The Bible teaches that God hears and answers the prayers of his children. The devout Christian prays often and earnestly and rejoices in the good that comes to him from that he is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or thing.” Unselfishness and humility are naturally associated with prayer. “Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures.” It is shocking beyond measure when men make use of the intimacies of their prayer-life for advertising purposes. This is carrying super-salesmanship too far and is disgusting to people who understood the nature and uses of prayer. Prayer is so personal, intimate, and involves the very depths of the heart to an extent that the delicately poised soul recoils from opening the door of the sacred closet that the world may gaze in. It is not a healthy symptom for a man to be always telling you how honest he is, how successful he is, how much he gives and how often he prays. Personally, I am afraid of such a man, as he usually lacks anything from balance and poise to something even worse.

My Book is open at Matthew six. Our Lord was observing “the righteousness” of the Pharisees. They prayed, fasted and gave alms. Jesus advocated these activities but he did not savor the manner in which these hypocrites engaged in them. His warning is still timely. Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them; else ye have no reward with your Father who is in heaven.” They gave alms, advertised the fact and gloried in the applause of shallow-minded flatterers. They prayed in bombastic style, made great pretensions to piety and were thrilled if they were considered special pets of the Almighty. With sad and disfigured faces they advertised experiences which if legitimate would have served well as calm strength within the soul. It is a delicate matter to criticize a man’s prayers, but Jesus ex-piety and made no effort to conceal the identity of the oppressed the deepest scorn for these peddlers of their own fenders.

But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee.” Shut thy door. This closed closet is the sanctum sanctorum of divine fellowship of the profoundest intimacy. The suppliant finally emerges, peaceful, comforted and otherwise blessed. He does not type off a highly colored account of his intimate experience and send it to the paper for the same reason he did not leave the door open in the first place. It is considered bad manners and otherwise highly improper to impugn the motives of men in religion, but then Jesus did just that, and their motives, were what drew the fire of his scorn. It does not require such super-natural knowledge of men as Jesus possessed to detect wrong and even wicked motives in the activities of some men today.

Nothing has been more prostituted as a screen for selfishness and wrong than prayers. Men have advertised their prayers to conceal everything from thievery to heresy. Religious leaders in Jesus’ day robbed widows’ houses and for a pretense made long prayers. Prayer was made to sanctify thievery. Such hypocrites can tell you when, how and where the Lord has answered their prayers. They have marvellous things to relate and have you at a disadvantage unless you feel equal to challenging their veracity. Religionists use “answered prayers” to cancel out the great commission and nullify the conditions of pardon. If we preach that men must believe, and be baptized to receive remission of sins, a multitude of sectarian experience meetings bear witness to numerous cases of salvation before and without baptism. If God answered their prayers and gave them the feeling, what difference does it make what the Bible says? Sectarian papers generally, including such wild theorists as Christians, Mormons and other “healing” cults, feature their “testimonials” and “experiences.” “Answered prayers” are their main stock in trade. If God does all that enthusiasts and charlatans loudly and piously claim that he does, he exhibits fanciful moods to the point of being a God of confusion. The answer to all this is, “Let God be found true, but every man a liar.” It is simply not allowable for men to sidestep responsibility for heresy or disloyalty with their personal testimony to, “answered prayers.” It is an old trick which has lost much of its power to deceive. The really devout would not resort to it and the poor in spirit who really receive answers to their prayers do not boast of the fact. Men with smooth and fair speech rise up to deceive the hearts of the innocent or perhaps engage in subversive activities of a somewhat milder type. They meet criticism with a look of injured innocence and dramatically call on high heaven, in the presence of all who walk on the earth, to witness that their prayers have been answered. The point, of course, is that God has borne witness to his suffering servants and their critics are wicked persecutors. It is an old trick employed by any and sundry who have felt unequal to the task of honorably facing issues on their merits.

As devoutly as we believe in prayer and rejoice in the blessings that flow from him who answers prayer, it is im-

(Cont. on page 9)
The affable editor of the Firm Foundation, with usual geniality, but characteristic incisiveness, deposes on his editorial page as follows:

There is a paper now called "The Bible Banner" issued twelve times to the year. Besides the actual editor, it lists at least three "associate editors" and some fifteen "staff contributors"—editors in the making. I am not well acquainted with the editor of the Banner. He is a personal friend of mine and I esteem him highly as a brother in the Lord and appreciate his friendship. On Bible questions he is almost always right, and as a preacher, debater and writer, he takes first rank. He is, doubtless, above the average in ability, and I read and enjoy his paper. From this good "Gospel Banner" of October, I clip from a staff writer, R. A. Turner:

The Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation can be mighty forces in helping the Bible Banner and Apostolic Times, continue the effecting of division between truth and the digression staged by the Christian Leader and Clinton Davidson. This, to date, in the main they have failed to do. They cannot perform their God-given mission and ignore their imperative responsibility. The brotherhood has a right to expect them to rally to the defense of the cause of Christ against this digressive aggression. Their silence in the fight will be calculated to effect false peace between truth and digression. If the Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation fail to serve the brotherhood in this capacity, then, a sword must be drawn against them.

This paragraph is from an excellent article on the subject: "Not Peace, But A Sword. This is a favorite text with the Firm Foundation's editor. It has been the basis of many of his essays. But the strange thing is that the brother seems to know so little about the Firm Foundation. It is true maybe that I know as little of him. I don't think that I ever knew that such a man lived till I read the article mentioned above in The Banner. I asked the list keepers to see if he is on the Firm Foundation list, or the "Preacher List" or the "Gospel Proclaimer" list, or the "Preacher List" or the "Gospel Proclaimer" list, or the "Spotlight" list, but behold he is not to be found. If he is a gospel preacher I do not understand why he does not at least have his name listed among the preachers of the churches.

But anyhow his thrust above. He is all stirred up about exalting a banner on a band wagon, and wants every one to get on or he, or somebodv else must turn himself loose on them and woe it will then be to them. Now the Advocate is abundantly able to look after its own affairs I suppose, at least I hold no brief for it or its owners and editors. But as for the Firm Foundation this Turner is abundantly welcome to just go to turning and twisting whenever he pleases. We are not boasting, neither do we mean to be defiant. But we have a record in the editorial management of the Firm Foundation of more than thirty years during which there has not come before the brotherhood an issue that we have not spoken plainly on when it appeared that it merited space in the columns. And there is not an errorist we fear in the least and just when the good brother thinks he is prepared to draw 'a sword' against us he will find us ready for the attack. It is just ridiculous, how a man can assume the victim of "one-ideanism." He thinks and speaks and writes on one thing till he thinks there is nothing else worth while.

At all events, it is the purpose of the Firm Foundation to keep along the even tenor of its way, defending truth and exposing error as in the past. And by this it means all error. A hobbiest works on the error to the exclusion of others, a level-headed Christian does not. We are not likely to be moved about by any wind of doctrine, nor by any sort of megaphonist laboring under the excitement of a waving banner on a band wagon.

There is no paper, editor or publisher whose confidence I would covet or enjoy as I would and do that of the Firm Foundation and its editor. I have been brought up under its influence during its thirty years under the able editorship of its present owner and publisher. My whole Christian life, and preaching life, have been molded and guided, aside from parental influences, by the Firm Foundation, and I have never known it under any other editor than the present. This may account for the fact that "on Bible questions" I am "almost always right"—and wrong only, perhaps, if I depart from its positions—which I am not conscious of ever having done on any point of controversy. The expressions of friendship and of confidence are altogether mutual and I reciprocate in all the generous words, of which in return he is far more worthy than am I.

