THE FOLLY OF COMPROMISING

A. B. Keenan

As I walked through the wilderness of this world, I lighted on a certain place where was a den, and I laid me down in that place to sleep: and, as I slept, I dreamed a dream. I dreamed, and behold, I saw a worldly man, filled with the spirit of good will and compromise, and my ears did hear him say, "What difference does it make what a man believes so long as he is sincere?" My soul was stirred within me: I beheld the error he was in, and like to entice others the same way. I saw one who was an immersed believer in Christ, and my ears did hear him say, "What difference does it make whether a man is a premillennialist, or a user of instrumental music in the worship of God, or whether he remains neutral on any or all of these issues so long as he is an immersed believer in Christ?" So shocking were his words that the fumes of sleep were dissipated, and I was left in an instant broad awake.

Let us drop this Bunyan-like similitude of a dream for plain talking. Spiritual strength among us is disappearing in some quarters. Instead of the old-time clarion call to faithfulness to the Word of God, it is becoming more and more of an uncertainty as to just what the trumpet is sounding. Many are therefore no longer pushing the plea for a return to Scripturalism as it once was pushed and as it must continue to be pushed if we are to have any justification for our separateness as a people. There is a growing willingness to compromise with sectarianism of every die; this is our doom unless strong efforts are put forth at once to eradicate it.

Sectarianism is hard or easy to combat as we lose sight of or keep in mind what a sectarian is. To wit, one who occupies a religious position which does not square with the New Testament teaching, and who by his adherence to this error causes offensiveness. He is always the aggressor inasmuch as he is the initiator of departures and innovations. He "goes out from" because he will not "remain with." Instead of accepting with a chapter and verse, he speculates within. It seems altogether likely that the protests of others do not deter his course: he makes much of his "liberty in Christ," which is only soon becomes evil spoken of, but because of his abuse of the test, the actual root of bitterness.

The very verse of Scripture which will support a man in the smallest amount of sectarianism will also abundantly support conventional Protestantism and Roman Catholicism as well. It follows that the immersed believer in Christ who is an errorist sins exactly the same way as does the Protestant sectary or the Romanist. If there is any difference at all, it is simply in degree and not in kind.

There can be no compromise with sectarians of any category, because to compromise with them is to recognize them, and to recognize them is to be vulnerable to their innovations. "We cannot compromise without admitting that we are not at all sure what the Bible teaches, or whether it teaches anything.

If we are to have any consistency about us in condemning Catholicism and the Protestant sects which it has mothered and weakened but imperfectly, then we must be positive about our speaking where the Scriptures speak and about our silence where they are silent. He who merely assumes this position in a verbal way, but who actually endorses something else by his willingness to tolerate even the most innocent-looking departure from "what is written," becomes a member of a sect himself. Believe it or not!

The only solution of the vexing problem of divisions among penitent, immersed believers in Christ, as well as for the binding up of the wounds throughout all "Christendom," is for all to return to "what is written," if they have left it, to take their stand there, and to refuse to budge from there for anybody. There they would have not only the instructive letter but the healing spirit of the New Testament, for no one can possibly experience its sweet and tender spirit who is disdainful of its letter in either stopping short of it or in going beyond it.

He who is so sweet dispositioned as to overlook "little" departures from the Word has no right to object to "bigger" ones, even the biggest. By what authority have some of us put a scale of values on sin? Where has the Lord permitted us to call some "mortal," others merely "venal"? This may be good Catholicism, but it is bad Scripture. Shall we accept those who "hang their clothes on a hickory limb, but who don't go near the water?" It seems the height of folly to have blazed our way as a people through endless obstacles to the doctrine of God our Savior, thus to uphold the faith once delivered to the saints to the world, and then wobble and careen crazily in every direction: premillennialism, Christian churchism, worldly and or unsafe Bible colleges, and neutrality.

Let us make straight paths for our feet!
THE "NEW SPIRITUAL CONTINGENT CALLED 'THE CHURCH' "OR, THE PROPHECIES AND PROMISES OF GOD

In Word and Work (March) R. H. Boll has somewhat to say in reference to the reliability of God's "solem promises" to "his people Israel." He seems much perturbed over the New Testament teaching that the church is God's Israel now. He thinks the Jews, old fleshly Israel must nationally be restored, and given a literal earthly kingdom, with Christ literally seated on David's literal throne in Jerusalem. If this is not in the picture for the Jews when Christ return-then "we cannot know that any promise of God can be relied on, nor can we know what he means when he says anything!" He cannot see any figurative interpretation or spiritual fulfillment of the prophecies. If the kingdom is the church, and Christ is on David's throne in heaven now, he thinks that instead of fulfilling his word "to his people Israel," God has changed it and has turned "all into a spiritual and figurative fulfillment to a new spiritual contingent called 'the church'" and to him it is "as though the word of God hath come to naught."

To read these strong expressions from Brother Boll one would get the impression that he believes God always means just what he says, and that no prophecy or promise of God could ever be changed a jot or fall short of fulfillment at all. But he has said and written too much. He is the last man who should talk about relying on God's prophecies and upholding his promises.

"If It Be Felt a Difficulty"

Let us apply his own reasoning (?) to his own teaching on the postponement of that kingdom which was announced by John and Jesus as "at hand," when the time was fulfilled, as stated in Mk. 1:14, 15. The kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament were to be fulfilled "in the days of these kings" (Dan. 2:44). In his book, Kingdom of God, page 34, Brother Boll admits that this referred to the kingdom John and Jesus announced; and he admits that "these kings" referred to Rome; and he admits that "Rome is gone." But while Rome was here, and these very kings were in existence, John the Baptist announced that the kingdom foretold by the prophets and promised by God was "at hand." He said "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk. 1:14, 15). Brother Boll admits this is the kingdom prophesied by Daniel, and admits that it was the time for it to arrive. Hear his words:

"We have put much stress upon this matter because of its weight and importance. We trust, however, that the reader would even without this discussion have perceived that the kingdom announced by John (and afterward by the Lord Jesus Himself, Matt. 4:17; Mk. 1:14, 15) could have been none other than that of Old Testament prophecy and of Jewish expectation in so far as that expectation accorded with the prophecies. And this is borne out by what we find in the following chapters of Matthew. If it be felt a difficulty that that kingdom, though announced as 'at hand', has never yet appeared, we shall find an explanation unforced and natural, and one which will cast no reflection on the truth and goodness of God." (Kingdom of God, page 34.)

Now, after admitting here that the kingdom announced by John and "the Lord Jesus Himself" was the kingdom that God had promised, and admitting also that it was the time for God to fulfill his prophetic word, Brother Boll has the boldness to say that this kingdom "has never yet appeared.

"An Explanation Unforced and Natural"

It must be evident to all that R. H. Boll has but little regard for the church. He has called it a new spiritual contingent (accident, emergency, liability), a thing not in the original divine plan at all. In his theory the church is only an emergency measure, a substitute for the kingdom, a mere accident resulting from a promissory default and a prophetical fiasco. If any believe we do him an injustice in these statements hear his own words further:

"We have now briefly traced the kingdom-teaching of Matthew, and the kingdom gospel, from beginning to end. We have seen how the Old Testament hope of the Messianic kingdom of Israel and its world-wide sway was at first entirely in the foreground; how a crisis came when the opposition of Israel culminated in plans of murder; how then the Lord Jesus Christ began to announce an entirely new and different aspect which his kingdom was to assume; and how thenceforth, not leaving out of view the Old Testament promise of the kingdom, the present, spiritual, veiled, suffering form of the kingdom of Heaven, until he should come again, occupied the foreground of his teaching. (Kingdom of God, page 46.)

So the kingdom itself was in the foreground until it was relegated by the Jews to a back seat, and when all prophecies and promises of God concerning the kingdom were thus thwarted, God "postponed" and "deferred" the whole program and Jesus then announced the "new" and "unexpected" and "different" thing which he calls a "form" and an "aspect" of the actual thing, just "a spiritual contingent called 'the church,'" which he says is an entirely new and different aspect which the kingdom "assumed." What "an explanation!" So "unforced and natural," to avoid casting "reflection on the truth and goodness of God!" His very language condemns him; it is not the parlance of gospel teachers nor the nomenclature of the New Testament. Even the parables of Jesus, in the Boll theory, were wholly of an emergency character, for he says "these parables are really an announcement of the new and unexpected aspect the kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the king's rejection and absence from the world." (K. of G., page 38.) Thus he not only borrows his thoughts from Scofield, Blackstone and Russell, but he employs all the force of their language and expressions to belittle the church, and exalt these God-dishonoring and Christ-demoting theories.

"Automatically Deferred"

But to help God out of the dilemma, which he calls "a difficulty," of unfulfilled prophecies and defaulted promises, Brother Boll says that he will find an "explanation unforced and natural," and he "finds" it in the Scofield postponement theory. Let those who have indignantly
declared that “Brother Boll does not believe and teach such things” read his very words and inform themselves before they speak. Here they are:

The dispute whether or no the kingdom of Old Testament prophecy (the restoration and sovereignty of The Nation of Israel) was ‘offered’ to Israel by John the Baptist and by Christ in his earthly ministry, is but a war of words, irrelevant and unnecessary. The only thing that ever stood between Israel and her glorious promises, kingdom and all, was her sinful condition. That removed, every other promise must necessarily be fulfilled to them, and that speedily. Whether there had been any formal offer of the kingdom to them, and, upon their rejection the same was withdrawn and postponed, is no essential matter. But if salvation was offered to the nation by Jesus, all else was implied therein as a matter of course; and if that was nationally rejected, the fulfillment of all their prophetic hopes was thereby made impossible, and automatically deferred until the time when the nation would turn to acknowledge Jesus Christ and be forgiven. (Kingdom of God, page 46.)

