom and wine" are ranked together as twin evils in the Bible. I see no reason why he would have brought that idea into this debate unless he means to convey the idea that wine is such regardless of the extent to which it is used. According to that logic, God had the children of Israel offering drink offerings of the twin evil of whordom unto him for some fourteen-hundred years in their solemn feasts, and the first recorded miracle of His Son, Jesus Christ, was to turn water into the twin evil of whordom for folks to drink at a marriage feast. (John 2: 1-11) But I am persuaded that neither God nor Christ was loose, either in language or morals. Hewitt Smith (April 15, 1930).

Third Negative

(Letter)

Wesson, Miss., April 30, 1930.

To the Professor of Logic,
University of Mississippi.

Dear Sir: Be so kind as to pass upon the following matter pertaining to the proposition here submitted: No. 1. The Scriptures teach that "The fruit of the vine" of Matt. 26:29, Mark 14:25, and Luke 22:18 is fermented, alcoholic, and is unleavened wine, and is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

By the wording of this proposition is the affirmant logically bound to meet the issue here raised that fermented, alcoholic fruit of the vine of the texts named is "unleavened wine"? Or if this is not an issue in this proposition, please so state here. We will thank you very much for a prompt reply.

Very truly yours,
T. E. Smith.

(Reply)

University of Miss., May 5, 1930.

Mr. T. E. Smith,
Wesson, Miss.

Dear Sir: This has been delivered to me. I am not sure that I understand just what you wish my opinion on. Your proposition affirms three facts, namely; The Scriptures teach that the "fruit of the vine" mentioned in certain passages, is alcoholic, fermented. Second, that the Scriptures teach that it is "unleavened wine," and third that the Scriptures teach that it is the drink element of the Lord's Supper.

I think that to sustain the proposition as written you must affirm that the wine of the Lord's Supper is "unleavened" and fermented. But per-

sonally I doubt your ability to show that the "Scriptures teach" this.

Very truly,
W. D. Hedlestone,
Department of Logic.

Here is the proposition analyzed and passed upon by the Professor of Logic; and the reader can see that he has evaded his proposition from the first on the term "unleavened wine." He said, "I am not discussing the issue over the term 'unleavened' for the reason that the proposition containing that issue was rejected and the ones we have signed contained no such issue." (3rd aff.) But it is an issue in the one he signed and is now debating.

The first rule for honorable controversy says, "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 them. If this be not done, the dispute is liable to be, in a great degree, verbal. Arguments will be misapplied, because the parties engaged in it have different apprehensions of the question." (Hedge's Elements of Logic).

Now, if the brother wants an honorable debate, let him define the terms of his proposition. And let him prove by the "Scriptures" that "the fruit of the vine" of the texts mentioned is "unleavened wine," as well as "fermented and alcoholic." I'm sure he will admit the bread used was unleavened. But was it "fermented"? It was "unleavened wine," that was "the fruit of the vine" here, he affirms, and he affirms that it was "fermented and alcoholic." Let him prove it by the teaching of "the Scriptures." We both agree that the drink element was "unleavened wine." And we can narrow the debate and settle the matter by determining whether "unleavened wine" is "fermented and alcoholic," as he affirms, or whether "unleavened wine" is unfermented and non-alcoholic," as I shall affirm. He now has the laboring oar, and must use it to sustain his contention, or fail. Our readers can see that he has evaded the real issue all the time.

I now notice the few things that his third article contains. He fears that I'm "sidetracking" the conclusion of our readers. Says that I denied the Passover was a sacrifice in the "feast of unleavened bread." Just turn to my first negative and you will see that it was the distinction of the sacrifices, that of the Passover and the others during this feast, that I had reference to. And this spoiled his argument. The Passover came on the 14th and the feast of unleavened bread on the 15th (Lev. 23:5, 6) Let him grapple with this. I shall examine every proof-text he offers where an offering is required, to see what that offering was for, its purpose or design. And by applying this rule to the brother's strongest text, Num. 15: 1 to 5, where he first tried to take the wine from the offering "by fire," and put this wine in the Passover with the Paschal lamb, it soon revealed the fact that this wine of Num. 5:1 to 5 was commanded with offerings that had a different purpose or design from that of the Paschal lamb. This rule also made manifest the fact that the of-

ferings in Num. 15, carried with them a meat (meal) offering that I want the brother to show, if he can, was ever commanded with the Paschal lamb. The brother left this, and tried to take the wine from the offerings made by fire. And now he is trying to take the Paschal lamb from the Passover supper and put it in the offerings made by fire. He says the Passover lamb was an offering by fire. And he cites Deut. 12:27 to show that the blood of the Paschal lamb was poured upon the altar. But these sacrifices which he referred to, that he says included the Passover lamb, he says were not burnt offerings or offerings by fire; so down goes his proof-text again, since he says the Passover lamb was an offering by fire. This rule will rout him from any text when we make the distinctions in the sacrifices and find out the purpose or design. I showed that the Paschal lamb was not an offering made by fire, because the Paschal law required that no bones be broken, while that for offerings made by fire required the breaking of the animal's bones. But he says this is not the law of the Passover. Now let us see if the Passover was an offering by fire whether it does not come under this law. In Num. 18:9 it is shown that a portion of all their holy offering was reserved from the fire for the sustenance of the priest; therefore if the Paschal lamb was an offering by fire, it must be divided for the priest and his sons, and this would necessitate the breaking of the bones. And to do this would make God's laws for the sacrifices contradict each other. And here is the brother's predicament. He says he did distinguish the sacrifices of Num. 15. He just began the task, and then dodged off, saying, "Only one in performing a vow. Another in a free will offering, and another in your solemn feasts such as the Passover. Then I asked him to tell us what was the sacrifice required in each case. Has he told us? No, and if he will do it, he will find no place here (Num. 15:1-5) for the Paschal lamb. You have not established by the Scriptures that when Israel entered the land of Canaan wine was made a part of the Passover. I can use this rule of yours of moving God's sacrifice out of their place, and prove that wine was used with the "scape goat" borne into the wilderness. Christ and the apostles went according to the law of the Passover in eating it. Very well. Now, what did that law require? A lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, not a bone of the lamb to be broken. (Ex. 12:8; Num. 9:13) The use of wine at the Paschal feast was not enjoined by the law. He has tried to leave the impression all along that the "drink offering" of the law was wine to drink. He used the expression "partaken of" in this connection, and he quoted Schaff as saying "partaken of" in this connection; and Dr. Trail, who joined him in writing a tract on "fermented wine," says the wine was drunk. What does Schaff mean by "partaken of," and what does the brother mean by it if not to drink it? But it was not drunk, as he now admits in referring to Peter and John preparing it, where he says that this drink offering was poured out upon the altar. Christ and the apostles

(Continued on page 5)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips.

BRO. C. H. WILLIAMS

Bro. C. H. Williams (blessed be his memory) is no more upon earth! God took him to Himself on September 9, 1930.

Bro. Williams lived at Spring Hill, W. Va., and was an Elder in the Church of Christ at South Charleston, W. Va., and preached the gospel in regions beyond as he had opportunity.

I met Bro. Williams in April (I think) of 1928, when I made my first trip to W. Va. I made my home with him while I was preaching in the South Charleston meeting house. I learned then to love him, and this love increased as I learned more of his godly life. When I went to Charleston in November, 1928, to debate with Ira C. Moore, of the Christian Leader, on the Sunday School issue, I found Bro. Harper there in a good meeting. He was staying with Bro. Williams, and I stayed with them. When I returned to Charleston in August, 1929, I again made my home with Bro. Williams. His home was always "the preacher's home," and "Clem and Georgia," as he and his good wife were familiarly known, knew how to make a preacher of the gospel feel at home.

He was gassed and shell-shocked in the World War, and his mother received word from the War Department that he was "killed in action." But this report was a mistake. His health has not been good since he was in the War, and I was not surprised to hear of his death.

Bro. Williams was the father of two bright, well-behaved little children, Roger and Thelma, aged about eight and nine years. They were bringing them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

When I heard of his untimely death, I wrote Sister Williams a letter, in which I said, in part:

"Words cannot express my feeling of sadness as I write you these few words. I only wish that the Lord had called me instead of him.

"This is a sad hour for you and Roger and Thelma. But you can have no doubt that, as 'The sun of his life' went down, he had the 'blessed assurance' that the blessed Savior would lead him safely 'through the valley of the shadow of death,' and that 'To all who love the Lord the

Sun of Righteousness shall arise with healing in His wings," as Alexander Campbell said to his wife as he fell "Asleep in Jesus"—as Clem did.