As for our Brother Rex A. Turner, of whom the Firm Foundation never knew nor even heard, till "the article mentioned above in the Bible Banner" was read, we will just say that they know him now. A young man in his twenties should feel complimented that the first time he was ever heard of he created enough sensation to put the office force of the Firm Foundation in a stir to find out who he is. And the fact that his name was not found on the Firm Foundation list, nor the Gospel Proclaimer, nor even the Spotlight does not within itself warrant the hasty conclusion that this young man's whereabouts are unknown to all, or that he is insignificant, or perchance not even "a gospel preacher." I don't take the "Spotlight" myself, as important as I am.

For a little further information on this young Turner, he is known aplenty in the regions of Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala. He is quite well educated, holding the B. A. degree from an A-one University, which should cause some of the college fellows to take notice, a potential definition of a man with them. He preaches for one of the largest and best congregations in the state of Alabama. Furthermore, he has stirred Central Alabama with his firm, and at times fiery, preaching over the radio. Sin and error "take it on the chin" every time he takes the floor. The Ministerial Alliance in Montgomery knows who he is, not because he is a member but because he is not a member, and they all know why. If this is the first time the Firm Foundation and its readers have ever heard of him, it will not be the last, for in the years to come it is our prediction that this young man will not only be heard of but will hear from in the affairs of the church.

The good Firm Foundation and its considerate editor should consider the fact that Brother Rex has not known the Firm Foundation for thirty years, seeing he is not that old. Not knowing its past as we do, he has judged it by the five peas in the pod were green, they thought the whole world was green. Don't expect us all to become green, brother, just because you become so. I am certain that the Firm Foundation has published far more against premillennialism than has the Gospel Banner yet published. This may not be true later, when the Banner is older, but I think such would be a wise surprise.
the present, and if too hastily, still his mistake might not be as serious as the criticism which has provoked the Firm Foundation. He, like others, is deeply concerned about several developments in the church-one of which is the Davidson movement. Believing that this issue “has come before the brotherhood” and that it is an issue that the Firm Foundation has not “spoken plainly on,” he feared that the “even tenor” of the Firm Foundation’s way was a bit too even and needed stirring up on this point—and he evidently succeeded since twelve lines quoted from his article brought forth a two-column editorial, which is two-thirds of the large editorial page of the Firm Foundation. Another thing that should cause the Firm Foundation to be a little easier on Brother Rex is in the fact that Clinton Davidson and his movement have received more or less favorable publicity through the Firm Foundation, and believing the movement to be fraught with many dangers to the church, he has felt perturbed over the apparent lack of activity “on the Western Front” in this fight. Again, we say that he does not know the Firm Foundation as we know it. Personally, I have no doubt as to the Firm Foundation’s stand because I know its editor. I do not believe that he is asleep, but is watching all fronts and that he will speak plainly on any issue if and when the issue appears to him to merit the space in his columns.

As for the “one-ideaism,” that charge has been made against the Firm Foundation many, many times in the past when it was having that fight-to-the-finish argument over what was falsely called the “rebaptism” question. The Firm Foundation would not let go nor turn loose, and was branded as an arch-hobbyist, for “a hobbyist works on one error to the neglect of others” and that was the charge against the Firm Foundation in those days. But it was this unrelenting fight which the Firm Foundation made that drove this error in practice virtually out of the church, and there are very few preachers in the church today either east or west of the Mississippi river who are willing to “shake in the Baptists” on their baptism. I would rather work on one idea that’s right when it needs working on than to grow them in bunches that are wrong.

As for the Bible Banner’s “associate editors and some fifteen ‘staff contributors’-editors in the making,” we do not consider that the Bible Banner is making them at all, but that they are making the Bible Banner. We are glad to list their names, young and old, and it is again worthy of remark that the youngest one on the roster is the one who got a rise out of the old staid and steady Firm Foundation and nearly caused it to lose the “even tenor of its way.”

But the Firm Foundation has “staff writers” also whose names, if not listed in the paper, nevertheless appear on the letterheads furnished them by the Firm Foundation. Frank L. Cox, Guy N. Woods, Leslie G. Thomas, Harbert D. Hooker, and others, use Firm Foundation letterheads listing them as editors, staff writers, representatives, etc., of the Firm Foundation. So we cannot even have an argument on that, nor anything else, for we will inevitably wind up on, the same side of the question.

In conclusion, we beg to say that if any article in the Bible Banner has misrepresented the Firm Foundation or in any manner reflected on its loyalty to the old paths—we tender our apologies.-F. E. W. Jr.
Some few days ago I received a "Success Bulletin" from Harding College in which Clinton Davidson was featured as a pattern and model for success. The bulletin stated that in spite of Mr. Davidson's success in the world, his wife had remained faithful and loyal Christians throughout the years. I immediately wrote to Mr. Davidson and learned the facts (as well as the entire bulletin) wondering how such a statement could be made in the face of his conduct throughout the years. I received a lengthy reply from Brother Davidson in which he made a denial of all he had ever taught. The information Harding had ever taught the Pre-millennial theories. Among many other things he stated that Davidson had made a public confession of his wandering before the Manhattan church and that we should graciously and lovingly receive him now. What do you know - about this confession? When was it made and what was the nature of it? I have been under the impression that no such confession has "come back." What is your attitude toward Davidson now? Is it true that he worshipped with the Christian Church with the instruments being used, which is "taken in." Immediately after I had heard of Davidson's confession of error to the Manhattan church and that we should graciously and lovingly receive him now, I felt sure you would know. Any light you can give me will be appreciated.

I trust that you are moving along in a fine way. Fraternally, Lindsay Allen.

To this letter Brother McCord replied as follows:


I have not seen the "Success Bulletin" from Harding featuring Bro. Davidson. But what you say it contains and what Bro. Benson wrote you are in themselves contradictory:

Davidson had made a public confession of his wanderings and his wife had remained faithful and loyal Christians throughout the years.

Bro. Benson: Davidson had made a public confession of his wanderings.

Those two statements just don't fit together: if he had remained faithful throughout the years there had been no wandering.

I have shown myself as unable to cope with a man of Davidson's reputation. I scolded him too much for being "taken in." Immediately after I had heard of Davidson's confession of error to the Manhattan Church, I wrote him a letter of congratulation. I also wrote him that I was saying "with or without" regarding gratitude that Bro. Davidson had seen his digressive error, and hoping he would see the importance of the premillennial errors. Bro. Wallace did not publish this letter. Article nine wrote Wallace, asserting I believed him unfair not to publish his own gratitude for Davidson's confession. Bro. Wallace then wrote me other things that Davidson has been doing he has almost certain evidence that Davidson is back of the anonymous letter itself. Mr. Davidson wrote W. B. McDiddy trying to get him to say Wallace had lied to him. Mr. Wallace tried to get Mr. Wallace to expose Wallace-something his own white-shirted paper will not stoop to do, but he will use all his powers to get other papers to do so. Thus, Wallace explains the more solemn statements of digressive affiliations is needed; such a statement does not meet the needs in the case.