Neither Scofield nor Blackstone, Russell nor Rutherford, ever wrote any ranker statements than these from the pen of R. H. Boll. It commits him definitely to the postponement of the kingdom after the time was fulfilled and after both John and Jesus had announced it. Brother Boll here says that when salvation was “nationally rejected” by the Jews, therein “the fulfillment of all their prophetic hopes was thereby made impossible” and the prophecies were “automatically deferred.” Do you get it—

the fulfillment of these prophecies was made impossible. Daniel prophesied it; God promised it; John and “the Lord Jesus Himself” announced it—but the fulfillment of it was made impossible and it was automatically deferred! Now, who is R. H. Boll that he should talk of those whose teaching causes him to wonder if “any promise of God can be relied on” or if we can know what God “means when he says anything”? He it is who says that whether the kingdom “offer” was withdrawn and postponed is “no essential matter.” With him, teaching against the future earthly, literal, fleshly restoration of the Jews is very serious because it means (to him) that God’s promise cannot be relied on; but for him to teach that God’s prophetic word and promise did fail at the very time the divine record said the time was fulfilled casts no “reflection on the truth and goodness of God.” And whether the kingdom was “postponed” or “deferred” or the “offer” was “withdrawn,” he says, is “irrelevant” and “is no essential matter.” A man who can talk and write in such vein can believe anything his fervid imagination tells him to believe. As a matter of plain fact, if the prophecy meant the first coming of Christ when it was spoken by the Old Testament prophets, it could not mean the second coming at any time later. If the prophets meant the second coming of Christ when the prophecy was spoken, then it never did mean the first coming, and so nothing was “deferred,” and either way it is taken Brother Boll is wrong. But he winces when his theories are “stigmatized” as “Bollism” and refers to what “some ignorant folk today would foolishly have called Bollism.” Note his language-ignorant folk; he forgets that he is supposed to be more pious than we are, and talks like the rest of us! This, however, is mild compared with many epithets he hurls. But we agree with him on that point—that he should never have been so distinguished by the label of “Bollism” on his theories, for they do not belong to him. He borrowed them from Scofield, Russell and Blackstone, and others of that die and cast. He should return his borrowed theories to their rightful owners, and himself to the plain gospel. Or else join these stray groups outright and cease to trouble churches of Christ.

“The Only Thing That Stood in the Way”

As further evidence that even Brother Boll knows that the kingdom prophecies referred to the first coming of Christ, and not his second coming, hear him once more:

The only thing that ever stood in the way of Israel and her glorious promises, kingdom and all, was her sinful condition. That removed, every other promise must necessarily be fulfilled to them and that speedily.” (Kingdom of God, page 46.)

That part of the issue is settled—when God through his prophets promised the Messianic Kingdom to Israel, these prophecies referred to the first coming of Christ. Then, according to Brother Boll himself, Jesus came to establish the earthly kingdom and the Jews expected the earthly kingdom. The puzzle is that Jesus wanted to establish the earthly kingdom, and the Jews wanted him to establish the earthly kingdom yet the Jews crucified Christ for wanting to establish the kind of a kingdom they wanted him to establish! Can you beat it?

Again, noting his language, it is observed that the only thing that “stood in the way” of the kingdom prophecy being fulfilled to Israel when Jesus came was Israel’s sinful condition. Then, so far as the prophecy itself is concerned, the kingdom was due, and its character was to have been exactly what they tell us the future kingdom will be. The conclusion is irresistible that if Israel’s sinful condition had been “removed” the kingdom would have come and Christ would have been king on earth, in which event, he would not have been crucified. So one prophecy failed that another might be fulfilled, and because it was fulfilled, the other one failed! Furthermore, if Israel had received the kingdom, the millennium would have begun then, since it is this same millennial kingdom “postponed” and “deferred” that Brother Boll is writing about. That being true, we would not have had the parables, the gospels, the death of Christ, the book of Acts, the church, epistles to the church, nor the New Testament—but the earthly, temporal kingdom and since it calls for only a literal thousand years, it would have all been over 938 years ago, and all of us left out, including Brother Boll himself! All this consummate folly because Brother Boll is determined that the kingdom is not spiritual and that God’s Israel is not the church. Surely to all who are not blinded by theory it must be evident that John and “the Lord Jesus Himself” announced a fact when they said “the time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand.” That Kingdom is the church, the theories of premillennialism to the contrary notwithstanding.

“A Harmless Theory”

Brother Boll’s own writings become the star witness against him. But there are those who deny that he teaches and believes what he himself says! Others insist that while they do not themselves “believe the Boll doctrine,” it is nevertheless “a harmless theory,” does no violence to the gospel, and that Brother Boll is such a good man that he should not be opposed. As for the theory, there was never anything taught by Russell, Rutherford or impostor Joe Smith, or any other leader of a stray cult, which was more vitiating to the gospel of Jesus Christ, the character of the New Testament church and the entire scheme of human redemption than are the premillennial theories of R. H. Boll, taken as a whole. As for the man, no man is a good man who willfully divides the church by his stubborn advocacy of an unwelcome theory. F. E. W., Jr.
GLORY IN DETROIT
CLED E. WALLACE

The Christian Standard is highly pleased over the results of “that meeting of brethren at Detroit in the interest of greater unity.” The Standard thinks the meeting “has been rewarded beyond all expectations” and seems inclined to break into paeans of praise over “the glory of the Detroit meeting” and such “hopeful signs” as a “desire for better mutual understanding” which seemed to everywhere abound. I don’t think I need to make a long expensive trip to Detroit to understand the Standard or make it understand me. I am opposed to the use of instrumental music in worship and other digressive innovations for good and sufficient reasons that have been advanced over and over again, and which up to date, the Standard has been unable to answer. I will not fellowship those who corrupt the worship and compromise the doctrine of the New Testament order. If the Standard contemplates a surrender of the things that divide us, there is nothing on the horizon thus far to indicate it. “The glory of the Detroit meeting” did not consist in any pressure brought on the digressive to give up their innovations. I think it consisted rather in the absence of such pressure. In view of the divided condition of the church, and the presence in Detroit of so many bad actors along that line, it looks like somebody ought to have called mourners. I have no evidence thus far that the Standard, guilty as it is, has any intention of going to the mourners’ bench. The Standard has a record, you know! In my rogues’ gallery of innovationists who by smooth and fair speech make instrumental music in worship appear as an innocent expedient, the Standard heads the list. In a glorious meeting where Claud Witty, Don Carlos Janes and the editor of the Standard exchange courtesies, brotherly greetings, bows and smiles, I do not see how the Standard stands to lose anything or the cause of truth stands to gain anything.

Handshaking and Pantomime

It must have been a pretty bit of pantomime when De- Forest March and H. H. Adamson advanced to the middle of the stage and laid their hands on the same Bible in the presence of a large assembly. Fervent amens were doubtless heard and tears splashed on creased pants. But the fact remains that March is a digressive and an avowed premillennialist, a corruptor of both worship and doctrine and will doubtless remain so after the shows are all over. What the Christian Standard evidently wants and is angling for is a “better mutual understanding” and fellowship between churches that use instrumental music and those who do not. Instrumental music is to be made a sort of no man’s land, discussion of the question shall cease, and congregations shall use it or not use it as they see fit, with impunity. After years of discussion the opposers of instrumental music shall subside, and take a stand which would have given the hornblowers in the church the right of way and prevented division in the first place. Brother Witty must speak out on this phase of “the problem” sooner or later, or everybody shall know the reason why. As long as churches use instrumental music, those of us who consider it a corruption of true worship will be conscience-bound to cry out against it, and refuse fellowship to those who practice it. It will take more than handshaking and pantomime to bring peace on the question.

On a High Plane

The Standard confesses that there was some fear that “we might come to such discussion of differences in more or less of an acrimonious spirit. This was the chief reason for approaching the matter so carefully.” Such a fear was of course groundless. The meeting was called for an exchange of love licks. The “spirit of humility and love” and a minimum of backbone steered the discussions. They stepped lightly around over the issues like barefoot boys in a grass-burr patch. This, I take it, is what the Standard calls discussing “the matters on which we differ ... upon the highest possible plane.” It must have been pretty high for they walked it as though they were afraid they’d fall off and get hurt. It would help considerably to descend to less dizzy heights and discuss real issues with greater vigor even if it should detract somewhat from the “glory of the meeting” in the eyes of the Standard.

Wresting the Slogan

The Standard fears that perhaps we who have so long “recognized that human creeds are divisive” have made a creed out of “an aphorism” to-wit: “Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.”

“What we have, therefore, is a division in our ranks over the interpretation of an aphorism-and an aphorism that originated with fallible human beings when they were in the twilight of the dawn of this movement, just beginning to see the way out of denominationalism.”

Well, anyhow, these “fallible human beings” saw more clearly “in the twilight” than the Standard seems to be able to see in the middle of the clay. They voiced their determination in “an aphorism” to believe and practice nothing the scriptures do not authorize. It outlawed sprinkling and pouring for immersion, infant rantsim, party names and divisive speculations emblazoned in creeds; and it kept instrumental music out of the churches for fifty years “after the dawn.” It was rather late in the day when the Standard crowd discovered something new in “interpretation” and read into “Where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent” the following declaration of freedom to go beyond what is written.