"You have deep trouble and a heavy load to bear. But remember that—

'When trouble like a gloomy cloud
Has gathered thick and thundered loud,
He near my (your) soul has always stood—
His loving-kindness, O how good!

"Bro. Ira's telegram stated that Bro. Clem 'passed peacefully into Heaven,' and we know that this is true. Had he failed to 'follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth,' you could have no hope, but, knowing that his repose is a peaceful one, he being 'asleep in Jesus,' which is, indeed, a 'blessed sleep,' you need not 'sorrow as those who have no hope'."

Bro. Williams had written a number of articles concerning his experiences in the World War, and had sent the manuscript to me to correct for the printer, and hoped to soon have the book brought from the press. I was busy on this manuscript when I got the word that he was dead.

Bro. Williams was willing to learn, and was opposed to the Sunday School and the cups, and every other innovation, and was a dear friend of "THE TRUTH," and Bro. Harper. How we need him and more like him to help us in our fight against "spiritual wickedness in high places" in the Church and out of it. His work will live on, and through it, "he being dead, yet speaketh."

BROTHER ECKSTEIN AND THE HEBREW MISSION

Bro. Stephen D. Eckstein, a Jew, and a member of the church of Christ, has a mission in Dallas, Texas, where Jews go and learn of their crucified Messiah. I know but little, personally, of Bro. Eckstein, but Bro. Paul Hays, of Fresno, Calif., has been in touch with him and his work for a number of years, and he assures me that Bro. Eckstein is a loyal-hearted brother in Christ, and that he is a disciple—a learner—indeed. Here is a letter I received from Bro. Eckstein yesterday: "Dallas, Texas, Sept. 23, 1930. Mr. James Douglas Phillips, Montebello, Calif. My Dear Brother Phillips:

"Peace to thee! Your letter of September 19th to hand. I prize highly your prayers. We thank God for friends who are interested in the salvation of Israel.

"I almost envy you when I think of the blessed fellowship you must have with Bro. Hays. He is a dear friend of mine. He has been and is now a great inspiration by his ideal and sacrificing life,—imitating the meek and lowly Jesus. During these years the friendship has grown stronger between us.

"Bro. Hays' life bears eloquent testimony of a rich and spiritual experience. Dr. E. V. Wood, a staunch friend of mine, who recently met Bro. Hays, remarked to me that 'Bro. Hays is one of the foremost Bible scholars in the nation.'

"During these Jewish Holidays (Jewish New Year, etc.—Ed.), I am exceedingly busy. Large numbers of inquiring Jews enter our mission al-

most daily. Thank God!

"I am enclosing a few lines for 'The Truth.' Publish this if you can find space in your columns. Have my name put on the mailing list, and I shall send the price soon.

"Thanking you again for your interest in our Hebrew evangelical work, I am,

"BROTHER ECKSTEIN."

A careful reading of Rom. 10 and 11 will show that we should be interested in seeing Israel accept their long rejected and despised Messiah. The article mentioned in Bro. Eckstein's letter follows:

SOWING SEED ETERNAL

By Stephen D. Eckstein.

You will be thrilled with delight to learn of the wonderful awakening among the Jews toward the sin-bearing Messiah. They are not now so stubbornly rejecting Christ as formerly.

Our Hebrew Mission is situated in Dallas, in the largest State and one of the greatest Jewish cities in the Southwest. Propagating the Gospel in our Hebrew Mission Hall among the Jews has had a profound and permanent influence. Hundreds have been brought within the hearing of the Gospel, and some were convinced and converted. Our Hebrew mission serves as a meeting place to a most interesting group of inquirers. These are mostly intellectual Jewish people of both sexes.

Recently I spoke on the street in Ft. Worth, Texas, in the principal part of the Jewish section on Main Street where a goodly number of Jews heard me reveal the great truth of the New Testament in Yiddish. I also distributed Yiddish literature among my kinsmen.

The writer desires to give the following brief outline of a remarkable experience. A middle-aged Jew who was present, probably out of curiosity, as were many others, stepped forward, and in a loud tone cried out, (it is impossible to describe the anger and innate enmity toward the Crucified One and His worshippers which he manifested): 'You are Mr. Eckstein, the Missionary who is leading Jews away from the path of righteousness. Say, are you also a murderer, as my Brother Elijah is, who killed my father who was a Rabbi, — blessed be his memory? My brother's embracing Christianity caused by father bitter grief, and finally died.'

I told him as well as the rest how my kindred tried by violence to end my existence or make me give up my belief in Christ, and go back to the teaching and inculcation of my fathers. But instead they found that my enthusiasm for the salvation of souls among my brethren became greater, my inspiration and loyalty more steadfast, my determination to labor and love and fight the good fight of faith more ardent. He and others present felt the two hours discussion had been most profitable, and the spiritual atmosphere strengthening and encouraging to search the Scriptures. Who can estimate the blessings which such testimonies may bring?

As I left, that Israelite remarked, "Mr. Eckstein, maybe you are right in your arguments, perhaps we Jews did not comprehend the ideals

of the carpenter of Nazareth, and do not even now understand Him (Jesus). When you are in the city again call on me in my business establishment perhaps you will be able to convince me." (a different tone.)

I just mention this to show what a missionary among the Jews has to contend with. (another difficulty of a more serious nature in my next report.) It is not an easy matter to come to a people who are unaccustomed with, and to whom are even very strange, the claims we make. We must be very patient, loving and loyal in this respect, so as to make them understand, and make our influence felt.

I am very grateful to the Lord for the opportunity of putting Christ before the Jews in America. It will give you an idea of what a rich work it is in spite of the difficulties we encounter financially and otherwise. We go patiently toiling and suffering for the Kingdom's sake, because this work has been and still is the joy of my life. As a minister of the Gospel of Jesus the Christ, "my heart's desire and prayer to God is that Israel might be saved," we ask your earnest intercession also in their behalf.

HEBREW MISSION,
P. O. Box 1011,
Dallas, Texas.

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

(Continued from page 3)

drank "the fruit of the vine." He drops the "Scriptures" and runs to Schaff and "history" to try to connect pouring of wine upon the altar with the sacrifice and the drinking in the feast of the Passover. Why this, if the Scriptures teach it? Let him even prove, if he can, that wine was poured on the altar in the Pascal sacrifice. This demands his attention. He quotes Num. 28:7. "Strong wine to be poured unto the Lord for a drink offering." This text say the fourth part of an hin for one lamb. What was this "one lamb" for? Was this the Paschal lamb? No. This was the "daily sacrifice," every day even during the days of unleavened bread. (Num. 16:24) It could not take the place of the Paschal lamb. During the seven days of unleavened bread, even, this sacrifice, morning and evening, was offered. And during these days all leaven, ferment, was to be put away from among them; and you will have to prove that your "fermented, alcoholic" fruit of the vine, "is unleavened wine" before you can bring it in here. "Strong wine (strong drink, R. V.)" Is every "drink" wine? Which is right, the King James or the Revised? Now, this calls for some of your knowledge of the Hebrew, as you gave us in your tract. Strong with what? Define the Hebrew word. He has had much to say about what the Jews designated their wine. Didn't the Jews have wine made from barley, dates and honey? Is all "wine" the "fruit of the vine?" There seems to be something "loose" about your knowledge of things here. Why do you go to the definitions of English words to instruct us in the meaning of Hebrew and Greek words? What are lexicons for? We may find that you really have

a religious "looseness" here before you finish. Are we to take Webster for definitions of N. T. Greek and O. T. Hebrew? You are just too "loose" to get at the truth in this matter of "wine," even by your own "Webster," for it is "fruit juices of any kind" that constitute his "loosely." Did the Jews designate all their element called "wine" by a term meaning "the fruit of the vine?" Light, please.

Here is your "fermented, alcoholic," but it is not "unleavened wine." It is designated in Holy Writ as wine of astonishment (Ps. 60:3), wine of violence (Prov. 4:17), a deceiver (Prov. 20:1), wine of the condemned (Amos 2:8), such, no doubt, as Christ refused to drink. Its nature is to addle the brain, dethrone reason, plunge into debauchery, and the Good Book says not to look upon it (Prov. 23:31-33), "it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Yes, "Thine eyes shall behold strange women and thine heart shall utter perverse things. "Do you really believe that Jesus turned the water of "six water pots" (120 gal.) into this kind of wine; and were they drunk?