A.L. Lamb:...I am sure that you have been a photo-static copy of a letter that appeared in the May issue of the Bible Bulgaria Sunday School paper.-We are all its suppliants and recipients-but in view of Clinton Davidson's course among us he reminds me of the old phonograph record: "He Came In Like A Lion And Went Out Like A Lamb."-F. E. W. Jr.
We continue our review of Brother Errett’s articles, in the Christian Standard of June 10th, he says: “We care, therefore, to the main point. Fundamental to it is the question as to whether there is any definite New Testament ordination of worship. (You are right, Brother Errett, this is the milk in the coconut J. T. L.) This our conservative brethren appear to assume. (You are wrong, here, Brother Errett, this is not an assumption, but a matter of faith ‘with our conservative brethren” J. T. L.). Brother Boles repeatedly uses the term “the worship,” and his argument seems to rest upon the assumption that the Lord has clearly delineated the bounds of an entity or procedure designated as acceptable Christian worship. This seems to us to be speaking where the Scriptures are silent. (Brother Errett, did you ever read Matthew 15:9? “But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the precepts of men.” How could there be a vain worship, if there is a specific worship procedure designated in the New Testament, the only possible conclusion is that our conservative brethren are here presenting us with an opinion which they would force upon us. (You are wrong, Brother Errett, in thinking that the conservative brethren would force an opinion upon the digressive brethren in the matter of worship. If you will not think it presumptuous upon the part of the Bible Banner, which occupies an insignificant place on the “lunatic fringe” of Brother James DeForest Murch’s chart to teach the Christian Standard which occupies such a “strategic position” on the chart, what the New Testament system of worship is, the lesson will be free, and here it is. “For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord’s death till he come” (1 Cor. 11:23-25). You see we believe in the second coming of Christ. In 1 Cor. 14:15, we read: “What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.” Thus we see praying and singing, not playing, go with the worship. In 1 Cor. 16:1, 2, we read: “Now concerning the collection for the brethren, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, so do also. Ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come.” Therefore commemorating the death and suffering of the Lord, praying, singing, and contributing as we are prospered, constitute the divine system of worship, that Paul says he received of the Lord, and put in the church at Corinth. The Jerusalem church, “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers” (Acts 2:42). In Acts 20:7, we read: And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow, and prolonged his speech until midnight.” Luke gives Paul’s preaching at Troas a secondary place, the disciples came “together to break bread” on the first day of the week. The lesson is yours, Brother Errett. (You are right, Brother Errett, all Christian conceptions of worship would seem properly to stem from the words of Jesus to the woman at Jacob’s Well, a clear statement during the Mosaic dispensation of a contrasting type of worship that is to come in a new dispensation. This must be Jesus’ own statement of what acceptable Christian worship is to be. (You are right, Brother Errett, and we will give you the words of Jesus. “Ye worship that which ye know not: We worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth” (John 4:22-24). To worship in truth is to worship according to God’s word. ‘Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth.” No assumption here, Brother Errett. (You are right, Brother Errett, the digressive brethren in the Christian Standard of May 27. Read it again, and see the fruits of such teaching. Presumptuous Practices It seems to me that scores of our brethren should be using their voices in protest against a foolish, if not a sinful, practice. I refer to the growing habit among the churches of uniting with the denominations in observing the Lord’s Supper on Thursday night before Easter. The day of the week on which Jesus instituted the Lord’s Supper is still uncertain. When Jesus instituted the supper. He didn’t say on what day or how often it should be observed. He simply requested His friends to do it in memory of Him. The New Testament gives us further instructions and very specific about observing the Lord’s Supper. Jesus told His friend that He must leave them, but He would send the Holy Spirit to abide with them; and the Holy Spirit would bring to their remembrance all He had taught them and would teach them all things. The record tells us that the Holy Spirit came on the day of Pentecost and did guide the apostles. Under the direction of the Spirit-guided apostles the Lord’s Supper was observed on the first day of the week. It was regarded the heart of the Lord’s Day worship and was not observed at any other time. There is an incident recorded in Acts 20 that establishes this fact definitely. Paul had finished his third missionary journey and was hastening to Jerusalem as he wanted to be there when the feast of Pentecost was held. He evidently wanted to be at Troas for the observance of the Lord’s Supper with the brethren there; and to do that it became necessary for him to remain there seven days. If it was all right to observe the supper at any time, why didn’t they do it on Tuesday or Wednesday or some other day so that Paul and his party could be on their way? So much of his time was consumed here that he could not go to Ephesus, where he wanted so much to go. He had to send for the officers of the church to meet him at Miletus, and he gave them his farewell instructions there. (Cont. on page 14)
THE ANIMUS OF THE CHRISTIAN LEADER MOVEMENT

It is the general judgment of loyal brethren everywhere that the Clinton Davidson-Christian Leader movement presents the most formidable challenge to the New Testament Church in our generation. The Davidson movement takes on the aspect of an octopus, and is seeking the strange hold on the entire body of Christ. It began with a flood of questionnaires, polling the brotherhood, the claims of which have been proven false. It turned out that their report was a percentage that never existed—worse than a stuffed ballot box of a state election. Davidson's next move was the underhanded effort at character assassination. It is my firm conviction that I have in my personal possession sufficient evidence to prove that he not only has "a guilty knowledge" of the anonymous letter campaign but that he has a criminal connection with it as its sponsor and promoter. I think I know this and believe that I can prove it if the brother ever decides to carry out his threat to sue my sox off. I have been putting on a new pair every week since he made this threat so that he could sue for a good pair.

From questionnaires and legal threats, the movement advanced to his well-known efforts to intimidate certain publishers to sell him their papers. He succeeded in buying the Christian Leader, and his modern digressive movement thus became definitely organized with this old historic paper as his party organ.

It is now proposed that this man Davidson, who is not only positively disqualified but utterly unfit to lead, much less head, any important movement in the church—it is now proposed that he will promote and finance a complete series of "Sunday School Literature" for the churches.

Of course, an effort will be made to convince the public that it is not Davidson's literature. But it will be remembered that after he bought the Leader it was claimed that he had nothing to do with it and was not even a director. But the business mail, as well as some of the mail regarding articles, was nevertheless going out from his New Jersey office. And when after much apology the editor of the Leader finally summed up enough courage to announce an exchange of articles on the millennial issues, the announced order was immediately countermanded! Davidson evidently said: Nothing doing—that talk about the announced order was immediately countermanded!

So it is with reference to this literature series. Is the cooperation thus becomes definitely organized with this old historic paper as his party organ.

It is now proposed that this man Davidson, who is not only positively disqualified but utterly unfit to lead, much less head, any important movement in the church—it is now proposed that he will promote and finance a complete series of "Sunday School Literature" for the churches.

Of course, an effort will be made to convince the public that it is not Davidson's literature. But it will be remembered that after he bought the Leader it was claimed that he had nothing to do with it and was not even a director. But the business mail, as well as some of the mail regarding articles, was nevertheless going out from his New Jersey office. And when after much apology the editor of the Leader finally summed up enough courage to announce an exchange of articles on the millennial issues, the announced order was immediately countermanded! Davidson evidently said: Nothing doing—that talk about me not being a director was only for public consumption!

So it is with reference to this literature series. Is the public so gullible as to believe that Clinton Davidson will promote this literature series with his money, as he has the Christian Leader, and not retain control of it, through others if not directly? If so, then we have failed to profit from the lesson administered to the churches by the digressive series years ago. Their movements have ever been sinister, and they are still sinister. No, I have no confidence in a digressive, no more than I have in a mule, and if I were going to preach a mule's funeral, I would stand at his head.

The following correspondence which has been furnished me for publication by Brother C. A. Norred will reveal some things which we believe brethren ought to become wise to, and Brother Norred renders the Cause a service by releasing this correspondence. In a letter to me, he says: "Before sending you the correspondence between Sewell and me I found myself wondering if it were right for me to expose to view a private correspondence and that without the permission of Sewell. I reached the conclusion that all things made it a worthy thing to do." So do I. When these men have sought to prevent the exposure of their compromises under the legal protection of a copyrighted paper, the mere technicalities of what is supposed to be ethics by all means should be cast aside when the matters involved affect the whole church of Christ.