“Where the Scriptures speak we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we speak anyhow if in ‘our own best judgment’ we think we should keep on talking.”

“Interpretation” is not the proper term to describe the Standard’s violent treatment of the “aphorism.” I know, and I think the Standard knows, that the “fallible human beings” who “originated” that statement of loyalty to the word of God would be shocked at some of the uses it has been put to. The Standard calls attention to “the possibilities of division within such a pattern of words.”

“One brother has undertaken to state the same principle by radically altering the aphorism: ‘Where the Scriptures speak, we are silent; where the Scriptures are silent, we speak.’ When a slogan can be twisted in such fashion to state one attitude, it is assuredly dangerous to follow it slavishly.”

There isn’t anything wrong or “dangerous” about the “slogan” which is only a devout declaration of loyalty to the word of God. The Standard locates the danger in the wrong place. It is in the twister. Peter says that “ignorant and unstedfast” men twist the scriptures to their own destruction. It isn’t dangerous to follow the scriptures even “slavishly” because there are men who are so
ignorant, unsteadfast or devoid of the spirit of loyalty as to "wrest" them. Such men should be marked for what they are. During the last fifty years about everything twistable has been twisted to lend some support to the practice of instrumental music in worship. "Some of us" want it and we are going to have it, aphorism or no aphorism, scriptures or no scriptures, and the authority we plead is our freedom "to act on our own best judgment, in harmony with the spirit of the New Testament." Whatever we want to do that we have no command for, no example of, and no necessary inference for, in short no scriptural authority whatever for, comes under "the spirit of the New Testament." With such latitude the Standard ought to get by with about anything it wants to do in religion.

The Line That Divides

The Standard further says:

"We are all agreed that there is a freedom in Christ; that there is an area for our best Christian judgment. The question after all, is one of drawing the line that divides the area of the commanded from the area of freedom and our judgment."

The Standard has come to see, I think, that any authority for instrumental music in worship must come from "the area of freedom and our judgment." It is not to be found in "the area of the commanded." It is an abuse of whatever "freedom" we have "in Christ" and mighty poor "judgment" to presume to add something to the worship of God the scriptures do not authorize. The scriptures no more authorize the use of instrumental music in worship than they do the burning of incense, or the washing of feet. If they did, the Standard would talk more to the point and not so much talking around.

Here is a final plea that betrays what the Standard hopes for out of such meetings as the one in Detroit. That will be "glory" if such a goal can be reached.

"Can we not recognize as brethren in Christ and in this propaganda of unity all those who, having accepted Christ and obeyed Him in the terms of salvation, sincerely seek to attain unity upon the basis of New Testament doctrine and order, even though they may differ in their understanding of what the New Testament teaches in certain details."

Instrumental music, of course, comes under "certain details." The Standard shows no disposition whatever to surrender the music. It is a clear case of "love me, love my dog." It is a diplomatic appeal to churches that do not use instruments for conscience sake to tolerate and fraternize with those that do; even if they do show clearly that they prefer the unauthorized instrument to the fellowship of their brethren "who having accepted Christ and obeyed Him in the terms of salvation, sincerely seek to attain unity upon the basis of New Testament doctrine and order." In short the Standard asks us to surrender our fight on the music question and seems to think the Detroit meeting is a step in that direction. And maybe so it is.

Finally, the Standard's talk about "what our consecrated judgment tells us is the teaching of the New Testament" sounds a lot like "the sanctified common sense" that introduced the organ and divided the church in the first place. Personally, I have no more confidence in the "consecrated judgment" of slogan twistors who cling to the organ than loyal defenders of the truth a generation ago had in the "sanctified common sense" of the men who introduced it into the worship. The division that was caused by the organ will stay as long as the organ stays— I hope.

"TO FURTHER THE CAUSE OF UNITY"

The Christian Standard says: "A deep impression was made by a telegram from Sherman, Texas. It was signed jointly by Homer Strong, minister of the First Christian Church, and A. R. Holton, minister of the Central Church of Christ. They expressed themselves as greatly interested in the Detroit meeting, said they were praying for God's guidance in its deliberations, and indicated their own willingness to further the cause of unity." That is approachment at Sherman! It was Homer Strong who made a laborious effort to prove by Psallo that instrumental music in the church is scriptural, after admitting that A. D. Rodgers failed. He used Payne's book, which makes it mandatory. He says it is in the church prophecies of the Old Testament that instrumental music would be in the church of Christ, and is therefore essential to the fulfillment of prophecy. But the Unity Conference that Homer and Holton prayed for puts it under "the silence slogan" and takes Homer's pet arguments away from him. He prayed too quick. An interesting question we would like for Homer Strong to answer is, does he expect to "further the cause of unity" by trying to prove that instrumental music is in Psallo and the prophecies, or by accepting the conclusion of the Unity Conference that it belongs to the area of silence? He cannot ride both horses— and he should not preach one way and pray another.

While waiting for Homer to answer this question, let us ask Brother Holton (my erstwhile schoolmate) a question also. How can Arthur Holton join Homer Strong in such a telegram, conveying such a prayer— a joint prayer and telegram— seeing that Homer prays one way and debates another, and has no earthly idea of giving up his idol?

Several of our preachers at Sherman have served as president of the Ministerial Alliance while they served as "minister of the Central Church of Christ." While the "minister of the church" was president of the Alliance, Homer Strong was secretary of the Alliance. While some of us are defending the truth in debate with Strong, the church at Sherman, through their preachers, are affiliating and fraternizing with him, and other sectarianists. Now comes the Homer-Holton arm-around-each-other telegram to Detroit. The Standard thought this was a great news item from the old battlefield of Sherman, Texas, and they "boxed" it— put it in a border. It must be an evil omen for the church in Sherman when her preachers serve as representatives of Ministerial Alliances and lock arms, instead of horns, with digressive and sectarian preachers, who are avowed enemies of the New Testament church, none of whom are greater enemies of the church than Homer E. Strong and his father.

Since it is now a question of the silence of the Bible on the subject—will Homer and Holton "further the cause of unity" by having a discussion of this question in Sherman? I offer this proposition: Does the silence of the New Testament authorize the use of instrumental music in the church? W. R. Walker says it does. I say it does not. Will Homer and Holton send us "a joint telegram" accepting a discussion of this proposition in Sherman, and make arrangements for the same to be held? — F. E. W., Jr.
The word “church” is found in the New Testament 115 times. The word was used before Jesus came into the world and hence before Jesus built His church or had a church. It therefore must have had reference to other institutions than the church that Jesus built. In Acts 7: 38, the Jews that were called out of Egypt through the Red Sea, out into the Wilderness, were called the “church in the wilderness.” In Acts 19: 39 the courts in the city of Ephesus are referred to by the town clerk as a church, i.e., the word “assembly” there in the last line of that verse is the same word in the Greek that is translated “church” in other places. In the forty-first verse of the same chapter, the town clerk dismissed that which Luke calls the “assembly.” but the word “assembly” here is from the same Greek word from which we get the word “church.” Also, Jesus says in Matt. 16: 18, “Upon this rock I will build my church.” The Bible is our source book of information about the church that Jesus called “my church.”

We now have, from the Bible, the word “church” referring to four different things. First, the assembly in the wilderness. Second, the Greek courts in Ephesus. Third, the Ephesian mob that wanted to kill Paul. Fourth, the church that Jesus built. One of these was a politico-religious institution: one was nothing but a court; one a howling mob; and one is the church or body of Christ. From this we learn that so far as the word is concerned, it simply means a congregation of people, an assembly or body, without regard to the nature or kind of body. We are studying now, the one that Jesus built.

The Bible Our Source Book

The Bible is the source of our information as to this church that Jesus calls “my church” (Matt. 16: 18), and which Paul calls “the body of Christ” (1 Cor. 12: 27). The word was used by Jesus three times: twice in Matt. 16: 18 and twice in Matt. 18: 17. The word is not found in either Mark, Luke, or John. From Acts of Apostles on we have it used 112 or 113 times. It is called in the New Testament by several terms—the church of God, the body of Christ, the one body in Christ, the one new man, the temple, the tabernacle, the house, the household, the family of God, a people, God’s husbandry, God’s building, a holy nation, and other terms. 1 Peter 4: 11 says, “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.” Therefore we, who try to be Bible people in speech and in practice, use any term found in the Bible in speaking of the church, but we use no term not found in the Bible. The Bible never says, “The Methodist Church,” “The Baptist Church,” “The Presbyterian Church,” “The Christian Church,” or “The Mormon Church,” and hence we reject all such “Ashdodish” language. Now, we desire to study the church that Christ built, with an open New Testament, that from it we may learn the manner of church Christ’s church is.

The Church—Local and Universal

The term church is used in the New Testament in two senses. First, to mean the local body—the church in any given locality; second, the church in its universal sense. Even Jesus himself used it in both senses. In Matt. 16: 18, when he said, “I will build my church,” he used it in the universal sense. I.e., it includes every Christian—all saved people—all that are in Christ. But in Matt. 18: 17 he used it in its local sense. In this verse he tells the brother who cannot settle his trouble with another brother to tell this trouble to the church. He did not mean that the individual should travel the whole face of the earth and find every Christian, nor even every congregation, and tell about this trouble with some other brother. But he should tell it to the congregation of which he is a member. In this sense the Bible speaks of the church at Jerusalem, the church in Corinth, etc.