He says Paul teaches that the Corinthians drank the cup of the Lord unworthily, and cites I Cor. 11:27-30; and that Paul teaches that the effect was that some were drunken, and cites I Cor. 11:20, 21. But if the reader will look closely how he gets their drunken condition connected with the cup of the Lord, he will find that the brother read the thought in the text backwards. Why did he not give us what Paul said. Paul connects this drunken condition with each taking his own supper and "one is hungry and another is drunken." The brother calls this intoxicating element the fruit of the vine, as though a good tree could bring forth evil fruit, for he admits that evil grew out of its use. But Jesus says a good tree can not bring forth evil fruit. But a corrupt tree brings forth corrupt fruit. (Matt. 7:18) So if the grape vine is good, it does not produce evil fruit, such as a "fermented, alcoholic" element laden with toxin, or poison, that will intoxicate the users.

T. E. Smith.

COWAN-HARPER DISCUSSION No. 2.

As I said, although Cowan was to prove his proposition that—"The cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same, yet he put in his time on personalities, vulgarisms, the number of cups to be used, just anything to attract attention from arguments he could not meet.

His "eating a melon" was introduced in trying to make it appear that they could drink the cup by drinking out of cups. The melon was cut into several pieces, and each person ate a piece, and thus they ate a melon.

Brother Harper exploded this by just one question—Did each one eat the melon? Silence was the only answer. And after the pause, he said, "No; but each one drinks the cup when they 'drink the cup,'" for it says, "Wherefore whosoever shall . . . drink the cup in an unworthy man-

ner, shall be guilty," etc. (I Cor. 11:27.) And while "ye drink the cup" (I Cor. 11:26) each one (whosoever) drinks the cup (I Cor. 11:27) in so doing. "How can one 'drink the cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark) By drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer.) Each one drinks "what is in the cup" (Thayer), "what it contains" (Clark) and thus they drink the cup. And they can do it in "no other way."

Cowan dropped this, and went to "the simple axiom" — "The whole is equal to the sum of all its parts"—for proof of the use of cups to drink from. But Brother Harper knocked down his cob house again. He said, "Cowan, hand me your watch. I will then break the crystal into a thousand pieces, and give it all back to you, and don't you whine, for "the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts."

Cowan replied, "That is different." "True," replied Bro. Harper, "and I am glad you can see there is a difference." He then called attention to the page in the Logic that exposes the fallacy of applying the mathematical (quantitative whole), "The whole is equal to the sum of all its parts," to the qualitative whole. Mathematically all the parts of the broken crystal equal the whole; but qualitatively there is much difference, and so of the liquid in a cup when put into cups. The qualitative "marks" are not the same. Cowan was dumfounded.

He then jumped to—"Jesus said divide it, but did not say how."

Brother Harper then called attention to the Living Oracles and other Bible translations that read "share it," and that Jesus "took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it" (Matt. 26:27) and "they all drank out of it" (Mark 14:23), and cited the Greek scholarship for the translation "out of or from it." And thus they "shared" or "divided" it. Also they were to "drink the cup," as in I Cor. 10:21 and 11:26, 27. And they can do this only "by drinking what it contains" (Clark), by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer). And this is how they obeyed the command of Christ, and "in no other way."

Brother Harper then read a letter from the Editor of "The New Standard Dictionary." "Question: 1. What would one have to do in order to drink from or out of a cup?" Answer: "One drinks out of or from a cup, when one places a cup to one's lips and drinks. Question: 2. Must one put one's lips to a cup and drink in order to drink from or out of a cup?" Answer: 2. "Certainly one must place a cup to one's lips in order to drink out of or from it." (Signed) THE LEXICOGRAPHER.

Cowan was not able to cope with this evidence against his position, so he put in his time talking about a portion of writing from a letter by Dr. James H. Ropes, Professor of Greek, Harvard University, insinuating and intimating that Brother Harper had marked it out. This was dirty and mean, but it served to call attention from facts Brother Harper had put up that Cowan was not able to refute. Under date of September 6, Dr.

Ropes says, "What I had written was marked out by me." The "it" was supplied in the Authorized version, and Bro. Harper had asked about the Greek. But Cowan, like a drowning man, was simply "grabbing around" in despair while going down.—H. C. Welch.

EXAMPLES (First Article)

In every-day life we often hear the remark when some great disaster takes place — "That ought to serve as an example." For instance, a man in a car tries to cross the railroad track ahead of a fast-moving train, and his car is struck and he and family are killed; and indeed that should serve as an example to us that we may use more precaution.

It is plainly seen that we have examples in things earthly. The Bible furnishes us with many examples that are of far greater value to us than these. Both in the Old and in the New Testament we have examples of those who do God's will and are blessed for so doing contrasted with those who disobey and must suffer the consequences of their rashness; yet how few seem to take notice and profit by these examples. In First Corinthians we read in the 10th chapter: "Now all these things happened unto them for examples, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world have come. In Gen. 4:3, 4, both Cain and Abel offered gifts, but the Lord had respect to Abel's offering and rejected Cain's. Cain had authority from the Lord to make an offering, but he substituted an offering of his own instead of the Lord's. Cain became jealous of his brother, and slew him. Here we have a picture of the first vain religion, a worship after man's way. Seth was born to take the place of Abel; and to Seth was born Enos. Then men began to call upon the name of the Lord. In the course of time, the sons of God saw the daughters of men were fair and took wives of them. Who were the sons of God? And who were the daughters of men? The sons of God were descendents of Seth, and the daughters of man were the descendents of Cain, the first idolator. What was the result of this mixture? Wickedness and folly, and the Lord's decision to destroy man with a flood of waters. Gen. 6:7. Thus we see the awful results of an idolatrous mixture in religion. But Noah, who was perfect in his generation, with his wife and three sons and their wives, was chosen to repeople the earth. The wicked were destroyed, but the righteous were saved.

The Israelites were the chosen of God; hence a type of the church. They were the smallest of seven nations, yet they were the chosen of God; so let no one be discouraged about the small number in the church.

In Ex. 32 we read how the people persuaded Aaron to make a calf and how they sacrificed to have this thing done to their notion, just as many are doing now. What was the result of this. About three thousand were slain. The Israelites were commanded to destroy the altars, break the images, cut down the groves of other nations, and

make no covenant with them,—warning to us today, for our God is a jealous God. Why mix and mingle with that which is not of God?

When Israel took Jerico (Josh. 6:18), Achin took of the accursed thing, and the people could not stand before the men of Ai. Achin had to be killed before God would prosper his people. There are those today who have taken of the accursed thing, even uniting in meetings—"union meetings"—and do not seem to realize the difference between the things of God and those of man. Geo. A. Moore, Gothenburg, Nebr.

I AM WITH YOU

To the brethren at large, greeting:

This will let you know that I stand against all innovations and am with you in the fight to rid the church of Christ of all such. I am for the teaching of the Old Book that has stood the test of the ages, and will face us at the Judgment Bar of God. Let those take chances who will and barter away their souls. Digression is digression no matter who practices it. Let us still say with Paul, "Let God be true, but every man a liar" when it comes to God's word. Some cry down the "instrumental music in the worship" and go on with their "Bible School," Sunday School, women teachers and classes; hired "Pastors" and cups to drink from in the communion, things that are "contrary to sound doctrine". I want to write some for the paper soon. I intend hereafter to turn all my support to "The Truth" paper as I believe it is the only paper that is contending for the Bible way. And others are waking up to this fact, too. Success to you all in this fight for the right to maintain the supremacy of our King. With much love. D. F. Watson, Broken Bow, Okla., Box 666.

H. C. Welch, Morton, Texas.—Just closed a good meeting at Bula, Texas, a mission point, eighteen miles west of Littlefield. Good crowds and good interest all the way through. To hold such meetings is a great pleasure to me, where people appreciate gospel preaching. Two were baptized, a Primitive Baptist and his wife, and two restored. My next meeting will be at Hobbs, N. Mex.

Success to "The Truth," the only paper now standing for the Word of God against all humanisms in the worship. Now let Littlefield put up Cowan on the CUPS if they really think his debating can kill the "one cup idea." Why not?

Walter W. Leamons, Salado, Ark.—Since last report I have preached at Bradford, Judsonia, Grand Glaise, and White Hall, Ark. Am now in a mission effort at Stillman Farms in Miss. Co.

C. H. Lee, Phillipsburg, Mo.—Our meeting commenced on Saturday night before the 5th Lord's day in August, and closed the second Lord's day night in September. The preaching was done by Bro. R. B. Musgrave, and to say it was done well is putting it mildly. Although there were no additions, we feel that lasting good was done, and we expect to reap from the good seed sown.

R. C. Crawford, Plant City, Florida. — Have preached at the following places since May 1st: Mount Olive church—seven baptized; Santa Fe—fourteen baptized; Central schoolhouse — seven baptized; Chiefland—eighteen baptized and seven restored to fellowship.