The animus of the New Christian Leader movement, promoted, financed and directed by Clinton Davidson, with this newly proposed Literature Series for the churches, can be seen without eye-strain from the following correspondence.

Jesse P. Sewell’s Letter

August 8, 1939, C. A. Norred, 920 So. Adams, Fort Worth, Texas. Dear Brother Norred:

Sister Sewell and I expect to spend Friday night, August 18, in Fort Worth.

If it is convenient, I would be very much pleased to have a meeting with you and some of the other preachers and leaders in Fort Worth to talk over with you the new series of Bible lessons being planned.

Ten different groups in widely separated sections of the United States are at work now developing a prospectus for these lessons. This is not a factional move in any sense. The material will belong to the people who produce it until final arrangements for its publication shall have been made.

Brother Clinton Davidson is paying the expense involved in its development and guarantees its publication in case the different publishers do not care to publish it on a cooperative basis, but Brother Showalter has assured us that he will be glad to join in its publication and has appointed Brother Cox to cooperate with me in its development. I have not approached Brother McQuiddy with reference to the matter yet, but we are hoping that he also will be interested.

My desire is to make this literature represent the very best thinking of the best prepared men and women in this field in the entire brotherhood. To this end I am asking this conference with you in Fort Worth, that if possible we may enlist the cooperation of a group there.

The meeting involves no responsibility of any sort or kind, and I shall appreciate it very much if it is possible for you to arrange it.

Hoping that you are well and happy and that your work goes nicely in every way, I am

Sincerely and Fraternally yours,

(Signed) J. P. Sewell

JPSys

P. S.: Please write me care of Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, whether or not the conference suggested is satisfactory.

C. A. Norred’s Answer

August 9, 1939, Mr. J. P. Sewell, San Antonio, Texas. Dear Brother Sewell:

I have your letter in which you request that I take steps to arrange a conference with you and the leaders and preachers in Fort Worth for the purpose of discussing the Bible lessons you are preparing. I feel that the honorable thing to do is to state with all kindness and meekness that I could not conscientiously have anything to do with such a meeting.

Frankly, I distrust the spiritual leadership of Brother Davidson. If I am correctly informed he was for a long time affiliated with the digressives. Almost immediately with his change he manifested a desire to alter our meth-
ods and tactics. Until I am made to see him in a more favorable light I shall avoid anything which might entangle me in his influence.

And I can never forget how my heart ached as I read Brother Lovell's statement in the final issue of the West Coast Christian that his paper was merging with a new paper which was coming out as a protest against the other papers. The Leader was the paper with which the West Coast Christian merged. Further, Brother Lovell was taken in as one to shape the policies of the paper. I can see that the papers have made their mistakes, but when a paper comes out as a protest against the papers published among us it manifests a spirit from which I even involuntarily recoil.

Under these conditions you will excuse me, I know, from any participation in your conference. And I beg of you that you understand that these statements are made in kindness and at the dictate of conscience.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. Norred

Jesse P. Sewell's Second Letter

Thursday. Dear Brother Norred:

I have read your letter in the same spirit in which you wrote it.

The meeting will be held in the Polytechnic meeting-house at 8 o'clock. I am still inviting you to attend, and your letter indicates to me that you need to attend unless you are willing to base your own judgments and attitude and the influence you exert on the basis of one-sided and perverted information.

As to Bro. Davidson you say "if I am correctly informed" and etc. and then say "until I am able to see him in a more favorable light I shall avoid" and etc. Just how do you expect to see him in a more favorable light by refusing to hear anything except from those who hate him-mostly whom have made no first hand investigation? That you have been misinformed about him in some fundamental your letter demonstrates beyond any doubt.

Some of us who have given a good many years of service to humanity have spent a good deal of time and considerable money in an independent effort to learn the exact truth, not from his friends or from his enemies but from reliable disinterested sources. Everything we were able to thus learn contradicts the statements of your letter. I believe a good man, and you have impressed me you are, should not only be willing but anxious to know the truth.

As to the literature we are developing, Bro. Davidson has no more control over it than you have. The development is entirely in the hands of Frank Cox, representing Bro. G. H. P. Showalter, and me, representing myself. I am inviting the co-operation of men and women throughout the country who have studied and had experience in this field. Those who prepare the material will be responsible for it. It will belong to them and they will determine who shall publish it and on what terms.

I feel that your study and experience in the field entitle you to an exact knowledge of what is being done and how. And to any contribution to it you might be prepared to make. Just the facts as to what is being done and how is what I propose to present in those meetings. Am asking not one thing except the sincere judgment of those who attend. And I am more anxious for criticism than for commendation. I have only one desire and that is to de-agogically, that will make possible better teaching in the velop a series of Bible lessons, sound Scripturally and ped-

churches. I am absolutely free to do just that. Whatever hardship there is connected with it mine-not Brother Davidson's, Bro. Showalter's, or any other publisher's. Those who cooperate with suggestions, criticism and work will determine what it shall be. If you stay out and we put over something unsound from any point of view, I feel that your responsibility will be considerable. This is a matter of service to me. I am receiving no pay from any source and will not. Those who write the material in its final form will be paid. No one else. I am paying my own expenses on this trip. If you think I am selling out or giving, out to Clinton Davidson or anyone else, you have your wrong man.

As to my soundness, and loyalty to Christ and his truth, on any point, I invite you, and if you won't accept an invitation, then I challenge you, and if that isn't enough, I dare you to pick out one place where I am either unsound or disloyal.

I have spent too many years and am too close to the end to tie myself up and endeavor to draw others into it at any point. I am not interested in any faction or group or click. I am interested in the Lord's church and his truth.

Come to this meeting, Bro. Norred, and let us talk things over plainly and frankly as brethren, and not stand aside and refuse to hear each other and pass judgment on one-sided information.

I expect some men to do that but not you. You will not be entangled with me or anyone else. Come help us see the truth. I'll be looking for you.

Sincerely and fraternally,

(Signed) J. P. Sewell

C. A. Norred's Second Answer

August 18, 1939, Mr. J. P. Sewell, San Antonio, Texas. Dear Brother Sewell:

In your letter written Thursday you bring forward several things which we could both discuss with much interest. In view, though, of the limitations imposed in a correspondence we must confine ourselves to main issues. And you will understand why I must address you in correspondence when I say that at the hour of your conference I shall be engaged in a service at our meeting house.

The request you made of me in your letter of August 8 was that I arrange a conference here in which you and the leaders here might talk over "the new series of Bible lessons being prepared." You stated in that letter: "Brother Clinton Davidson is paying the expense involved in its development and guaranteeing its publication."

You will recall that I begged to be excused on the ground that I distrusted the spiritual leadership of Brother Davidson. In that connection I stated that I had been informed that until a recent date Brother Davidson had been affiliated with the digressives. Also I took occasion to say that almost immediately on his alleged change he undertook to alter our methods and tactics. In this latter statement I had reference to his questionnaire and his charge that our papers were run by men ignorant of Journalism and were made ineffective for good because they gave so much space to controversial matters.