In speaking of congregations (the church in its local sense), the Bible calls them “churches of Christ” (Rom. 16: 16), and three times “churches of God.” The expression “church of God” is found nine times in the New Testament. (Acts 20: 28; 1 Cor. 1: 2; 10: 32; 11: 22; 15: 9; 2 Cor. 1: 1; Gal. 1: 3; 1 Tim. 3: 5, 15.) But Christ said: “All mine are thine, and thine are mine.” (John 17: 10.) Therefore the churches of Christ and the churches of God are the same. In 1 Thess. 2: 14, Paul calls them churches of God in Christ. This does not mean that there are many different kinds of churches, but rather the same church in many places. The seven churches of Asia (Rev. 1: 20) are seven churches, each like the other, each a church of Christ, that are in seven different towns. The names of the seven towns are there given. One preacher—the same preacher—John—preached to and for all seven of these. No one preacher today can preach to and for seven different denominations in this country—without being turned out of all seven of them.

Denominations Not Branches of Christ’s Church

Some think that Jesus meant to speak of different denominations or different churches when he said, in John 15: 1-6, “I am the vine, ye are the branches.” Here Jesus calls himself the vine. The word “ye” used here by Jesus is thought by some to mean denominations. Well, if it did, it could not have meant any denominations now existing for no one of these now existing was in existence when Christ used that language. It could not have meant the Catholic church for it did not begin with its pope prior to the year 606. It could not have included the Lutheran church for it did not begin before the year 1517. All other Protestant churches such as Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., began even after this date. That being so, let the man who thinks that Christ was talking about denominations, when he said, “ye are the branches,” name the denominations that then existed. But Christ was not talking about denominations. He was talking to and about the disciples. In the sixth verse, he says, “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a
branch." Did anybody ever hear of a branch, that had not been tampered with, being different from every other branch in the same vine? Who ever heard of a grapevine having branches that differed from each other? Whoever heard of a grapevine that had one branch that was grape, another that was watermelon, another that was pumpkin, another that was squash, another cucumber, and another gourd?

Yet, that is the conglomerated mess that you would have, Christ being the vine, if the Methodists and the Mormons, the Baptists and the Swedenborgians, the Presbyterians and the Catholics, were the branches. That is the ridiculous mess that one must undertake to justify in trying to justify the human denominations of this godless age. The denominations, those named and hundreds not mentioned, are not branches of the church of Christ.

Contrast of Builders, Foundations, Owners and Destinies

Christ says, "I will build my church." Christ is a divine person, therefore this church has a divine builder or founder. Every other church is of human authority and is therefore a human church. Christ said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." All other churches, having human founders, must of necessity be built upon the sand. Christ called the church that he built on the rock "my church." (Matt. 16: 18.) These other churches are not Christ's churches. They belong to the human beings that built them. Christ said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," his church. But the gates of hell will prevail against every other church, whether it be Mormon, Campbellite, Methodist, Baptist, or what not.

Rooted Up

Daniel said the kingdom (church of Christ) should stand forever. (Dan. 2: 44.) Jesus said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," his church. Paul said that it (the church of the Lord) is a "kingdom that cannot be shaken." (Heb. 12: 28.) But Jesus says, of other institutions, "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." (Matt. 15: 13.) Whereas the church of Christ will stand forever, every human church that exists in the earth will be rooted up. And, of course, those who compose them, who are in them, will be rooted up when the churches are rooted up. Friend. if you believe the Bible, what Jesus said in Matt. 15: 13, you believe that every human plant (denominations are human plants) will be rooted up. Can you therefore stay in one? It matters not which one, whether Methodist or Baptist or any other, even yours or mine, it shall be rooted up. Neighbor, if you are in one of these human churches (plants not of the Father) you had better get out before the final "rooting up."

Authority To Build a Church

Jesus Christ said, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." (Matt. 28: 18.) Since he had all authority in heaven and on earth, he had authority to build a church. But no man has such authority to build a church. Hence Jesus Christ is no counterfeiter and his church is no counterfeit: but every man that builds a human church is a counterfeiter and the church which he builds is a counterfeit church. The United States government, being a sovereign nation, has authority or right to coin money-which money is not counterfeit. But every individual, who, without authority in this nation, coins money, is a counterfeiter and his money is counterfeit money. And the United States government will put all such counterfeiters in the penitentiary.

Christ Built But One Church

Jesus built one church and but one. (See John 10: 16; 11: 52; 17: 11, 21-23; Rom. 12: 4, 5; 1 Cor. 10: 17; 12: 12, 13, 18, 20, 27; Gal. 3: 28; Eph. 1: 10: 2: 14-16; 3: 6; 4: 4; Col. 3: 15.) Here the Bible positively says that there is but one body which is in Christ. And Paul says in Eph. 1: 22, 23 that the church is his body. In Col. 1: 24 he says that the body is the church. It would have taken only three letters to have put the word "not" in somewhere, then common people like all of us could have known it, if the church is not the body or the body is not the church. But since Paul said the church is the body and the body is the church, those who believe the Bible believe the church and the body are one and the same thing. Hence, we believe and teach, because the Bible says it, that there is but one body or church in Jesus Christ.

All the Saved and Only the Saved Are in Christ's Church

People often ask if a man cannot be saved in one church as well as another, or even be saved out of any and all churches. Well, yes, he can be saved out of all human churches. The truth is, he cannot be saved in them. But one cannot be saved out of the divine church-the one over which Jesus is head-the one Christ built. We submit the following reasoning:

First, the saved are added by the Lord to the church. "The Lord added to the church daily such as were being saved." (Margin, Acts 2: 47.) Since the Lord adds the saved to the church, there is not one saved man out of his church. But since he adds the saved and only the saved, then not one unsaved man got into his church. And since the saved-all the saved-and nobody but the saved are in the church, there can be no difference between the church and the saved people, or the saved people and the church. That is what the church is, the saved people. Hence, if you have no church you have no saved people. On the other hand, if you have saved people you have the church. One is as large as the other and no larger; they are one and the same thing.

Second, the church is the fullness of God. God gave Christ to be "head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in." (Eph. 1: 22, 23.) Now, since the church, his body, is the fullness of God, it follows that there is not one saved person out of this church. If so, the church would not be the fullness of God. If only one saved man is not a member of the church, then the church would be the fullness of God except for one man. But that is not what the Bible says. It says, "the fulness of him that filleth all in." Therefore, all the saved are in the church.

Third, all the flock make up the church. "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, .. to feed the church of the Lord." (Acts 20: 28.) Now, when they were feeding the church they were feeding all the flock, that is, all the flock is the church. The church is not made up of part of the flock with some left out, but of all the flock. There is not a little lamb or an old sheep left out of the church of God-they are all in it.

Fourth, we are reconciled in the church. Paul says, "That he ... might reconcile them both in one body unto God." (Eph. 2: 15, 16.) This one body is the church. All are reconciled in, not out of, this body. But when one is reconciled he is saved, and when he is saved he is reconciled. But he is reconciled in the church, the one body. Therefore he is saved in the body-the church. Hence, there can be no saved man out of the body which is the church.

Fifth, the church is God's family. "Behave themselves in the house of
God, which is the church of the living God.” (1 Tim. 3:15) God’s house is God’s family. “Whose house are we.” (Heb. 3:6.) If therefore the house of God, the church, is the family of God, and God has children out of his church, then God has children out of his family. Now would not that be a disgrace? Men may have children out of their families but God has not.

Sixth, the church is the bride of Christ. (See John 3:29; Rom. 7:4; 2 Cor. 11:1-3; Rev. 21:9.) Now, since the church is the wife of Christ, if Christ has any children not connected with the church, then he has children that do not belong to his wife. What would you call them? What kind of children would they be? And if Jesus does have saved people, children, that are not members of his church-which is his wife-then you have saved people that are illegitimate, since they are not members of his church which is his bride.

The Church of Christ Not a Denomination

The church of Christ is not a denomination. We have learned that the church of Christ contains the saved, all the saved, and nobody but the saved. The very best that any denomination can claim for itself is to have only a part of the saved in it. No denomination makes the claim that it is the saved, all the saved, and nothing but the saved. If it did, and the claim were true, then that denomination and the church of Christ would be identical, and it would not be a denomination but would be the actual church of Christ. Rut denominations are human institutions, gotten up by men, with human heads, human creeds, human organization, human laws of entrance, human worship, and a human heaven-if they ever have any! There are many people in them that are not saved, never have been saved, that do not know the law of salvation, that do not know how to become Christians. And if there be any in them that ever were saved, they sinned by going into these human religious institutions, plants which are to be rooted up.