W. V. Anderson, D. C., Ph.C., Sarasota, Florida, Box 1384.—It has been my pleasure to receive a few copies of "The Truth" recently, and I must say that I am favorably impressed with its contents; and I am glad to learn of such a publication, and hope it may soon have a greater circulation as it is much needed. I hope to be in position to do more later. Please enter my name.

OUR HELPERS

S. E. Fletcher, California	-----\$5.00
Tom Stark, California	-----2.50
B. M. Massengale	-----1.00

Homel L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Oct. 13, 1930.— Since last report, I closed a good meeting with the faithful brethren, meeting at Greenfield, New Mex., on the night of Sept. 7, embracing three Lord's days. The visible results were three baptized and three restored. I assisted these brethren in a series of meetings last year, but the attendance this year was almost double that of last year. One of those baptized was a man of sixty years of age, who had been a Baptist for many years.

Greenfield is the home congregation of our beloved Bro. T. F. Thomasson, whose address is Lake Arthur, N. Mex., a splendid gospel preacher of much ability, and one who is true to the Book in doctrine and practice. In fact, the congregation there owes its existence to the untiring and sacrificing efforts of Bro. Thomasson. Right here, I wish to state that I am personally acquainted with Bro. Thomasson, and have heard him preach, and I unhesitatingly commend him to the loyal congregations everywhere as one worthy of your support in the work of the Lord. You will make no mistake in calling him if you want the Bible way of worshipping God. He is one of the best song leaders that it has ever been my pleasure of hearing, and he did much to make the meeting a success at Greenfield.

From Greenfield, I went to the L. F. D. congregation, near Roswell, and continued about two weeks in a series of meetings with the faithful ones there. The results there were beyond our expectations. If I remember correctly, fourteen noble souls were baptized into Christ and a number restored; several confessed faults. To God be all the praise.

I go next to Freedom, near Montreal, Mo. Pray for me and the work.

(By an oversight Bro. Thomasson's name and address were omitted from his "New Mexico Notes" in the October 1 issue. Address him at Lake Arthur, N. Mex., R. 1.—Editor.)

NOTICE.—Bro. W. T. Taylor, Rt. 1, De Leon, Texas, is thinking of going to New Mexico to take up a homestead in the near future, and would like

to hold several short meetings and thus get acquainted with the churches and the country. Bro. Taylor has been with us from the first issue of the Way and "The Truth," and is tried and true.—Ed.

NOTICE

Any one desiring to locate in a good country where we don't have to depend exclusively on rainfall address me at Gothenburg, Nebr. We are desirous to settle Christians with their families here. Geo. A. Moore.

G. W. Pasley, Wawai, Wash.—I thank you for a sample copy of "The Truth." I am glad there is one paper that stands for the truth and is not afraid to publish both sides of any question where it concerns the manner of the worship of God. I had begun to feel a little like Elijah, but now I take courage and press on. Will send in my subscription, and now say to you, many, many thanks.

A WAYWARD FATHER'S MESSAGE

The following message was sent to a son by a broken-hearted father from a jail cell:

"It is with a heart full of sadness that I write you from the county jail, where I am now confined. I am in an iron cell eight by sixteen feet, where I am kept day and night. The room contains only an iron bedstead, a hard mattress, and some blankets. If you live to be old enough, I want you to visit this place, where your father spent his last days, and let my fate be a lesson to you. My cell is the second on the right. As you look in, I hope that you will realize that right here I spent many an hour of fear and anguish on account of your welfare. Many times have I hugged you to my breast; and while I loved you with all the tender affection that a father can feel for his baby, I would rather you had died in infancy than to follow the life I have lived.

"One thing is the earnest wish of your father, that you do right in all things from the time you are old enough to know right from wrong. You will meet with evil temptations, but never submit to the first temptation to do wrong. Be industrious and economical, love and fear God, and success will crown your efforts. Remember that poverty does not degrade you or make you unhappy. Nothing will degrade you but sin. 'The wages of sin is death.'

"Above all, never touch a drop of whiskey or any strong drink. Every drunkard has seen the time when he could let drink alone. Intemperance has ruined more men than any other evil in the world. When whiskey gets the advantage of a man, he is unfit for any business or position in life. All the demons of hell combined could contrive or invent no curse that would be worse to humanity than whiskey. When I was a young man, my life was promising. I was the idol of my parents and was well thought of by all. There was nothing to keep me from growing up a good man. But I learned to love whiskey. At first I could take a social glass with friends. But I kept on, and the appetite grew on me and I could not stop. It led me to where I am. Never touch it, my boy. Remember your father's warning."—Selected.

A. W. Genter 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.

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

(Continued from Nov. 1st issue)

Fourth Affirmative

"Facts are stubborn things." "To deny a fact knowingly is to lie." (Webster) "Your proposition affirms three facts, namely; The Scriptures teach that the 'fruit of the vine' mentioned in certain passages is alcoholic, fermented. Second, that the Scriptures teach that it is 'unleavened wine,' and third that the Scriptures teach that it is the drink element of the Lord's Supper." (Prof. of Logic, University of Miss., in letter to T. E. Smith, May 5, 1930, in which he analyzed the proposition I affirm and that Bro. T. E. denies)

The Prof. says also that to sustain the proposition one must affirm that the wine of the Lord's Supper is "unleavened and fermented." Fact No. 2 says it (the fruit of the vine) is unleavened wine. Bro. T. E.'s proposition contains fact No. 2 and 3. But he denies that "The Scriptures teach that the fruit of the vine is alcoholic, fermented. Hence, the issue in this debate is over fact No. 1. If he will deny fact No. 2, an issue will arise there too, and the debate will be greatly shortened, for he will have given up his proposition.

His letter to the Prof. must have been rather cloudy. Even a Prof. of Logic could not understand it. According to his question to the Prof., the issue between us is whether the fermented, alcoholic fruit of the vine of the texts named is "unleavened wine." If the fruit of the vine of these texts is not fermented and alcoholic, your question is senseless. "The way of the transgressor is hard," hence, you received cold coffee at the Professor's hands. My analysis of affirmative No. 1 agrees exactly with the Professor's. He numbers alcoholic, fermented, together; I, separately.

Yes, you are going to have the issue, Bro. T. E. When I agreed to submit the prop. to the Prof., I asked that you submit yours also. But you wanted the Prof. to say something to help you out, didn't you? and yet you prate about "honorable controversy."

Now we will notice his last negative to see if he is getting along well in denying fact Number One of the proposition. 1. He is now denying that he ever denied that the passover was a sacrifice in the feast of unleavened bread. "The passover was a sacrifice in the feast of unleavened bread." (Argument No. 3, first aff.) He attacked this, cited Gen. 23:5, 6, and challenged "special investigation." Why all that, Bro. T. E., if you agreed with me? But now you say you were making the distinction of the sacrifices; that of the passover and others during this

feast. Then why did you not introduce it in reply to argument No. 4 where it belonged if it was offered in distinguishing the sacrifice of the feast of unleavened bread? Simply because you knew that if you couldn't disprove No. 3, you couldn't attack No. 4, because the latter is a necessary conclusion from the fact contained in the former. So when you came to argument No. 3; saw that we were agreed on it, and then saw that No. 4 must be true also, and that No. 4 ruined your theology, it was cute in you to make a lot of noise and challenge special investigation on No. 3, so as to get me to spend time on that instead of No. 4, where we differ. And still you wish to "narrow the debate." But when I quoted Matt. 26:17, you just had to do something about it, didn't you? So then you decided you didn't deny No. 3 at all, but was only distinguishing the sacrifices. But your reply to argument No. 4 shows that you did not distinguish these sacrifices, as I have shown. (third aff.) Then in his second negative he said of Num. 15, "I'm glad you're beginning to make distinctions in the sacrifices of your proof text. He saw his attack on No. 3 go down and he decided he never had denied it. When he saw his lack of distinction in the sacrifices of Num. 15 go down, he tried to appear as though he had been trying all along to get me to distinguish them. When his arguments fail, he looks on them with a strange air, as though to say, "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity, for I never knew you." No, brother, I do not fear that you are going to sidetrack anyone's conclusion; you're in a debate this time and as you have said, "We are going to have some debating," not on your lack of distinction in the sacrifices of Num. 15, for you have already given that up, but on the issue which lies between us. The passover, we agree then, was a sacrifice in one of the solemn feasts. And God commanded in Num. 15 that in offering a sacrifice in their solemn feasts, a drink offering of wine be brought with the sacrifice of a lamb. Hence, he commanded wine to be offered with the passover lamb. But you say this was an offering made by fire. To which I replied that the blood of the passover was burned upon the altar, and proved it by Deut. 12:27. When I asked what sacrifices this meant, you said, "They were burnt offerings, as it says." I asked that you submit it to the Prof., but you knew better, didn't you? Yes, Bro., they offered the blood of God's sacrifices upon God's altar, because, 1. They were commanded to do so; 2. They were put to death if they did not do it (Lev. 17:3) and 3. They did it. "And they killed the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands, and the Levites flayed them." (2 Chron. 35:11) His "bone" argument