Personally, I should be happy to see persons repudiate the Christian Church. But when a person allegedly affiliated actively with them for years suddenly undertakes to change our methods to conform with the general ideas advanced by the digressives I distrust his leadership and entertain scruples against participating in that particular enterprise.
But in your letter written Thursday you say: “Every-
things we were able to learn contradicts the statements of
your letter.” I assure you that if I have been misinformed
I want to know it. Since you assure me that you have
made investigation in these matters I want to ask you two
questions:
1. Is Brother Clinton Davidson paying the expense in-
volved in the preparation of the Bible lessons you are
recommending, and guaranteeing their publication?
2. Was Brother Davidson affiliated until a recent date
with the digressives?

It is my humble desire to abound as much as is pos-
sible with me in every good work. If your work is worthy
I certainly should be happy to give it any encouragement
I could. On the other hand, I could not afford to support
that which I have been made to see in an unfavorable light.
I am, therefore, frankly informing you of my fears and
inviting any information you will give.

Particular

I shall say that as much as I dislike con-
trversy we cannot look from my mind the conviction
that error must be exposed. (2 Tim. 4:4) And the wisdom
of that provision of the Divine Will is impressed on me as
I observe that those groups which have disdained the work
of exposing error have slipped so far in compromise as to
have little excuse for their continued existence. I can not
dismiss the feeling that among us there is a distinct drift
toward compromise and liberalism. The information which
has been given me makes me think of Brother Davidson’s
work as looking in that evil direction. Until my convictions
in that matter have been changed I cannot identify my-
self with his enterprise. But I say again that if I have
been misinformed I want to know it.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
C. A. Norred.

C. A. Norred’s Final Answer

September 8, 1939, Mr. J. P. Sewell, San Antonio,
Texas. Dear Brother Sewell:

I feel it my duty to write you that I am made to feel
grieved over what I must think of as a discourtesy. Re-
cently you imposed on me a correspondence in which you
requested a certain favor. I explained my scruples and
begged you to excuse me. In a none-too-kind reply you
informed me that information you had secured showed
that I had been misinformed and that I was basing my
action on one-sided judgment. As I was engaged in a
service the evening of your conference here I mailed you
by special delivery a letter requesting the information. I
have not received any reply. Of course I can realize that
your letter could have gone wrong in the mails. Also,
there might be the barest chance that you did not receive
my letter. If, though, under the circumstances you have
withheld a reply I can not dismiss the feeling that your
action amounts to a discourtesy.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
C. A. Norred.

Note: No reply Sept. 26, 1930.

There is the evident effort to conceal the connection
Clinton Davidson sustains to this Literature Series. But it
cannot be hidden. It is silly for Brother Sewell to assert
that “Bro. Davidson has no more control of it than you
have” after having definitely stated that “Brother Clinton
Davidson is paying the expense involved in its develop-
ment and guarantees its publication in case the different
publishers do not care to publish it on a cooperative basis.”

As well argue that Leon B. McQuiddy has no more con-
trol of the Gospel Advocate and its literature than “you
have. This is the old Davidson scheme, his same old
trick. He made that same offer to the other publishers
with reference to the paper deal-that is, he offered them
the alternative of cooperating in his journalistic program
or else he would promote a competitive paper. They re-
 fused. He started his paper. Due to the public reaction it
was then announced that it was non-competitive—but he
moved it from Cincinnati to Nashville. He will do what he
did before—put out a series in opposition to them. So his paper threat has been
followed by a literature threat of the same character. Hit-
er occupies the Rhine, then takes Sudetenland, Czecho-
slavakia, Austria, then Danzig and Poland! But he had no
“territorial” ambitions in Europe, nor has Davidson in the
church! All he wants is control of the papers, the literature
of the churches, the colleges, and the preachers! By the
time Davidson and Witty get the church partitioned between
themselves and the digressives in this religious aggression,
the church would look like the Polish partition between
Germany and Russia!

As for Brother Sewell’s soundness, he invites, chal-
enges and dares (I thought he was about to double-dog
dare) anybody to pick out “one place” where he has been
“either liberal or dissident.” We all know Davidson was
sentenced to the state penitentiary in Arkansas, and they
named Abilene. Texas is indebted to Brother Sewell for the
introduction of Bollism into our state when he brought such
men as David L. Cooper to Abilene Christian College over
the protest of many good brethren. Brother Sewell knew
that Cooper was from Louisville and of the Boll school. He
refused the warning of others who knew it also. Cooper
denounced a number of the best and brightest students
in the school and they were sacrificed to error. Cooper
was dismissed from Abilene after several years, but only
when public sentiment was so strong against him that it
amounted to a tempest of protest. He now affiliates with
some new off-brand non-orthodox, premillennial, cult in
Los Angeles, and does not even attend a church of Christ.

Brother Sewell also brought George A. Klingman to Abi-
lene as head of the Bible department, and he succeeded
in making digressives out of several fine young men, and
others became liberal or went modernist. At the same
time he brought other men to Abilene whose disloyalty to
the truth and general soft-pedalism have since been mani-
1fected in the works of Abilene. Texas is indebted to Brother Sewell for the
 introduction of Bollism into our state when he brought such
men as David L. Cooper to Abilene Christian College over
the protest of many good brethren. Brother Sewell knew
that Cooper was from Louisville and of the Boll school. He
refused the warning of others who knew it also. Cooper
denounced a number of the best and brightest students
in the school and they were sacrificed to error. Cooper
was dismissed from Abilene after several years, but only
when public sentiment was so strong against him that it
amounted to a tempest of protest. He now affiliates with
some new off-brand non-orthodox, premillennial, cult in
Los Angeles, and does not even attend a church of Christ.

Brother Sewell also brought George A. Klingman to Abi-
lene as head of the Bible department, and he succeeded
in making digressives out of several fine young men, and
others became liberal or went modernist. At the same
time he brought other men to Abilene whose disloyalty to
the truth and general soft-pedalism have since been mani-
1fected in the works of Abilene. Texas is indebted to Brother Sewell for the
 introduction of Bollism into our state when he brought such
men as David L. Cooper to Abilene Christian College over
the protest of many good brethren. Brother Sewell knew
that Cooper was from Louisville and of the Boll school. He
refused the warning of others who knew it also. Cooper
denounced a number of the best and brightest students
in the school and they were sacrificed to error. Cooper
was dismissed from Abilene after several years, but only
when public sentiment was so strong against him that it
amounted to a tempest of protest. He now affiliates with
some new off-brand non-orthodox, premillennial, cult in
Los Angeles, and does not even attend a church of Christ.

BROTHER DAVIDSON AND MISTER WALLACE

Believe it or not, I have met Clinton Davidson. And it
was in Louisville, KY., in the Bradstown Road church. He
came to hear me preach—that is, he came where I was
preaching. He sat in the rear. A friend of mine, brought
him to the front after meeting and introduced him to me.
I said: “I am glad to see you Brother Davidson.” He replied:
“How do you do, M’ister Wallace,” and emphasized the
‘M’ister. He remarked that he had heard and read of me.
I replied that I had also heard of him and had read some
things he had written (meaning things his name was not
signed to), and I looked him right in the eyes with both of
mine. It may be that he still speaks the language of the
digresses, as we remember that he addressed the preach-
ers “Rev.” when he sent them his questionnaires and some-
one had him to correct his error. I told him I would like to
talk with him, but he said he was leaving for New York
immediately. I don’t know what he was doing in Louisville
during my meeting unless he was trying to get R. H. Boll
and E. L. Jorgenson to come out to hear me preach. He
did not visit J. F. Kurfees, the brother of M. C. Kurfees,
whom he says he admired (?) so much. How does it hap-
pen that he has such little use for his fine brother, and the
church where M. C. Kurfees preached for forty-five years?
People in Louisville told me that he was definitely on the
Boll side there—mark you, definitely. Anyway, I met
Brother Davidson and found out that I am just plain
Mister. -Oh well, I think I will just keep on preaching and maybe he will
“brother” me some day. -F. E. W. Jr.