Laws of Entrance Differ

The law that puts a man into one church will not put him into any other church. The things that one does to put him into the Methodist church will not put him into the Baptist church or any other church. No person ever joined the Mormon church and found the next day that he had, at the same time and by the same things, become a member of the Methodist church or any other of the more than 200 different kinds of churches in this country. What one does to become a member of the church of Christ will not put him into any human church, and what one does to become a member of any human church will not put him in the church of Christ. Jesus gave the law in the gospel, which people call the great commission, by which people become members of the church of Christ. The terms by which one enters Christ’s church are: faith, repentance and baptism. But this must be the faith, repentance and baptism of the Bible—not just any manner of faith, repentance or baptism. When one believes with the faith of the Bible, repents-genuinely repents, as the Bible requires, and is baptized into Christ for the remission of sins, the baptism of the Bible, such an one thereby becomes a member of the church of Christ-the church of the New Testament. But this will not put a man into any denomination. If you think so, name the denomination that this will put a man into. One may take a license that has the name of a certain young lady on it, and by the same license marry himself legally to some other girl as easily as one can take the law that brings one into a human church and come into the church of Christ thereby. The New Testament will make a Nem Testament church and it will not make any other. The parts of a Ford car when put together will make a Ford car every time, whether assembled in Texas, Mexico, South America, Europe, Africa, or the Fiji Islands. You may take the Ford parts and put them together one time; one hundred times, or one million times and they will never make a little baby Austin—they will make a Ford car every time. So it is, the New Testament-the gospel-when believed and obeyed will make a church of Christ, one time and every time. As well expect the parts of a Ford car, when assembled, to make a baby Austin, as to expect the New Testament, when believed and obeyed, to make a Methodist or Baptist or any kind of denomination.

Perpetuity Not Succession of Flesh and Blood

The church of Christ, the kingdom of God, is built and perpetuated by the word of God. Luke says (Luke 8:11, 12) that the word is the seed of the kingdom. When we want to build a church of Christ, we plant the word of God into the hearts of men and women, and when it germinates, it brings forth fruit, children, Christians into the church or kingdom of God. We are not interested in a succession of flesh and blood-men and women—human perpetuity. We do not, as the Baptists do, plant human beings in order to raise the church! We plant the word of God—the divine word—and the word brings forth divine fruit, Christians, the church of God. The divine word will not build a human church, it will make Christians every time. Should there be an oak forest and a wide body of water between it and a distant land, and a “pecker-wood” should take an acorn from an oak tree of this forest and fly across this body of water and plant this acorn in that distant land, the acorn, when it germinates, would not produce a “red-headed peckerwood.” It would produce an oak and nothing else. Should a squirrel take an acorn from the same forest and pass, by some means, to that same land and plant that acorn, it would not germinate and bring forth squirrels. It also would produce an oak and nothing but an oak. Even so, the seed of the kingdom of God, the word of God, when planted in good soil, will produce the kingdom of God, the church of God, and nothing else. One had as well expect the acorn planted by the woodpecker to produce woodpeckers, or the acorn planted by the squirrel to produce squirrels, as to expect the gospel of Christ to produce a Methodist, Baptist, or Mormon. The gospel makes Christians and Christians only. The doctrines which make the different human institutions will never make Christians throughout all time and eternity. They are not only useless, therefore, but damnable.

To those not already entangled: beware of the spiderweb of sectarianism woven from the bowels of Satan, designed only to catch all whose “minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.” To you who are already entangled in this yoke of bondage—this Babylon of denominationalism—“Come forth ... out of her, that ye have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached even unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.” (Rev. 18:4,5.)
BIBLE BAPTISM

E. G. Creacy

The Saviour said to His apostles, in giving them the great commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark 16:15, 16). On the day of Pentecost, when the apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit and began their work of preaching "repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ," the Spirit filled apostle Peter, in answer to the question: "What shall we do?" said: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). For clearness of expression these texts stand at the very head of the divine statements of the plan of salvation. They condense that plan into the fewest words possible and confound the theological world with their brevity and simplicity. Realizing that these passages destroy every vestige of denominational teaching, the theologians have given battle to these inspired passages more than any other in the Scriptures. They have given battle to these inspired passages to destroy every vestige of denominationalism. Realizing that the Saviour carried out this mission in connection with baptism in the New Testament. The lexicons define baptism to dip, to immerse, etc. The use of the word in the New Testament carries out this mission.

Pharisees and lawyers in rejecting baptism "rejected the counsel of God against themselves." These facts are too numerous to be ignored by people who claim to have the knowledge of the Bible and believe it. There is something radically wrong with a theology that can set aside, as worthless, such a volume of evidence on any subject. Yet, according to theology, I mean of course the doctrines of denominational churches, nothing in the Bible is so worthless and nonessential as baptism! According to denominational teachers, baptism is not only unnecessary, but in reality they make it very necessary to say nothing about it.

The Passages Considered

In the first text quoted (Mark 16:16) the Lord Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." He did not say: "He that believeth is saved, and should be baptized as an outward sign of an inward grace." The Lord placed salvation after baptism, not before it. In the second text (Acts 2:38), the Holy Spirit through Peter said: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." In this passage repentance and baptism come before remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. That is why both repentance and baptism are "unto" the remission of sins, and the reception of the Spirit. But Jesus said that one must believe before he is baptized; therefore, faith precedes repentance. Faith, repentance and baptism are the conditions of pardon. They are in order, the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Belief results in a change of mind; repentance kills the sinner, and baptism buries the dead man. The sinner can do nothing more for himself in obtaining salvation. That is why he must be baptized—he cannot baptize himself any more than a dead man can bury himself. Believe and repent are verbs in the active voice, something done by the living child of Satan. But "be baptized" is in the passive voice—something that must be done for the dead sinner by another—by the gospel agent whom God has appointed, and hence by the Lord, through his agent. (Matt. 28:18-20). Thus the sinner is "buried in baptism." Man can kill; but man cannot make alive. Life comes from God. "Man's extremity is God's opportunity." The dead and buried sinner is now in God's hands only. Through the name acknowledged by the sinner before his death and burial, in that name does God raise him from the dead into newness of life in Christ.

The scriptural subject for baptism is the believing penitent. Only one who is old enough, and intelligent enough, to believe in Christ, and repent of sins, can be scripturally baptized. Infants cannot believe, and have no sins of which to repent, and are not commanded to be baptized, and therefore cannot be. Infant baptism is a relic of Rome.

Sprinkling Is Not Baptism

In passages cited we learn that baptism is immersion in water. Sprinkling and pouring cannot be baptism. There is no such thing as "modes" of baptism. Baptism is an action. Then, if sprinkling, pouring and immersion are modes of baptism, what is baptism? Of course, sprinkling is mentioned in the Bible, but never in connection with baptism.

In the Old Testament, in the Jewish law, there are twenty sprinklings; eight sprinklings of blood; three sprinklings of blood and water mixed; two sprinklings of oil; four sprinklings of mixed water and oil; hence, six sprinklings only in which there was water and then the water was mixed, and never unmixed. The truth is, God never at any time, in any dispensation, commanded anybody or anything to be sprinkled with water only (unmixed water) for any purpose.

Now, let us see what is in the New Testament on sprinkling. I shall give you every passage where it is mentioned.


What Baptism Requires

The lexicons define baptism to dip, to immerse, etc. The use of the word in the New Testament carries out this definition. Note what baptism requires:

(1) A subject; the believing penitent (Mark 16:16, Acts 2:38); (2) An administrator; a gospel preacher (Matt. 28:19); (3) Water; "see here is water" (Acts 8:36); (4) Much water (Jno. 3:2); (5) Going to the water (Matt. 3:5-8); (6) Going down into the water (Acts 8:38); (7) A burial in water (Rom. 6:4); (8) A resurrection from the water (Col. 2:12); (9) Coming up out of the water (Acts 8:39).
CHRIST OUR KING AND PRIEST

The New Testament Affirms That God Fulfilled His Oath to David When He Raised Christ from the Dead and Exalted Him at His Right as King and Priest

John T. Lewis

"Thus speaketh Jehovah of hosts, saying, Behold, the man whose name is the Branch: and he shall grow up out of his place; and he shall build the temple of Jehovah; even he shall build the temple of Jehovah; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both" (Zech. 6: 12. 13). "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the root of Jesse, that standeth for an ensign of the peoples, unto him shall the nations seek: and his resting-place shall be glorious" (Isa. 11: 10). Paul, the great agitator and spiritualizer, says: "For I say that Christ hath been made a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, that he might confirm the promises given unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written. Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name and again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. And again, Praise the Lord. all ye Gentiles; and let all the people praise him. Xnd again, Isaiah saith, There shall be the root of Jesse, and he that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles; on him shall the Gentiles hope" (Rom. 15: 12). Thus Paul declares that the "Branch" of Zechariah’s prophecy and "the root of Jesse" of Isaiah’s prophecy had reference to Christ, when he was raised "to rule over the Gentiles." "that he might confirm the promises given unto the fathers."

Spiritualized Prophecies

Now let us study these prophecies, and their fulfillment, for they have been fulfilled. Zechariah says: "The Branch shall grow up out of his place"-out of David’s root, or family. "And he shall build the temple of Jehovah; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne." Paul says to the Gentiles, in the church of Ephesus: "So then ye are no more strangers, and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2: 19-22). Paul here tells these Gentiles that Christ had built his temple, and that they were in it. Paul then says: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you Gentiles" (Eph. 3: 1). That is, the Jews objected to Paul thus spiritualizing God’s promises, so they had him arrested, and he spent the last four years of his life a prisoner. If Brother Robert H. Boll had been living in Paul’s day I do not believe he would have joined the Jews in putting Paul in prison because he said Christ had done what Zechariah said he would do:-"And he shall build the temple of Jehovah"-and spiritualized the Gentiles and put them into the temple; but he would have made the Jews a mighty good witness, hear him: "If, after all he has so solemnly promised and sworn to his people, Israel, God does not fulfill his word to them, but instead turns all into a spiritual and figurative fulfillment to a new spiritual contingent called "The Church," then we cannot know that any promise of God can be relied on, nor can we know what he means when he says anything" (March issue of Word and Work). You know the Jews “laid hands” on Paul and would have killed him if the chief captain and his soldiers had not rescued him; because they thought he had brought "Trophimus the Ephesian" into the temple. If Brother Boll had been there and told the Jews that Paul had spiritualized the temple and brought the Gentiles into it, I doubt whether the “chief captain” could have saved Paul.