comes next. He says if the passover was an offering by fire, it necessitated breaking its bones, for in Num. 18:9 it is shown that a portion of all their holy offering was reserved from the fire for the sustenance of the priest; therefore if the Paschal lamb was an offering by fire, it must be divided for the priest and his sons, and this would necessitate the breaking of the bones." His argument is, that a portion of all offerings by fire were for the priest. Now then, in every article he has written he has accused me of trying to leave the impression that the drink offering was wine to be drunk. Even after I said in plain language that the drink offering was poured out upon the altar, he still so accuses me. But we will see who it is that contends for this error he is trying to lay at my feet. You see, according to his contention, a portion of all offerings by fire were for the sustenance of the priest and his sons. "And thou shalt bring for a drink offering half an hin of wine, for an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord." (Num. 15:10) Thus we see that his "offering by fire" quibbling excluded, and we see whose contention is designed to leave the impression all along that the "drink offering" of the law was wine to drink.

"The way of the transgressor is hard." How does the reader like his effort to uphold the assertion? "2. It had a different bread commanded." Pray tell me, Bro. T. E., when are we going to "have some debating" on this, one of "these points"? No, no, I'll not relieve you of the responsibility; just come along with some proof.

God commanded, as I have shown, that a drink offering of wine, the fruit of the vine, be offered with the passover lamb when Israel entered Canaan. And we know also that when Jesus ate the passover with his apostles and instituted the Lord's Supper, He designated the element which he drank and which he appointed to constitute the drink of his Supper by the phrase "the fruit of the vine." I reasoned that God and his Son united in the kind of element they appointed and that since the fruit of the vine which God appointed for a drink offering in the passover offering was fermented and alcoholic, then the fruit of the vine which Jesus and the apostles drank at this last passover was fermented and alcoholic. Now if Bro. T. E. agreed with me that the drink offering was the same element that Christ and the apostles drank, I want to know the import of his making so much noise over the fact that the wine of the drink offering was not "wine to drink," especially so when he has persistently used it as an alleged rebuttal argument, though I have repeatedly let it be known that I did not contend otherwise. Now if what you have said on this point means anything at all, it means that you were trying to disprove that the drink offering and the fruit of the vine used by Christ were the same element. Then you must have seen a weak point in your position, for you are now contending that the drink offering was unfermented and non-alcoholic. I believe every one will agree with me that a man who will deny that an element which God commands and describes by the terms "wine" and "strong drink" is alcoholic, he has indulged

in the very last degree of nonsense. Bro. T. E. realized this as well as I, I am sure, and for this reason he was loud in proclaiming that the wine of the drink offering was not "wine to drink." But when I showed that God appointed the fruit of the vine for a drink offering in their solemn feasts and that Christ and the apostles drank the fruit of the vine in one of their solemn feasts, and argued that Christ and God were united in their selection of the fruit of the vine; he saw he must drop that contention or have the Father and the Son at variance. And now you will notice that he is contending that the drink offering was unfermented and non-alcoholic, hence, has agreed with me that the drink offering was the same element that Christ drank, for he says that too is unfermented and non-alcoholic. Now, Bro. T. E., you have had a nice debate with yourself on your leaven idea. You set up a proposition that "fermented wine was leavened wine;" went ahead with a pretended line of argument, and then in your third negative you disproved the proposition by showing that "wine" (fermented grape juice), "strong drink;" the element of the drink offering was unleavened. I hope now that you may be free to accept the Professor's analysis of my proposition and come on back to the issue.

Next is his dodge on I Cor. II. I showed by this scripture that the Corinthians drank the cup of the Lord and ate the bread of the Lord unworthily, not discerning the Lord's body (I Cor. 11:27-30), and that the cup of the Lord was fermented and alcoholic, "For in eating everyone took before other his own supper: and one was hungry and another was drunken." Bro. T. E. says Paul connects this drunken condition with each eating his own supper. Paul does, as I said before. They ate the bread and drank the cup of the Lord unworthily, as Paul teaches. They did not discern the Lord's body in eating it, but made of it their own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken." (I Cor. 11:21) Hence the cup of the Lord is fermented and alcoholic, as Paul teaches.

In desperation Bro. T. E. turns loose quite a volley of Scriptures which in his mind show that wine is evil within itself. I am certain that he and I agree that the Bible teaches that drunkenness is condemned. But I am persuaded that we are supposed to be discussing the drink of the Lord's Supper. Now if a glutton was an angel of light and his appointed feasting place was at the Lord's table, I could see why you were alarmed at the idea of using an alcoholic drink in the Lord's Supper. After you showed the evils of excessive wine drinking by such passages as you quote, in which God says of those who "tarry long at the wine, 'Thine eyes shall behold strange women and thine heart shall utter perverse things,' you ask, 'Do you really believe that Jesus turned the water of 'six water pots' (120 gals.) into this kind of wine; and were they drunk?'" I believed that Jesus turned the water into wine, just as the Scriptures say. Whether they drank all the wine, or not depends upon the number of persons at the feast. If Christ turned the water into the element you are contending for, and if he

thought of wine as you think of it, they drank 120 gallons of unfermented grape juice at the feast, or else he plumb forgot to tell them to "Pasteurize" what was left to prevent its becoming wine, which would cause them to see strange women. But as Christ told them to "draw out" and bear to the governor of the feast, we may doubt what they took him the whole 120 gallons, and you may be sure that what remained, kept quite well, for it was wine.

Bro. T. E. uses some rich logic indeed on his closing dodge. "The brother calls this intoxicating element the fruit of the vine, as though a good tree could bring forth evil fruit, for he admits that evil grows out of its use." According to this logic (?) the Corinthians were quiet right in eating the bread and drinking the cup of the Lord unworthily; Paul was wrong when he said they ate and drank damnation to themselves, for T. E. Smith informs us that evil cannot be committed by using that which is good. If you feel disposed to grab the Lord's Supper off the table; run for the woods and eat a dog's bait, go ahead if Bro. T. E. is right in this "fruit" argument, for the appointments of Christ are good, hence, evil cannot come of them. But misuse of anything is condemned, and wine is no exception. Try again, Bro. T. E. Did the use of wine in the Lord's Supper cause all those disciples of the present Restoration from Campbell to David Lipscomb to "behold strange women and their hearts to utter perverse things?"

From the preceding we learn that God appointed fermented, alcoholic fruit of the vine for the drink offering in their solemn feasts. History teaches that the drink designated by the phrase "the fruit of the vine," was fermented and alcoholic. Paul teaches that the cup of the Lord was fermented and alcoholic. No God doesn't think of wine in Bro. T. E.'s phraseology, for when he wished to name an element that suitably represented the spiritual things under Christ, he called it "a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined." (Isa. 25:6) He seeks to escape the definition of wine by saying, "It is 'fruit juice of any kind' that constitutes his 'loosely.'" Listen, "1. Fermented juice of grapes. 2. The fermented, or, loosely, the unfermented juice of any fruit or plant used as a beverage: as, currant wine." (Webster's New International Dict.)

Bro. T. E. mentioned a tract written by myself and Dr. A. J. Trail. This tract, "The Cup of the Lord," should be read by all, especially those who misrepresented him in a former tract published at Shreveport, La. The tract is free to those who haven't the price of 10 cents, and may be secured from me at Brookhaven, Miss., R. 6. Also, one of the most reputable debaters in the brotherhood is attempting to criticize the tract and I hope to be able to publish the correspondence between us. It pleases me no little to have the opportunity of meeting Bro. T. E.'s contention and the only other that can be brought against the truth at the same time.

Bro. T. E. seems to think there is something for

him in the Greek and Hebrew and wants me to take it up. I did intend to save this for bigger game, but perhaps I shall take it up in this debate if you so desire.

The first negative came to me signed only with a typewriter. I asked that the others be signed with pen or pencil. The second was, but the third came just as the first. Perhaps this is to save time, as Brother H. C. Harper would have to return the articles to Bro. T. E. before they could be sent to me. If this is the case, will you not please authorize Brother Harper to sign the articles himself with pen or pencil? Hewitt Smith.