**PROFANE PRAYER**

(Con’t. from page 1)

portant that true disciples do not drift into such profane
uses of prayer as sectarian developments often em-
ploy. As I see it, Clinton Davidson, our New Dealer in deluxe
copyrighted journalism is introducing a dangerous innova-
tion. He spreads out over a couple of columns of his paper a
recitation of some of his prayer experiences with their re-
results. The reader is left on infer that the Lord has been tak-
ing extra good care of the brother from tender years onward.
At the age of fourteen the Lord in answer to prayer helped
him find a lost check it would have taken him two or
three hours to have found without the aid of prayer. Pray-
er served as a labor-saving device. It is not stated whether
a grateful employer gave him time off to go swimming
or skating according to the season. Probably the precio-
cious lad was too staid and settled to enjoy juvenile sports.
Later in life he was most anxious to put over the most
important business deal of his life which involved a mil-
lion dollars or more which others, probably worldly-minded
people who cared nothing for the church, had at stake. A
villainous attorney had him stalemated. The Lord in an-
swer to prayer exposed the villain and saved the million to
his humble servant by causing a telephone operator to
stick a plug in the wrong, or in this instance, right hole
by mistake. Who profited most in this deal? This is all
pretty childish to be dishing out to the readers of some-
thing new and high-class in journalism. A Catholic tra-
dition relates that the little Lord Jesus was wont to make
birds of clay and clap his hands and cause them to fly
away to amuse his little play-mates. It is a common fault
to inject too much imagination in religion but does less
harm if kept out of the papers. We are told that the broth-
er got a lot of his inspiration from Brother Harding. Be
it said for Brother Harding without either criticising him or
setting him up as authority, that he was not interested in
employing the help of the Lord in making a million dol-
ars for himself or anybody else. His theory of trust led
him to oppose either owning property or taking out in-
insurance. His disciple Davidson boasts that he for years sold
lars for himself or anybody else. His theory of trust led
employing the help of the Lord in making a million dol-
lar. Such a practice is not necessary, the Lord in answer to
prayer to save a million dollar deal for some unbelievers
up in New York, Jews or Gentiles, is somewhat different
from a prayer to “give us this day our daily bread.” Our
praying, fasting promoter of high finance who takes Broth-
er Harding as his model in matters of trust, is asking that
all who will, write in similar experiences of their prayer
life. The ones who have the most to tell, if they would tell
it, will not write in. I have circulated around among “us
as a people” for a good many years with two good eyes and
two big ears open. It would be an interesting diversion
to read some of the “crank” mail which will flow in an-
swer to this unusual call from this unusual paper among
us. If they think it expedient to open up, he may even get
some “healing” testimonials from some of our mis-
sionaries who have seen Seventh Day Adventists cast out
demons, and others speak in tongues. It may be safely
said that all that comes to the office will not even reach
the editorial committee much less find its way into the
paper. I have my book open at something better than a
prayer for a lost check or a million dollars. “And this I
pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in
knowledge and all discernment: so that ye may approve
the things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and
void of offense unto the day of Christ; being filled with the
fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ,
unto the glory and praise of God.”

**A SIGHTING-IN SHOT**

The Bible Banner has contributed its part to a rather
hard-fought campaign “that the truth of the gospel might
continue with us.” There “have been some tragic and
rather amusing sidelights to the major actions. Some of
our bitterest detractors in private have of late used rather
precipitate haste to publicly avow that they agree with us
in doctrine. They criticize our methods. At any rate
these methods have been rather effective in smoking out
some of the brethren who have been holed up a long time
on some of these issues. We are rather proud of our influence
along this line. Even so, some of them are showing a pre-
ty ugly spirit and leaving a pretty bad scent wherever they
go. We object to their methods. They try to appear as
sweet as saccharine in public but display the bitterness of
gall in private. “Out of the same mouth cometh forth bless-
ing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not to be.” A mild-mannered, intelligent brother told me of a
visit he had from a honey-toned brother who exuded
spirituality from every pore and seldom ever had a fit until
the Bible Banner was mentioned. Then he went into active
and vocal eruption such as might be expected of Herr Hit-
tler when somebody introduced Anthony Eden or Winston
Churchill into the conversation. Be careful, boys. If you
preach one set of principles in public and violate all of
them in private, the brethren are going to draw some fas-
reaching conclusions. Fact is, some of them already are.
It simply does not “jibe” when you publicly broadcast
your opposition to premillennialism, and then suddenly look
and talk like you were weaned on a pickle when some-
body says something nice about the Bible Banner. As
for us, we do not have two sets of manners, one to be used
in private and the other in public. Like Pop Eye, “we yam
what we yam” all the time.—Cled E. Wallace.
DID R. H. BOLL FIND A PREMILLENNIAL CHURCH

John T. Lewis

Brother R. H. Boll mailed me two tracts, one under the above heading, and the other entitled "The Church I Found and How I Found It." Before going further with our review of his book "The Kingdom of God," I will notice some things he says in his tracts. Before criticizing a man's position, he should be allowed to state his own position, in his own words, and in his own way, and when thus stated, he and his position become inseparable, and you cannot criticize one without criticizing the other. For instance, when I criticize the use of instruments of music in the worship, I criticize the ones who use them. Therefore when I criticize R. H. Boll's vagaries of a future kingdom, I am criticizing R. H. Boll—not as a man, but as the advocate, and agitator, of the mass conversion of the Jews, their literal return to Palestine, the literal reign of Christ, for one thousand years, upon the literal earthly throne of David, in literal Jerusalem. This is my position, and so long as I fight Boll's position, there is no need in crying, "We are brethren, quit." When his advocating, and agitating; quits, then the fight ends. In his tract "Premillennialism," he says: "Among the pioneer preachers of the Church of Christ such men as Alexander Campbell (evidently, according to his later writings) Walter Scott, Moses E. Lard, J. T. Barclay, James Challen, and of later ones, H. T. Anderson, Prof. Milligan, J. B. Rotherham, Dr. Bents, and J. A. Harding, were premillennialists." I have an idea that there is a difference in saying the pioneers taught certain things, and producing their writings to show that they taught them. In the Millennial Harbinger 1841, page 103, Alexander Campbell says: "These seven specifications of antitheses between the literal and figurative resurrections, may suffice for the present. There are other points that have occurred to us besides these; but these, we presume, incontrovertibly show that the Lord cannot possibly come in person before the Millennium; and that with me, at present, is all that I wish to establish." A few years ago, M. D. Clubb was going to and fro through the country declaring that the pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of missionary societies, and instrumental music, in the work and worship of the church, and boasting, that he, and about one million five hundred other brethren, were standing with them. "The Voice of The Pioneers On Instrumental Music and Societies" was published. Clubb evidently read the book, and I have heard no more of his groundless claims about what the pioneers taught on those subjects. But Brother R. H. Boll is evidently not reading my articles, so he keeps making his bombastic claims about the pioneers believing his premillennial theories. I have already shown that Dr. Thomas was the only pioneer that Brother Boll could claim, with possibly Sidney Rigdon. I quote again from Alexander Campbell, Millennial Harbinger, 1842, page 265, he says: "Our brethren on the Western Reserve have been troubled with two Smiths. The Boston Smith opened the way for the New York Smith. (The-New York Smith, was "Joseph" Smith, America's greatest impostor, the fakes of Mormonism. J. T. L.) The one who wrote on the literal return of the Jews and a literal reign of a thousand years. From that egg Mormonism was hatched by Rigdon, and Smith of Mormon memory. And now from extrinsic influence some are converted to a new theory which they have almost identified with the very hope of the gospel. But of these matters we have much to say, and hard to be uttered." Thus Campbell declared that "the literal return of the Jews and a literal reign of a thousand years" was the egg that Sidney Rigdon, and Joe Smith sat on and hatched Mormonism. What has R. H. Boll been sitting on, and writing about for the last quarter of a century? Has it not been on the literal return of the Jews to Palestine, and the literal reign of one thousand years of Christ on the literal throne of David, in the literal Jerusalem? Has he not almost identified these theories "with the very hope of the gospel?" Would not the species he has hatched rather sit on the stage with the enemies of the truth, than to sit with the defenders of the truth? I quote again from Brother Boll's tract.