God’s Oath to David

But let us go on with the prophecies. Zechariah said: "And he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne." Isaiah said: "Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this" (Isaiah 9: 7). David said: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant: Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations" (Ps. 89: 3, 4). In verses 34-36. he says: "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness: I will not lie unto David; his seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me." Peter speaking of David on Pentecost said: "Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was he left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus did God raise up, wherein we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear" (Acts 2: 30-33). If this does not mean that God had fulfilled his oath to David "to set one upon his throne," it means nothing. Again David had said: "Jehovah hath established his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all" (Ps. 103: 19). And there is where the Holy Spirit, through Peter, said it was; but, of course, he had to spiritualize it to get it into heaven.

Theoretical Blasphemy

had rather risk the Baptist confession, that says: "I believe God for Christ’s sake has pardoned my sins," than to confess Jesus as Lord, and then say: "I do not believe Christ is King on David’s throne." One is ignorance; the other is blasphemy. Paul said God “delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Col. 1: 12-14). Therefore, if there is no kingdom, there is no forgiveness. Again Paul says: "Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace, whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe: for our God is a consuming fire" (Heb. 12: 28, 29). I know Paul was an agitator and a spiritualizer; but I had rather risk his agitation than Brother Robert H. Boll’s piety. John also said he was in the "kingdom and patience whicheare in (Continued on page 11)
PERTAINING TO THE PRIESTHOOD—THIS IS THE SUM

WILL M. THOMPSON

“Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing there are priests that offer gifts according to the law” (Heb. 8:1-4).

From the above language of the peerless apostle, we learn that Christ is now High Priest in heaven, and that He should not be a priest on earth. His ministry is of the “true tabernacle” (kingdom) and not of the tabernacle of Moses. Let us notice some of the facts set forth in the New Testament concerning the priesthood of Jesus Christ.

1. He was made priest since the law.

“For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, which is consecrated forever, more” (Heb. 7:28).

This passage teaches beyond all question that Christ was made High Priest by “the word of the oath” since the law. But the law terminated, or ended, at the cross. (Col. 2:14, Eph. 2:15) It was therefore after the cross of Calvary that He became our Great High Priest.

We have but to turn to Zech. 6:12-13 to learn that Christ was to be Priest on His throne. The priesthood and kingship of Christ are therefore closely related. He was to be King when Priest. There is no divine authority by which to separate the kingship and priesthood of Jesus Christ.

2. The Order of His Priesthood.

“As he saith also in another place, Thou are a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek” (Heb. 5:6).

Here is a question of paramount importance—what was the order of Melchisedek?

Let the apostle answer this question: “For if this Melchisedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him.” (Heb. 7:1). It is here seen that Melchisedek was king and priest at the same time. So Christ being priest after that order, He must be King and Priest at the same time.

3. Jesus Christ is of the Tribe of Judah.

“For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake concerning priesthood.” (Heb. 12:22). When the atonement was made in heaven, Jesus Christ obtained eternal redemption for those whose high priest He is.

4. Jesus Christ Is a Faithful High Priest.

“Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people” (Heb. 2:17). We learn from this that when Christ came into the world He took upon Himself human form in order to become our faithful High Priest. “Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into heaven, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession” (Heb. 4:14). He is great because He is the Son of God and because He is priest after the order of Melchisedek and because His priesthood is unchangeable. He is great because He can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities. He is great because He is a priest on His throne, and His throne is in heaven. (Psa. 11:4).

5. He Glorified Not Himself to be High Priest.

“So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee.” God the Father glorified Christ that He might become our High Priest in heaven.

6. He Is High Priest of the Good Things to Come.

“But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building: neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:11-12). When the atonement was made in heaven, Jesus Christ obtained eternal redemption for those whose high priest He is.

7. He Is High Priest Over the House of God.

“And having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water” (Heb. 10:21-22). The house of God is the church. Every Christian is a priest. The common priests went into the holy place to accomplish the service of God. Christians accomplish the service of God in the church. Christ is our High Priest and through Him we reach the throne of God, and there find mercy and grace to help in time of need.

8. The Change of Priesthood Made Necessary the Change of Law.

“For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of law” (Heb. 7:12). The change in priesthood was a change to the Melchisedek order, and this change occurred by the word of the oath which was since the law. The Levitical order ended, therefore, with the law of Moses, or at the cross. We now have a new priesthood and a new law—Christ our Priest, and the New Testament our law.

Since Christ should be priest on His throne, and He should not be a priest on earth, it follows that His throne cannot be on earth.

Since He is priest in heaven, and is priest on His throne, it follows that His throne is in heaven.

If Christ is not on His throne now, He is not priest now. But if Christ is priest now, He is on His throne now, because He is King and Priest at the same time, after the order of Melchisedek. As reigning King, Jesus has all power in heaven and earth (Matt. 28:18-20), which reign and authority extends until the last enemy, death, is destroyed at His coming, when He shall surrender His authority and kingdom to God the Father who will be “all and in all” (1 Cor. 15:20-28).
DEFENDING THE TRUTH

It is the Duty of Every Christian to Oppose All Forms of Error That the Blood Stream of the Church May Be Kept Pure

E. R. Harper

For this opportunity of writing to this paper regularly in defense of the truth I am grateful. While I am not an experienced writer, I shall always try to be clear in my articles, that there may be no misunderstandings concerning any position taken by me.

I shall at all times be glad to make myself understood regarding those questions that have to do with peace and progress of the brotherhood.

The question I have chosen to discuss in this article is that of “defending the truth.” It seems to me that in certain sections that we have grown into a condition that is rather alarming, and that bids fair to take the church into sectarianism, to accept and fellowship “creeds,” and to bid God’s speed to the human churches about us.

I do not know which constitutes the greater danger — fellowshipping the creeds or making the creeds.

The Right to Oppose Error

Because we oppose and expose error some of us are called “creed makers,” “sects,” and are branded as the “dividers of the church”; but it is my honest opinion that the so-called radicals of the church are the ones who are going to keep pure the blood stream of the church and save it from being “creed bound,” in that we will have to submit to all kinds of error on the ground that “every Christian has a right under heaven to preach his convictions.” That to me is as much a plank in a man-made “creed” as it would be to say “every man has a right to preach his convictions but not with the support and endorsement of the church.” I personally had rather stand with the latter “creed makers” than with the former, for the latter would not commit the church to the support and encouragement of error.

Methodist, Baptist, Catholic, and Holiness churches have the right to preach “what under heaven they believe,” but they should not have the church back of them. So it is, with all error. We have no right to deny a man liberty, but we do have the right to oppose him without being branded as “creed makers” and “sect formers.” We have the right to withdraw from any man, who is teaching error to the disruption of the church, our indorsement and fellowship, until he corrects his errors and comes back to the faith.

Now, the issue is, shall we sit by and see error ride with an unchecked charge against the truth or shall we rise up and defend the truth? In Little Rock, and in most places in Arkansas, we have determined to defend the truth against all forms of unsound doctrine whether it is from without or from within; whether it is old-fashioned sectarianism or the new sectarianism known among us as “Bollism.” If either gets root in this state, it will be by men from without the state who have brought it in, and not by those of us native born.

Attitude Toward Teachers of Error

The Bible lesson last Sunday, in a special Bible class, was 1 Tim. 6: 3-5: “If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perversity of speech, a man of corrupt mind, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.” If this is not a true condition that has been brought about by “Bollism,” which is not according to the “words of Jesus Christ,” then I would not know how to define it. It has brought about envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings (that we are creed makers, sect formers, destitute of the spirit of Christ, etc.), and from those who have brought such corrupt doctrine into our midst Paul says “withdraw thyself.”

Holding the Traditions

In 2 Thess. 2: 14, 15, Paul says, “Wheresoever he calleth you by your gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.” If this does not teach us to defend the truth, hold it sacred to our hearts, and not to allow error to come in and take possession, then the admonition has no meaning. In the third chapter, verses six and seven, the apostle says, “Now we command you, brethren, (not that you may if you want to, or you may not as it pleases you, but ‘we command you’) in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, (the highest authority that can be put back of a command), that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us, for yourselves know how ye ought to follow us.” This command does not apply merely to wrong conduct, but it applies to everyman that went contrary to the traditions taught them by the apostles “by word or epistle.” We are commanded in the passage to stand for the traditions, and hold the traditions. How then can any man say that those of us who are doing this very thing are “creed makers” and “sect formers” and are “responsible for the trouble in the church”? How can a man obey this command and take the position that “every man has the right under heaven to speak his mind” without the criticism and condemnation of the brotherhood when he should leave the traditions? If Brother Boll and his friends have not left the truth, then let his defenders accept his theory. If he has left the truth, then let them stop branding those of us who are doing what Paul here commanded us to do, as “the dividers of the church.” Let them, if they believe like we do, join us in “standing” for the traditions, and “holding those traditions, and in withdrawing support and fellowship from such errors.