Fourth Negative

The fact that you will not define the terms of your proposition shows that you are not fair in this debate. You turn a deaf ear to what the Professor of Logic says you must prove to sustain your proposition. The Professor says, "I think that to sustain the proposition as written you must affirm that the wine of the Lord's Supper is 'unleavened' and fermented. But personally I doubt your ability to show that the 'Scriptures teach' this." Then if you ignore the term "unleavened wine," or fail to prove by the Scriptures that the drink element of the Lord's Supper, "the fruit of the vine" in the texts mentioned, is "unleavened wine," as well as "fermented and alcoholic," you fail in this debate. You try to make it appear that the Professor agrees with you because he numbers "alcoholic" and "fermented" together; but he also numbers "unleavened and fermented" together, and he says he doubts your ability to show that the "Scriptures teach" this. And why? Because he knows that fruit of the vine that is "fermented, alcoholic" is leavened wine, and not "unleavened wine," as you affirm in the proposition. Yes, "Facts are stubborn things," and "To deny a fact knowingly is to lie." You may be ignorant here, but from the way you have evaded your proposition, it looks the other way. The Professor of Logic says, "To sustain the proposition as written you must affirm that the wine of the Lord's Supper is 'unleavened' and fermented." And your player about "fact No. 1" is not going to relieve you from facing the fact stated by the Professor of Logic. But we have just about given up hopes of getting you to face the issue. You are letting your proposition perish; are completely ignoring it. I deny, brother, what you affirm in your proposition, namely, "that the wine of the Lord's Supper is 'unleavened' and fermented." I assure you that I shall be willing to submit my proposition to the Professor for his analysis, and shall take up the issue, when the time comes. Yes, "Facts are stubborn things." And the physical fact that "alcoholic" wine is leavened, not "unleavened," has upset all your theology on this matter. My question to the Professor was, What is the affirmant bound to show according to the reading of this proposition? And this, he answered. And I now submit the following questions for you to answer, or ignore if you cannot answer them:

(Continued on page 5)

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
 J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
 Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

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

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

MESSIAH THE SON OF GOD

By J. D. Phillips

We can never learn too much of the Messiah. We call ourselves "disciples of Christ." We are told to "disciple all nations."—Matt. 28:18. "Disciple" here is from the Greek word *matheteuo* and it means, according to Feyerabend, "to teach, instruct." A disciple is a learner. A disciple of Christ, then, is a learner of Christ — one who learns of him. If we are not learners, we are not disciples. As disciples, we should "search the Scriptures" to learn of Him who "spoke as never man spoke." The subject of the Messiah naturally divides itself into five departments, namely: 1. His Pre-existence, 2. His Two-fold Nature, 3. The Godhead, 4. His Kingship, and 5. Priesthood.

1. His Pre-existence. This is suggested by the name of God. He has two names in Hebrew—Yahweh and Elohim. Yahweh is singular and Elohim is plural. Gen. 1:1 says: "In the beginning Elohim creates the Heavens and the Earth." Gen. 1:26 says: "And Elohim said, 'Let Us make man in Our image.'" Elohim, being plural, corresponds with "Us" and "Our" in this passage. Yahweh is not used here, it being singular. John says: "In the beginning (it was 'in the beginning' that 'Elohim created the Heavens and the Earth,' Gen. 1:1.—J. D. P.) was the Logos (translated 'word'), and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God."—John 1:1. "And the Logos was made flesh, and dwelt among us,—and we beheld His glory, a glory as of an only begotten of a father,—full of favor and truth."—John 1:14. "Let Us make man," says Elohim. John says: "Without Him (the Logos, or Messiah) was not anything made that was made."—John 1:13. David, speaking prophetically of Messiah, said: "A body hast Thou prepared me." The "me" existed before the "body." "I came forth from the Father," said the Messiah,—"the incarnate Logos." In His prayer to the Father in the Heavens, Messiah said: "Glorify Thou me with thine own glory, the glory that I had with Thee before the world was."—John 17:5. "Before Abraham was, I Am." The Prophet Micah said: "His (Messiah's) goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

2. His Two-fold Nature. Messiah is called, "The Son of Man," "the Seed of the Woman." He is also called "The Son of God." He existed with Elohim "in the beginning." He finally became "Emanuel" which is "God with us." He said: "I was in the bosom of the Father before the world was." He was even then "the Son of God." But he was finally born of the Virgin Mary, at which time He became also "the Son of Man," "the Seed of the Woman"—"Emanuel, God with us." To His mother—Mary—God said: "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."—Luke 1:35. "Without controversy great is the mystery"—the secret—"of godliness"—"God was made manifest in the flesh," in "Emanuel, God with us." He is "the only begotten Son" of God. He is the only one who ever lived that was a divine character clothed in human flesh. He left the glory of the Heavens and came to this Earth to bless poor fallen, depraved, and sinful humanity. "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Wonderful thought! Transcendent grace! He was "the Son of God" before the creative voice of Elohim broke the silence of eternity, and "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job 38). "I know that my Redeemer lives," says Job,—and that, too, before He was born of the virgin. He existed as the divine Logos from the very beginning. "A body thou hast prepared me"—this was fulfilled when He was born of the virgin. He then became "Emanuel, God with us." He existed as "the Son of God" from "the beginning." But He existed as "the Son of Man" since the days of Augustus Caesar.

3. The Godhead. After "the Son of God" became also "the Son of Man," Paul says, "In Him dwells all the fulness of the godhead bodily," or substantially. Col. 2:9. "Godhead" here is a translation of the Greek word *Theotes*, and is defined by Feyerabend as Deity or divinity. A. E. Knoch says Deity is the best English equivalent of *Theotes*. It is not found anywhere else in the New Testament. Alexander Campbell says: "The fulness of the Deity, or Godhead, indicates all the divine excellency—all the perfections of God." God's Son and His Spirit are closely connected with Him. It is possible that the "Son" and the "Spirit" of God were with Elohim "in the beginning." And now, since the Messiah has been made King, we are commanded to be "Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."—Matt. 28:19. And while this is true, we should avoid the language of Ashdod and use the language of Canaan, by saying "Godhead" instead of "The Holy Trinity." And we should preserve the "purity of speech" by saying, "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," instead of following the theological nonsense, saying, "Three persons of one substance, power, and eternity." "In Him (Messiah) all the fulness of the Deity dwells."

4. His Kingship. Alexander Campbell says: "Prophets and Apostles must now be heard. Da-

vid, by the Spirit, says, "The chariots of God are 20,000, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them even as in Sinai in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious, that the Lord God might dwell among them" (Psa. 68:17, 18). The same prophet, in speaking of the solemn and joyful procession at the carrying up of the ark of the ancient constitution to Mount Zion, turns his eyes from the type to the antitype, and thus describes the entrance of the Messiah into heaven:—"Who shall ascend into the hill of God?" The attendant angels in the train of the Messiah, approaching the heaven of heavens, shout, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates! be lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in." Those within, filled with astonishment that anyone should so confidently demand admission into those gates so long barred against the sons of men, responsive, shout, "Who is the King of Glory?" The angels in attendance upon the Messiah reply, in strains as triumphant, "The Lord, strong and mighty! the Lord, mighty in battle!" and still more exultingly triumphant, shout, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates! even lift them up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in! Who is the King of Glory? He is the Lord of Hosts! He is the Lord of Hosts! He is the King of Glory!" (Psa. 24:9, 10). Paul declares that Messiah "is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of Lords." The poet has well said: "Bring forth the royal diadem, and crown Him lord of all." David says: "Yahweh shall send out of Zion (Jerusalem) the rod of thy strength: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies (the city of thy strongest foes)." "Thy throne, O God, endures forever." Messiah is our King. He has "all authority, both in Heaven and on Earth."

5. His Priesthood. He is our great High Priest. He is now in Heaven, in the presence of God, making intercession for our sins! "He entered once for all into the holy place . . . by means of His own blood, having obtained aionian Redemption for us."—Heb. 9:12. He can "be touched by the feeling of our infirmities." "He was made perfect," for the Priesthood, "through suffering," says Paul. As High Priest, He intercedes for us. He now appears "in the presence of God for us." Glorious thought! "If we sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous." He was "made sin" for us. His blood "cleanses us from all sins."—1 Jno. 1:7. "My sin—oh, the bliss of this glorious thought—My sin—not in part, but the whole, Is nailed to the Cross and I bear it no more, Praise the Lord, praise the Lord, O my soul!"

WHO OWNED THE APOSTOLIC WAY IN 1923?

"Editorial Statement"

"We deeply regret, as the result of the death of our esteemed brother and co-worker, Clarence Teurman, that the necessity devolves upon us, as the legal owners, to select an office editor for the

Apostolic Way." (Signed) "G. A. Trott H. C. Harper."