"What Difference Does It Make?"

"In discussing the prophetic teachings of God's word one is constantly confronted by an attitude of inertia, almost impatience. What's the use of all this', one hears said—it is not essential; we can be saved without it; it does not matter one way or the other; it is all theoretical, speculative, superfluous—why bother our minds with it; nobody can understand it anyway." And, 'Give us something practical—If we learn how to live and serve and worship, and what we must do to be saved, we have enough to occupy our minds, etc. That certainly is a wonderful attitude to assume toward any part of God's Word! It is like saying to God that much He has told us is valueless and confusing; and that since He didn't see fit to leave it out we will see to it that it is left out. It is presumptuous ignorance (Italics mine J. T. L) that thinks itself quite capacitated to pass judgment on the value of the teaching of the Bible." From the above, we learn that Brother Boll believes his theories about the national restoration of the Jews to Palestine, the literal reign, of a literal thousand years, of Christ on the literal throne of David in the literal Jerusalem are Bible truths. Therefore if he believes, as he claims, that these facts (?) are taught both in the Old and New Testaments, he is under obligation to God and man to teach them. Those who claim that he does not press his theories upon the church, are charging him with not teaching what he knows (?) to be the truth. Therefore I do not blame Brother Boll when he says the "attitude of inertia" that declares his teaching to be "theoretical, speculative, and superfluous," is "presumptuous ignorance." You will have to admire Brother Boll's frankness when he expresses himself on the "attitude of inertia," that he believes to be hindering the truth. Of course brethren Boll, Dr. Wood, Frank Mullins, and Blansett, who teach the theories of premillennialism in the open could not be put in the "inertia" class, neither can men like brethren Harde- man, and Foy E. Wallace, Jr., who fight those theories in the open be put in the "inertia" class.

Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary gives the following example of the use of inertia. "Any great reformer will find less practical discouragement in the opposition of bad people than in the inertia of good people." I am sure that Brother Boll's friends and sympathizers would class Harde- man and Wallace as bad men. It is rather significant, therefore, that Brother Boll used a term that tells the nambypamby neutrals that their attitude of "inertia" is more discouraging to him in his fight for truth, and reformation, than the hostilities of Hardeman and Wallace. I am sure that deep down in his heart, Brother Boll has more respect for Hardeman and Wallace than he does for the noncommittal brethren. I feel sure that Harde- man and Wallace feel the same way about Boll—they know what he stands for—premillennialism gone to seed.
Doubtless Brother Boll felt that he had been “wounded in the house of his friends” when he read the following from the August Bulletin of David Lipscomb College. “In certain sections the whisper is David Lipscomb is a Bollite school.” This is false to the core. No one at Lipscomb holds or teaches the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll, or other forms of premillenialism.” If, therefore, no one at David Lipscomb holds or teaches the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll,” they must think it is something bad, or they would not be afraid to “hold or teach” it. Within the last year Brother N. B. Hardeman, and Foy E. Wallace, Jr. have both held meetings in Nashville, fighting the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll.” So far as I have heard or read, they could also declare “no one at Lipscomb” has ever uttered a word, or written a line against the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll.”

“We without controversy great is the mystery” of some of our Bible colleges on the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll.” They declare before high heaven that “no one at Lipscomb holds or teaches the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll.” So far as I have heard or read, they could also declare “no one at Lipscomb” has ever uttered a word, or written a line against the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll.”

I may be accused of not having the Spirit of Christ, but when ever a doctrine is advocated by any one that causes division in the church of my Lord, you will not find me shouting from the house tops, “I do not advocate the doctrine;” but you will find me fighting both the doctrine and its advocates. Brother A. McGary told me of an experience he had during the World War. He was driving a mule down the highway, and met some soldiers, the young men began to bray like a donkey. Brother McGary stopped and said: “Boys he seems to understand your voice.” The men laughed hardily at the boys, and thanked Brother McGary for his repartee. I believe that every teacher in our Bible Colleges should speak on the living issues” of today, so every one could understand his “Voice”—his position.

In Obadiah 1:10, 11, we read: “For the violence done to thy brother Jacob, shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever. In the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and casts lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them.” Does this describe the attitude of David Lipscomb College on the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll?

The college is thirty eight years old, therefore, “of age,” and can speak for itself. Whenever gospel preachers, religious papers, or Bible colleges, have been running as long as thirty eight years and brethren are whispering around about how they stand on issues that are troubling the church, there is evidently something wrong with their “voice.” Since the subject is up, I would appreciate it, if David Lipscomb College, in its next bulletin, will tell us who are the “troublers of Israel.” Are those who advocate the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll” the troublemakers, or the ones who fight the “doctrines?” If they will do this, the next time I hear whispering about how “David Lipscomb” stands on the subject I will read the bulletin to the whisperers.

“Voice”

We now notice some things Brother Boll says in his tract. “The Church I Found and How I Found It.” We read on page 5, “The moment a Christian bows to a human creed he ceases to be a simple follower of Christ. An alien authority has intruded between him and his Lord; and his claim to be a member of the Church of Christ requires the explanation that he belongs to that particular party which holds to such and such a creed as the authoritative expression of its faith.” I have met some very bitter prejudiced sectarians; but I have never met one yet that ever accused church members of giving such “explanation” as Brother Boll speaks of in the above. If Brother Boll had wanted to state facts in the above, he would have used missionary societies, instrumental music, open membership, and premillennialism, instead of “that particular party which holds to such and such a creed.” He knows that he never heard a member of the Church of Christ make such an absurd statement in his life. Is it the spirit of Christ which makes such flagrant charges, or implications, against brethren? Is it an attribute of goodness, humility, and piety? But we read on. “If a man thus bound to a creed should see occasion (as any living, growing, thinking man must) to correct past views, or to enlarge past conceptions, and to take in new truths from the storehouse of God, he would either have to shut his eyes to light, or break away from the old creed, and formulate a new one every time he made a step forward.” Has the Church of Christ ever been bound by such an absurd and fanatical creed? Or is it another hallucination born of Bolline piety? If Brother Boll means to intimate, insinuate, or affirm in the above that the Church of Christ is, or has ever been bound by such a creed as he describes, I think Brother Armstrong should change some of the adjectives he used in describing him.