Fellowshipping Error

Why do they fight us if they believe as we do? Does Paul mean for them to withdraw fellowship from, condemn and criticize those who are defending the traditions of the apostles, or are they to withdraw themselves from those who by teaching error are causing the trouble? It should not take a Solomon to see this. Men defend that which they admire and condemn that which they despise. We who oppose “Bollism” are defending the truth. Those who defend Brother Boll are upholding error. Those who fight faithful men of the gospel in their defense of the truth whether they mean to or not are fighting the truth. When they uphold men who teach error, who have brought sorrow to the church, who have disrupted the peace of the church by false teaching, they defend not them only, but also their doctrine, and it destroys
the “weak brother for whom Christ died.” He sees the strong brother eating the meat offered to idols; he does not understand, and eats, accepting “the idol,” and it destroys him. So when one opposes and condemns those who defend the truth, against “Bollism,” and other forms of error, he is in fellowship with those errors. That is the reason Paul commanded withdrawal from such forms of teaching and in keeping with “the traditions.” He knew others might be overcome by such, and lost.

When students are taught that “Bollism” is harmless; that it has nothing to do with the work and worship of the church and the Christian’s life; that it is a theory about like that which opposes it is a theory; that after all one may be as true as the other, the minds of those students are prepared for the reception of such error and they in turn go over the country teaching congregations that “Bollism” is nothing, that you may believe it or not, it makes no difference. When that is done error has won and truth has lost.

Stopping Their Mouths

In Arkansas, we are going to come to the defense of the truth, and expose error in any form it may appear. We are going to “earnestly contend for the faith” as Jude admonished. We believe the sound principles given by Paul to Titus (1:9-14) to keep pure the truth, “holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision; whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply (this is what the friends of Brother Boll say we should not do—that he is too good a man for that) that they may be sound in the faith (the only purpose for our fight against all this error is for the soundness of the faith, but we are branded as personal haters, jealous, envious, etc.) not giving heed to Jewish fables (this future kingdom idea is a Jewish fable, if ever there was one), and commandments of men that turn from the truth.”

I, with Paul, believe that when men who have turned from the truth are subverting men and women, it is time to see that their mouths are stopped—that we defend the truth.

My next article will be on this same subject, showing how we defend the truth in Little Rock, and over the state.

That denominational preachers are easy on the errors of their fellow denominations is well known. Their attitude is, “We’ll preach our particular doctrine, but will not condemn other churches.” But that gospel preachers, men claiming the New Testament preachers for their models, should follow that same course is astounding. Many among us are thinking in exactly the same channel as the denominationalists; “Let’s preach the truth, but let other folks alone.” The result is that, instead of a major operation on error, they just massage it. A weak and a wrong attitude toward error has beset us; it is not new, for our brethren have borrowed it from the sectarians, but it is inimical and death-dealing to New Testament Christianity. This fatal, devilish “method” is manifest when we consider the (1) journals, (2) colleges, (3) and preachers.

The Papers

Look at the wide divergence in the papers among us, papers all supposed to be bulwarks in defense of New Testament Christianity. The Word and Work does not mention names of those it attacks, but contents itself by saying, “There are those who are making a new sect,” or “There are those who ostracize us.” So with the Truth-seeker—it is determined to be sweet-spirited, never pugnacious. Those two papers are twins in attitude toward error; never directly frontal in attacks, they use cunning craftiness and sly innuendo. They are easy on error; they are not setting forth in the positive terms of Raccoon Smith and Benjamin Franklin the plea for apostolic Christianity. Sectarian papers would like the Word and Work and the Truth-seeker. On the other hand, the Foundation, Advocate, Leader, the Christian Worker are not hesitant in calling the names of denominations and in uprooting their doctrines. These latter three are as different from the former two as daylight and dark; and the difference is attitude toward error: one group tears it out; the other masses.

The Colleges

The striking difference among our periodicals is no less evident among the colleges. Though David Lipscomb and Harding Colleges have much in common with Freed-Hardeman, there is a wide separation. And again, the difference is over attitude toward error. The difference is not just over the fight on premillennialism; it is over their attitude towards all kinds of error. Freed-Hardeman College is positively outspoken; David Lipscomb College and Harding College condemn error, but in a roundabout way. David Lipscomb College is not the same school in attitude toward error as in days of Freed and Boles. It is not that I am prejudiced; rather, I love all the schools, and make mention of them in my prayers; would to God they were of the same mind and judgment.

The Preachers

If there is a difference among the papers and among the colleges, that difference is even more pronounced among the preachers. As strong and talented a man as Athens Clay Pullias does not call out the names of denominations in his preaching and condemns them; as God-fearing and earnest a man as E. H. Jamms will call a Methodist preacher at New Hope, “Brother,” and call on a Presbyterian preacher to lead the prayer at Oneonta, Alabama. On the other hand there is the preaching of a Hardeman, an E. R. Harper, and E. G. Creacy that hues to the line, that draws the line between truth and error, that calls the names of errorists. I deeply admire the tact and the high principles of men of the Pullias type; I humbly thank God for the piety and meekness of men of the Jamms type. But those characteristics are not peculiar to New Testament preachers; Methodists have them; Catholics have them. It is true that no man is a New Testament preacher without those noble characteristics. He may be the most positive and the soundest preacher in the world, doctrinally, but unless he is humble, high-principled, exemplary in life, he is not God’s preacher. Which is better, to be sound morally and weak on pointing out the doctrines of men, or to be weak morally and strong on doctrines? Of the two I should prefer to be strong on morals, but neither one is a New Testament preacher; both sides of the matter are fundamental. No man is true to the New Testament if he is unsound morally. No man is true to the New Testament if he is so keen in condemning the commandments of men. The New Testament preacher, God’s preacher, is pure in life and firm in doctrine.
Great Songs of What Church?

Some months ago, in the Firm Foundation, this writer reviewed and criticized the misnamed songbook, Great Songs of the Church, compiled by E. L. Jorgenson. It was pointed out that by the purchase and use of the Jorgenson songbook, loyal churches are lending aid to and supporting a factious movement which would, if it could, wreck the whole church. It was pointed out that the songbook represents in all probability the main source of revenue from the Word and Work (R. H. Boll's paper) has, and that it is doubtful if the paper could survive of its own strength. This article elicited both commendation and criticism. Of the critics, Brother Jorgenson was himself the chief complainant. His method of replying to the article was to submit ads to the papers, rather than articles, reciting in detail the sales on his book, with especial emphasis on large sales to large churches from the time his book was made, using many old figures and commendations, instead of more recent ones. We saw little point in his recitation then, except to confirm some things said of his methods, but he has since revived the issues respecting his book by his ads and advertisements of "The New Number Two." It will not be amiss to call attention to some of the major objections to the use of this songbook by churches of Christ.

Brother Jorgenson has insisted that Word and Work (paper) does not receive profit from the sale of the book. I have before me a copy of Great Songs of the Church, the title page of which reads: "Address all orders to Word and Work, Publishers, Louisville, Kentucky." The Word and Work, mind you, publishes the Great Songs. Before me is also an ad appearing in Word and Work, the paper, advertising Great Songs, and giving Word and Work as publishers of it. Moreover on his letterhead appears Word and Work as publishers of the songbook, as well as of the magazine. Can Brother Jorgenson successfully deny that the Word and Work which publishes the songbook receives whatever profit is derived from the book—or will he say that he has given them away at so close a margin all these years that there has been no profit?

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

The late songbooks bear the publishers title Great Songs Press. Naturally this would cause some to imagine that Word and Work has nothing to do with it at all. But Brother Jorgenson is playing Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde with us. As publisher of each, is it possible that he does not let his left hand know what his right hand doeth? Being publisher of the songbook, the profits pass through his pockets. Being publisher of Word and Work, the deficits must come out of his pockets, since his paper operates at a loss, per his own statement in an issue of some time ago. How can he say that he does not pay the deficits of one with the profits of the other? It is too fine a distinction to trace. He is publisher of both, and of course, benefits from the profits which enable him to continue his publications. It looks like he has resorted to a dodge in attempting to distinguish between himself as publisher of the songbook and himself as publisher of the Word and Work. But it is not even a good dodge. The point is this: If loyal churches should withdraw their patronage from Great Songs of the Church, the book could not be published, and probably the paper itself would fold up, and their divisive work come to a sudden stop. That certainly would not hurt the church any.

Yoked With Unbelievers

It is a fact that sectarian music houses furnish his songs, print his books, and are in fact his repositories. His orders are relayed to churches through these sectarian concerns. He has chosen sectarian affiliations and sources. He has also chosen a huge selection of sectarian songs without editing the error out of them and has dumped them into Christian worship. It is a sectarian affiliation; many of the songs are sectarian; printed by sectarian music houses, and shipped to the churches from sectarian headquarters. Still, he calls the book "Great Songs of the Church"! A better name for it would be Sectarian Songs for the Church! But it is said that all of our songbooks have songs of sectarian writers, and we are charged with inconsistency. But there is a difference between a sectarian song and a song by a sectarian author or composer. When properly edited, a song by a sectarian may become a true song. The songs in the Jorgenson books have not been edited and are full of error and heresy. For years the Gospel Advocate retained C. M. Pul- lius to edit the words of all songs used in their books, and no error is retained in their songs, unless by an oversight. Austin Taylor for many years assisted the Firm Foundation in similar capacity. In Great Songs of the Church (?) sectarianism has not been edited out, simply because the compiler and publisher of that book is himself steeped in those sectarian errors. In addition to other errors, song after song in Great Songs teaches the millennial heresy, fairly winging the doctrine into the hearts of whole congregations. There can be positively no excuse for such a songbook in our churches.