The foregoing was published in the Apostolic Way, October 1, 1923, the first issue published by Bro. Duckworth. Who said Bro. Harper has never owned any part of the Way? Why do they say it?—J. D. P.

BRO. MUSGRAVE IN THE WEST

Bro. Bob Musgrave, of Elk City, Okla., who loves the truth and knows how to preach it successfully, will begin a meeting with the church at Somerton, Ariz., the last Sunday in October. He will go from there to El Centro, Calif., for a meeting. We are glad to have him in Ariz. and Calif., and hope his meetings will do lasting good in the name of the sin-bearing Messiah.—J. D. P.

DISCUSSION OF THE WINE QUESTION

(Continued from page 3)

1. Is the "wine" of your proposition "unleavened"? If so, how did it become "fermented, alcoholic"? 2. How did you get alcoholic wine without the leavening process that produces fermentation? 3. Would you use fermented bread on the Lord's table? If not, why not? 4. Would fermented bread be unleavened bread? 5. Why do you contend for fermented wine but unfermented bread? 6. Would fermented or leavened bread be the body of Christ since he appointed the unleavened bread? 7. In Matt. 26:28, 29, where Christ spoke of the contents of the "cup," the "fruit of the vine" as being his "blood," did he convey the idea that his blood was fermented or leavened? 8. Did Christ and his apostles eat the passover on the first day of "unleavened bread"? 9. Did Christ and the apostles observe the passover just as God commanded it to be observed? 10. If so, did they have any leaven among them on that occasion? 11. If they had no leaven among them on that occasion, was "the fruit of the vine" they used leavened? or unleavened?

Now, let the readers watch closely to see whether he answers these questions. I certainly would rather go down trying to manfully defend a proposition I had signed than to play the coward by evading the issue.

His position is this—1. God commanded Israel when they entered Canaan to use fermented, alcoholic wine with the Paschal lamb. 2. This wine was poured on the altar. 3. That the Paschal lamb was an offering by fire. But his kind of wine is "leavened, and no leaven was allowed in any offering by fire. Lev. 2:11. And this excludes his kind of wine. 4. The passover supper was a sacrifice in the "feast of unleavened bread." He says I denied this. But the readers can find what I said in my first negative. Now since the passover was a sacrifice in the feast of unleavened bread, what proof text did he use to try to show that "wine" was used with it? He headed in at Num. 15:1-5, where he found "wine" commanded with a lamb, but this was for a different purpose than that of the Paschal lamb. Let the readers go to this chapter and read from the first to the eleventh verse, where he gets the "wine," and they

will see that there are three different animals commanded to be offered in their solemn feast to show a vow, or for a sweet savour. Also these animals that God commanded to be offered for a sacrifice carried with them a meat (meal) offering that was not commanded with the Paschal lamb. Now let him answer these questions if he can: 1. What did it take to constitute these offerings to make them acceptable to God? 2. Did it take the animal, the meat (meal) offering, and the wine? 3. Could you use either of these animals in the passover supper? If not, why not? 4. If you can use the lamb of Num. ch. 15 for the Paschal lamb, why not the "ram" or the "bullock"? He now has a good chance to "distinguish" these sacrifices of his main proof text. As I have already shown, to apply this rule to any of his proof texts, will reveal the fact in every case as to what the sacrifice is for and how it was to be offered. Now let him answer these questions: 1. Was there a meat (meal) offering commanded with the Paschal lamb? If so, what was it? 2. Is it a fact that there was a meat (meal) offering commanded with the lamb of Num. ch. 15?

Now, brother, come right up to your own proof text and grapple with the facts or take down and out. And remember that "To deny a fact knowingly is to lie." Give us the proof that God commanded Israel, when they entered Canaan, to use fermented, alcoholic wine in the passover supper, and that Christ and the apostles ate the last passover, using this kind of wine for a drink element in the Lord's Supper, and designated it "the fruit of the vine." "History"—for the sake of some information give the history that teaches that the phrase "the fruit of the vine" has been used all down the line to designate fermented, alcoholic wine. And does it say it was "unleavened wine," as you affirm in your proposition? The only statement you have given was to the effect that the way the Jews used the wine on "sacred occasions" was to drink it, for the author used the phrase "partaken of" to give this meaning. And you used the same phrase at the beginning, but found that the wine of your text, "a drink offering," was poured, and not drunk. And in your joint tract with Dr. Trail, on page 12, you say in speaking of the wine you contend was used in the passover supper "partaken of." What do you here mean if you do not mean wine to be drunk when you say "partaken of"? You now admit it was not drunk, but poured upon the altar. But Dr. Trail; in a letter to me, says the wine of the passover was to be drunk. And I am certain that one of you has made a mistake here; and there is another mistake in contending that the law enjoined wine at all in the passover supper. Just examine these facts: Israel entered Canaan without sustenance. They had been fed manna from heaven in the wilderness about forty years. They entered Canaan without bread or wine on the tenth day of the first month of their sacred year. Josh. 4:19. Just four days after they entered, they ate the passover. Josh. 5:10. Where did they get wine for the passover? Again. By the brother's contention it required an altar so the

wine could be poured and the blood sprinkled, to observe the passover, and he goes down in the light of facts here. Why? Because they were encamped at Gilgal when they ate the first passover after entering Canaan, a place where there was no altar. But Moses commanded an altar to be built for burnt offerings, or offerings by fire, in Ebal. Deut. 27:4, 5; Josh. 8:30, 31. But he cites 2 Chron. 35:11 in proof that wine was used in the passover then. It reads, "and they killed the passover and the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands and the Levites flayed them." There is not even an intimation here that wine was used. He tries to refute my argument on the fact that the bones of the passover lamb were not to be broken. He is utterly ignorant of the teaching of his proof text or is trying to depend on the ignorance of others. He cites Num. 15:10 to show that he has found an offering by fire, composed of wine only. To see the absurdity of this, all one need do is to go to Num. 15:8, 9, 10, and 11. What do we find the wine of this text connected with to constitute this offering by fire? Here it is: a bullock, a meat (meal) offering, "and, yes, and for a drink offering (to be poured upon the altar with this) 'half an hin of wine.'" And what he calls my "bone argument" as to the Paschal lamb stands untouched. And I hope he did not "knowingly" do what he did here. Yes, "Facts are stubborn things." He accuses me of having taken the position that the drink offering of his proof text was not wine to drink because of its kind until I put up that argument on the "strong wine" of Num. 28:7; and says I have had a debate with myself on the leaven question. And since he has steadfastly, and in the face of honor and logic, ignored this issue stated in his proposition, I have no one to meet. And I do not think that he can make any fair-minded, honest man believe but what he is "knowingly" guilty here of running from his proposition. I did not even intimate that the wine of his text was wine that could not be drunk. I was following him. He started out to prove that the way the wine was used in the passover was to be drunk. He then changed after I showed the wine of his text was to be poured over the sacrifice. I did not make a change, and the "strong wine" of Num. 28:7 will ring in his ears till the close of his affirmative. He's the one that introduced this text to prove that this "strong wine" was "fermented, alcoholic." But when I showed that "fermented, alcoholic" wine is leavened wine, and no leaven was allowed during the seven days and that the passover was observed on the first day and this wine of Num. 28:7 that went with the daily sacrifice was offered during these seven days. Then it was that he saw that he had to prove that the kind of wine he is contending for is "unleavened," as stated in his proposition, or drop Num. 28:7. He has just said, Depart from me you "strong wine," you will get me into more trouble if I hold to you. I thought when I wrote my tract with Dr. Trail about "strong wine" of Num. 28:7 that my say-so would stick as proof, but I see I was writing a tract then, but now I am

debating, and "Facts are stubborn things" to face.

Now, reader, it is a fact that the "wine" (whatever its kind) of Num. 28:7 went with the daily sacrifice; that God commanded its use during the seven days when all leaven was put away. Then was it leavened, or "unleavened wine?" And if "unleavened wine," was it "fermented, alcoholic?" He asserts (he has no proof) that everybody will agree with him that a man who will deny that an element that God commands and describes by the terms wine and strong drink, is alcoholic, has indulged in the very last degree of nonsense. Well, I'll just inform you right here that there are some bright stars in knowledge on this very thing who are ready to deny your assertion, and when you get ready to try to furnish proof of your bald assertion, you will be met with "facts," and "Facts are stubborn things."