Columnizing the Churches

The ads in Word and Work, listing the churches that purchase his book (new and old orders), are for the purpose of putting the churches in the Word and Work column. If the readers have observed the wording of the ads at particular intervals as they are timed to certain criticisms that appear in the papers, under such heading as "And Still They Go," with the churches columnized, they could hardly escape the impression. The publisher may deny the strategy, but knowing the circumstances, and observing the tone and time of his ads, it will take more than a mere negation to be convincing.

The elders of a certain church in Texas some years ago actually passed a resolution, signed and entered them into the minutes of their meetings, never to use any other book than this sectarian book, Great Songs! Brother Jorgenson would doubtless disclaim any influence in it; but it is a fact nevertheless, and those familiar with it are by no means convinced that
A Tribute to Preachers

C. A. NORRED

I often find myself pondering tenderly the memory of an incident which occurred on a crack train about one hour out from one of the cities of the South. One seat ahead and across the aisle sat a little withered grandmother way up in her eighties. Directly in front of me sat her grandson, a rugged type of man somewhere in the early fifties. As we had ridden together for at least twelve hours we had become sufficiently acquainted for them to know that I was a preacher. In a little snatch of conversation between the two, the grandson assumed a mock air of remonstrance and said for my benefit, "We shouldn't talk like that in front of a minister." Then still playing, he said to her, "But of course we all know that preachers are no better than the rest of us." Then the cultured face of the little old woman from Kentucky, while holding all the tender light of the mirth of the playful moment seemed somehow to reflect rebuke, and she said: "How beautiful are the feet—I" The grandson sincerely dropped his head and said, "Excuse me, grandmother. How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel." Then I recalled that fine old passage: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!"—and which is divinely rendered by Paul: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel in peace of good things!"

Messenger of Peace

The preacher is divinely committed to the proclamation of the gospel of peace. The original passage literally designated the messenger who brought Zion the good news of the end of the Babylonian captivity, but Paul divinely applies it to the gospel of Christ and the peace of salvation. Unfortunately our interests and impulses are so carnal that when peace is mentioned we think of it in a political way. Of course, even political peace is desirable. But spiritual peace that is interrelated with obedience to the gospel is the real content of the expression. And of this deeper peace that which is generally thought of as peace is merely a by-product. The passage therefore sets forth the preacher as divinely committed to the labor out of which arises such a measure of world peace as we shall ever know and the peace of God which is the accompaniment of salvation in Christ. The preacher is the one person I know among us who is actually divinely designated as one on whom the salvation of the souls of others depends!

Brother Jorgenson was not in some party to it. The Main Shaft

The main shaft of the objection to the book, and the one most ignored, is its doctrinal unsoundness. It is full of erroneous teaching, and therefore unscriptural. For a sample of the little error it contains, observe the following verses from various songs in it:

No. 167—"Jesus is coming to earth again, what if it were today? Coming in power and love to reign, what if it were today?"

Some of us have read the word of God to enough profit to know that the Lord Jesus Christ is not coming back to the earth to reign. Other lines of this song teach the millennial heresy which Jorgenson teaches, such as: "Satan's dominion will then be o'er" (the idea that at his coming the Lord will end Satan's dominion and enter upon his own world dominion — the millennium), then, "signs of his coming multiply, watch for the time is drawing nigh," etc. The song as a whole is a clear perversion of New Testament teaching, with directed aim at the objectionable doctrine, and Jorgenson apparently went out of his way to increase the number of such songs in his old book. If the "New Number Two" has adroitly left a few of these conspicuous songs out, there are others it did not leave out, and its sectarian, factional, sectional setup maintains the same objections to it.

Observe another erroneous song: Number 126: "I know that my Redeemer liveth and on the earth again shall stand." This is a perversion of the language of Job 19: 25. Job said centuries before Christ was born that in the latter day the Redeemer would stand upon the earth. Evidently he did. The song puts it in the future and adds the word "again," which Job did not say. There are editions of this song that eliminate this error, and preserve the melody, but these brethren choose the error. Song No. 194 puts the reign of Jesus with his saints after his coming, and puts the "hallelujah" to its straight millennial doctrine, unfit to be sung in the worship of Christians.

Song 384 is premillennialism gone to seed. It even sets to music the doctrine of kingdom postponement, featuring Christ "rejected" and "disowned" when he came first, but "vindicated" and "enthroned" when he comes again! Great Songs is full of the Boll and Jorgenson foolish notion, set to music's soothing lotion! The right name for the book, truly, would be Sectarian Songs for the Church.

Spiritual Civilization

This means that the preacher is the keeper of spiritual civilization. The gospel is the only hope of peace. But the preaching of the gospel depends upon the preaching of the preacher. When, therefore, I am tempted to sun myself in the light of public favor, to adapt my ministries to the interests of those who are headed away from God I must sternly remind myself that He who bought me with His blood has committed me to a keeping of spiritual civilization by keeping the traditions committed us of Christ. This is exactly what Paul had in mind when he said, "I have kept the faith," for the word kept translates a word whose meaning is that of guarding. Paul had the same thing in mind when he said, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." As ludicrous as it may appear to some it falls to the preachers to keep the purity of the traditions on which civilization and salvation depend.

Badge of Faithfulness

And this work will entail its hard, ships. As a little boy I saw a preacher in a pulpit put forth his foot and make a joke about the feet of preachers. I was shocked then, and I am shocked now as I remember it. I felt even then that there must be something fine and beautiful back of that figure. And there is; for it names the poverty that is the badge of faithfulness. The military messenger, bent on blood, had a chariot in which to ride. The messenger that was the emissary of merchants had his caravan to bear him along in comfort. (Do you recall the caravan of slave dealers that took Joseph down into Egypt?) But the faithful preacher of the gospel will go on foot! Of course, I do not understand this figure as meaning that it is sinful to go any way except that of walking, for Paul sailed of his own accord from Troas to Philippi. But I do know that the faithful minister will find it necessary to get along without the helps that worldly men are glad to put at the disposal of those who serve their interests. There were days when I shrunk under this apparent injustice. But I would a thousand times over choose to see my sons standing straight and strong in the ranks of the righteous and glad in the simple garments of honest poverty than to see them enjoy a luxury that was the reward for evil. "Let the million-dollar ride!" As for me and mine we count it a privilege to walk with Jesus and those other worthy souls who in sandalled and weary feet walked about in the task of keeping men for God.

Blessed little old grandmother from Kentucky. As we poor mortals have a way of doing, I let her slip away without my telling her how much I appreciated her tribute to preachers.
Freed-Hardeman Moves Forward

While Freed-Hardeman College has a glorious history of which it is justly proud, yet, it is not living in the past. "Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before," it presses forward to greater and better things.

The physical equipment of the school is always kept in fine condition. The buildings and furnishings are never allowed "to go to rack and ruin" but are promptly repaired as soon as they are impaired. They are always kept neat, clean and orderly. The same is true of the campus. It has been made beautiful with trees, shrubs, flowers and grass. It is kept in almost perfect condition the year around.

Before and during the coming session, it is planned to put in a dairy with a sufficient number of cows to furnish milk for the school, to re-furnish both dormitories with modern single beds, and to change the dining hall into a modern cafeteria.

But after all, the things that make Freed-Hardeman College what it is are not material. They are intellectual and spiritual. A faculty made up of men and women of broad scholarship and liberal culture; of right ideals and conceptions of life, with spirits modified and molded by that of the Great Teacher, together with students that are eager to learn and that are easily influenced by the right things; these are the things that make Freed-Hardeman College.

The academic work done in Freed-Hardeman is of the highest quality. Our students demonstrate that when they go to other institutions. And while we expect to maintain and even to raise this high standard of scholarship, yet, the greater emphasis in Freed-Hardeman is placed on the study of the Bible and related subjects together with the development of Christian character.

With reference to the Bible, Freed-Hardeman College has definite and clear-cut convictions. It stands for "the ancient order of things," for the old Jerusalem gospel without addition, subtraction or modification. It has no patience with hobbies, theories, speculations or "inventions of men." It is positive, bold, and aggressive in its advocacy of the Truth and likewise in its opposition to error. It believes we are in the midst of perilous times, that some have departed from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, that there is a tendency to compromise with denominationalism, and that worldliness in general is about to engulf the church.

In the midst of all these evils Freed-Hardeman College is "standing like a stone wall," fighting with all its might for the original doctrine, practice and spirit of the New Testament church. Our lives are dedicated to this work and we expect to fight it out on these lines if it takes the "remnant of our days."

The young preachers that go out from this school are filled with the same spirit and are putting up a valiant fight for the original faith.

Through the generosity and zeal of Brother and Sister J. W. Akin, Freed-Hardeman College is in a position to offer assistance to worthy young men who desire to prepare themselves to preach the Word but are unable to pay their way through school. A large number have already taken advantage of this offer, but ten or twelve more can still be taken care of.

Finally, we believe there is no better place for young men and young women, boys and girls to go to college than Freed-Hardeman. It is safe and sound in every way and we pledge ourselves to give the best there is in us to those who come our way. Write for literature.

N. B. Hardeman, President.

heed-Hardeman College
Henderson, Tennessee

A strong, well-organized, accredited junior college emphasizing moral and spiritual values. Maintains Bible school, Commercial school, Demonstration school, together with departments of Music, Teacher Training, Home Economics, etc. Bible teaching positive, affirmative, aggressive. Unexcelled advantages for young preachers. Special fund to aid them.