When you give I Cor. II as it reads your exposure will be complete here. You cite vs. 27-30 then 20, 21. Why this twist? Just to try to get their drunken condition connected with "the cup of the Lord." Let me use your perversion on another scripture. In Acts 2:38 Peter tells them they "Shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," "for the remission of sins," and to repent, and be baptized. Not a thing here, if in its place, that Peter does not teach. But when misplaced, they receive the Holy Ghost for the remission of sins. You start with your perversion at "for" (v. 21), which shows that something important preceded. "For in eating, everyone taketh before other his own supper and one is hungry and another is drunken." "For" in eating what? You said they made of the Lord's Supper their own supper. But Paul said in v. 20, just preceding "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper." And now we can easily see why it was their own supper—because it was not the Lord's Supper. "Your coming together to the same place is not to eat the Lord's Supper." (Diaglott) So their drunken condition is connected with their own supper, not the Lord's Supper. And they were told to eat at home. You say they drank the cup of the Lord unworthily, but Paul said no such thing. But he warns them with a "whosoever", which includes all for all time. You have no more proof here for your theology in your proposition than you had in Num. 28:7. "Desperation." You mean that the Scriptures that I gave so completely upset your proposition that despair has flooded you. You have tried to make it appear that the kind of wine (there is no "unleavened wine" that is "fermented, alcoholic") you are contending for is "the fruit of the vine." You assert that history teaches this. Just give us what history says on this point, as a matter of information. The "volley" of the inspired Scriptures I gave you tells just what to brand your kind of wine and its nature, yes, "in itself". Its characteristic is to cause the eye to behold strange women and the heart to utter perverse things. Daniel refused to defile himself with such, which was a portion of the king's meat (Dan. 1:8), the kind

that King Lemuel was warned against by his mother, as that which "destroys kings" (Prov. 31:3), the kind of which it is said, "Their wine is the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps" (Deut. 32:33), the kind that both "bites" and "stings". "It biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder," the kind that Lot's daughters deceived him with, and each bear a son by him (Gen. 19:31-39), the kind that caused Israel to forget God's law. But such he contends the Father and the Son united in making the "drink element of the Lord's Supper."

But he says it is the excess that is condemned. We are not to look upon it; not to touch it. Prov. 23:31. Question: Can man be temperate in things that God does not allow? You say we are supposed to be discussing the drink element of the Lord's Supper. Just so, and this is the element condemned that you want. Christ had no occasion to "Pasteurize" unfermented wine, which was commonly drunk on such occasions. Neither did he say draw some out and bear to the governor of the feast, as though only a part was used. Neither did he have occasion to "bottle" fermented wine to prevent its going into vinegar, when it loses its poison (toxin), for he made none such to debauch a wedding feast. And it was not my logic, but Christ's that you called "rich." Since "the vine" is "good," it does not bring forth the evil fruit for which you are contending "The vine" does not produce a "fermented, alcoholic" element that is "unleavened wine."

Just give us the proof that all disciples of the present Restoration used "fruit of the vine" that was "fermented, alcoholic," and is "unleavened wine." Does the word "refined" (Isa. 25:6) signify that the element was "fermented, alcoholic, and is unleavened"? Give us the Hebrew word and define it. Yes, give us the Hebrew you were saving for "bigger game." We want all the information we can get. Are you sure it will not spoil your contention for "the fruit of the vine" that is "fermented, alcoholic, and is unleavened wine?" Our readers see now that you failed to tell us whether Webster gives the meaning of Hebrew and Greek words. You know, or should know, that Webster gives the modern, current meanings of English words. And he applies "loosely" to "unfermented juice of any fruit or plant."

If you mean to insinuate that Brother Harper is doing my debating for me, let me now disabuse your mind of such a thing. And if you want to test it out, just meet me on your proposition before your congregation, in oral debate. I predict that you will not do it. Your insinuation if intended as here indicated, is unfair to Brother Harper, who has kindly typed the matter for the press. T. E. SMITH.

NOTICE

I have moved my family from Unionville, Indiana, to Tucson, Arizona, for the benefit of our health. I shall be glad to know of any brethren within fifty miles or less from here, with whom we can worship as the Lord directs in Matt. 26:

27; I Cor. II: 23; Acts 2:42 and Acts 24:14-16. Please write me. Yours for "the narrow way" (Mt. 7:14; Isa. 30:20, 21; Jno. 14:6). Clarence N. Young, Rt. 2, Box 10, Tucson, Ariz.

THE FATHER OR SON — WHICH?

Brother Hays, on the pre-existence of Christ, in the issue for Aug. 1, says, "In Isaiah he is called 'the everlasting Father.'" He seems to be laboring under the old question, "Who is this child that is born to us?" This being the wrong question, of course requires the wrong answer. Every child must have a father. The correct question is, Who is the father of this child that is born to us? Answer: "The everlasting Father." Who gave us this Son? Answer: "The Almighty God 'so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish.'" John 3:16.

"And the government (of the church) shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Prince of Peace."

This idea in no way contradicts the pre-existence of the Messiah, and needs no labored explanation, for it is in harmony with all other Scriptures on this point.—G. W. Pasley, Wawawai, Wash.

Walter W. Leamons, Salado, Ark.—We are now (Aug. 7), in a meeting near Mountain View, Ark. The brethren here still speak of Bro. J. D. Phillips' visit here several years ago. I recently conducted a meeting at Rosie, Ark., with two baptisms. We are to begin soon at my home, Salado. Much opposition from sects. They have had their way without much opposition from the truth until lately. It seems to cramp them to hear the whole counsel of God. They offered me the meeting house to preach in if I would agree not to "stir up confusion." I agreed to "speak as the oracles of God." The meeting will be under an arbor.

NEW MEXICO NOTES

I have been doing what I could to strengthen the weak places in these parts of the country and sow the good seed among the unconverted. Was at Salem, N. Mex., the fourth Lord's day in September, where there are a few brethren meeting for worship. They are true to the Book, and seemed to take new courage by hearing the word of the Lord. From there I went to Dusty, N. Mex., where there are a few meeting. Bro. J. B. Daniel, a faithful preacher and school teacher, now lives there, and is giving the brethren there an opportunity to build up the church. One was baptized there. From there I came back to Arrey, in the Rio Grande valley, where there are a few not meeting for worship. We began there Wednesday night and continued over the 3rd Lord's Day in October. Attendance was fair and interest the finest ever. And they promised to meet for worship, "not forsaking the assembling," (Heb. 10:25), as the manner of some is. I wish I were able to spend a few months in the Rio Grande valley and establish the cause there before innovators come in. The field there is very promising

now. Will some of the stronger churches come to our assistance while we "go and preach" awhile there?

Bro. Homer L. King closed another fine meeting at L. F. D. church near Roswell with fourteen baptisms and two restored. This is the church that backed Brother Harper in his debate with Alva Johnson on the cup question. This church has been standing for the truth and is growing and prospering. Some say debates do no good. Of course they do no good to the cause of error.

T. F. Thomasson.

Walter W. Leamons, Salado, Ark.—Am now at Labe, Ark., where our Brother J. D. Phillips is gratefully remembered for his work as a preacher of high standing. Last week I preached at Beech, Jackson, and Delaplaine, doing all the mission work I can here in the Ozarks. Those interested in helping on the good work, please address me at Dalado, Ark.

Morton, Texas.—I closed a ten days' meeting at Gilliland, Texas, last Lord's Day night. This is a place where there have been several discussions on the S. S. question, and some of the S. S. brethren, yes, all of them, are still mad. Several of their strongest members were persuaded to forsake them and walk in the "old paths" in this meeting. This was my third meeting with these brethren.

I go from here to Morton, Texas, where I shall, the Lord willing, meet a Holiness preacher in debate, after which I begin a meeting at Bula, Texas.

Let us keep busy in the Lord's vineyard.

H. C. Welch.

NOTICE

We have estimate from printers and will furnish copies of the written debate with Cowan on the propositions debated orally at Graham, Texas, at ten cents each or one dollar a dozen. Let us know as soon as you can how many copies you will take. This is "the cup question."

NOTICE

Any brethren desiring to change location will find as good farming district here as in North Oklahoma, and as nice and clean country town as can be found. Not but few here who want the whole counsel of God, and we are desirous to build up our church and neighborhood to the best. If interested, write me at Newkirk, Okla.

J. M. Tuttle.

OUR HELPERS

Homer L. King	-----	\$1.00
Roy A. Fiscus	-----	4.00
T. F. Thomasson	-----	1.00
Church, Elk City	-----	4.00
Ira B. Kile	-----	1.00
L. Garrett	-----	1.00
Bob Musgrave	-----	1.00
Clyde Smith	-----	.50
A. L. Thomason	-----	2.00
H. L. King	-----	1.00