But we read on. “The Church I Didn’t Join.” “After all the writer has gone through, would he have to fear that while endeavoring to stand simply as a Christian, and to belong only to the church spoken of in the New Testament, he might inadvertently have fallen in with a sect which, while calling itself by that good name stands upon some division of the Church of Christ, and of many thousands of simple Christians, my brethren in the Lord.” If Brother Boll “stands absolutely and foursquare upon the Word of God, all of it and nothing but it—not any creed or theory of any man, either of my own or any other’s, and that by that word and with it, I am content to stand or fall—I am declaring the fundamental position of the Church of Christ, and of many thousands of simple Christians, my brethren in the Lord.” If Brother Boll “stands absolutely and foursquare upon the word of God, all of it and nothing but it,” and “no one at David Lipscomb holds or teaches the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll,” it follows therefore that “no one at David Lipscomb” “stands absolutely and foursquare upon the word of God, all of it and nothing but it.” Brethren, that is worse than anything I have heard “whispered” about David Lipscomb College. It must take a lot of the spirit of Christ to keep “David Lipscomb,” heaven spare the name, from joining Freed-Hardeman, and the Bible Banner, in the fight against the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll.” All the premillenialists, make the boastful claim of taking all the word of God, just as it is, and nothing but what it says. I challenge their claims, and have enlisted for life, or for the duration of the war. Name the spirit brethren. Brother Boll says: “I am declaring the fundamental position of the Church of Christ, and of many thousands of sim-
ple Christians, my brethren in the Lord." I admire Brother Boll because when he speaks you can understand his voice. In the above he not only declares, and defends, "the fundamental position of the Church of Christ," but "of many thousands of simple Christians, my brethren in the Lord." Of course the "many thousands of simple christians, my brethren in the Lord." in the last clause of his sentence, means all the premillenialists in all the denominations. Since the premillenialists are not only causing trouble in "the Church of Christ;" but in all the denominations, it would be fine for "the church," and for the denominations too, if they would follow the advice of Abraham and "separate" themselves from the church, and from the denominations, "and move their tents as far as Sodom"—then surely they could be at peace among themselves. It seems to me that this is what Brother Boll himself says, on page 6. "If there be any organization that stands for less or more than this: if there be a party holding articles of faith and tenets of man's deduction and manufacture as a creed and standard of doctrine, written or unwritten—I do not belong to such a party-organization, let its name be what it may..." If, I say, there were such a body demanding submission to such or such like articles of faith, on pain of ostracism and excommunication from their brethren and fellowship—do they do well to count me out; for indeed I belong to no such sect." That is, if you expect Brother Boll to quit teaching and pressing his theories about the literal return of the Jews to Palestine, the "literal thousand years reign of Christ, on the literal throne of David in Jerusalem," to have your fellowships, it do well to count me out; for indeed I belong to no such sect."

Chapter Seven

We will now review Chapter seven of R. H. Boll's book, "The Kingdom of God." In this book Brother Boll is seen in two roles. When speaking of "the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel," and the literal reign, of a literal thousand years of Christ on the literal throne of David in literal Jerusalem, he is a bold assayer. But when making allusions about the church he is a shillysh alley. I will give two quotations from the book which present him in each of these roles. In speaking of "the kingdom of heaven at hand," as announced both by John the Baptist, and Christ, he boldly asserts: "To the Jews the announcement meant but one thing. The promise of the Messianic Kingdom, with all it involved—the appearance of the Great King of David's line: the destruction of the Gentile world power; the establishment and final restoration of Israel and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty; the promises God made to the fathers, and the prophets' visions of the future glory of the people, the Land, the City, and the Kingdom—our day—had imbedded itself in the very hearts of the people." In alluding to the church or spiritual kingdom, 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." This allusion to the church is not only vague; but contradictory. How can anything be unexpected, and anticipated at the same time? Chapter VII is written under the heading, "The Kingdom In Luke and John." The whole trend of this chapter is to show (?) that Christ did not fulfill the Law or the Prophets' in his life, death, and resurrection; but they are to be fulfilled in the Restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, and the earthly reign of Christ, for one thousand years on the literal earthly throne of David, in the literal Jerusalem. We read: "In the third gospel, which has been termed the 'most beautiful book in the world,' there is a wealth of kingdom-teaching. As Matthew is specifically the gospel of the king, so is Luke the gospel of the Son of Man—setting forth most especially His humanity. It includes therefore our Lord's Davidic descent, on which depends His kingly rights as heir of David's line; because this was His human ancestry." That is, the gospel of Matthew and Luke were written to establish the Lord's Davidic descent, and "His kingly rights as heir of David's line," when the earthly kingdom of Israel is re-established (?). Brethren, did you get these two outstanding facts (?) in your study of the gospels? If not, why not?

As Son of David He was to be the Messiah, the promised King of Jacob, who should rule the nations with a rod of iron, whose righteous sway should extend from the River to the end of the earth; in whose days the righteous should flourish and abundance of peace till the moon be no more. (Brother Boll persists in applying the term "Messiah" to Christ as an earthly ruler, which is positively in no sense the Bible use of the term 'Messiah' never applied to any one but to Christ, and to him only as the "Anointed One," the "Redeemer" of mankind. J. T. L.)

Such are the promises. A great part, if not all, the existing misconceptions of the kingdom are due to a failure to recognize the intimate relation between the Old Testament teaching, and to study the two in connection. The New Testament does indeed illuminate the Old; but so does the Old throw light upon the New. For the Lord Jesus did not come to destroy the Law or the Prophets, but to fulfill. To ignore these facts is to misunderstand the scriptures. Or course, if Christ had fulfilled "the law and the prophets" in his first coming, there would be no law, no promise, no prophecy of a literal thousand years reign, on the literal earthly throne of David, in literal Jerusalem, for him to fulfill at his second coming. Therefore, Brother Boll has to extend the fulfillment of "the law and the prophets" into the future to sustain his fancies of the restoration of fleshly Israel, and the literal reign, of one thousand years of Christ upon the literal earthly throne of David in Jerusalem. A mighty little thing for brethren to fight about. Eh?

Brother Boll says there are "three cycles" of the "kingdom teaching" in the book of Luke. The first cycle, "The Kingdom Hope In Christ's Birth." Remember, with Brother Boll, "the kingdom teaching" and "the kingdom hope" have no reference to the church; but always to the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel. "Agreeable to Luke's design, we have here the most detailed account of the birth—the virgin-birth of our Lord. To a virgin named Mary, betrothed to Joseph, of the house of David, came the messenger of God, announcing that she should be mother of a son who was to be named Jesus. "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of David for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (1:32,33)." (His "kingdom," and "the throne of his father David," spoken of by the angels in his announcement to Mary, according to Brother Boll's assertions, had no reference to the church, or to the spiritual reign of Christ, but to the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, and to the literal earthly throne of David, which, he says, Christ is to sit on at his second coming. J. T. L.) This is simply the
announcement of the fulfillment, through this child, of God's oath-bound covenant-promise to David in 2 Sam. 7. This child should inherit the throne of His forefather David, the royal rule over the house of Jacob; it is especially to be noted that the covenant involved perpetuity of the house of Jacob, the nation of Israel, as particularly pointed out in 2 Sam. 7:10, 23, 24. In 2 Sam. 7:12, there is no misunderstanding as to what people and nation was meant. And while the fulfillment may often greatly transcend the wording of the original promise, it never belies it or nullifies it. In the announcement of Luke 1:32 no clearer term could have been used to signify just that nation than 'the house of Jacob;' That does not and cannot mean anything else than the whole nation of Israel—not Judah merely, nor the ten tribe kingdom, but the whole nation which descended from Jacob. By no principle of interpretation can this term be forced to signify 'The Church.' There you have it, brethren, there was not even a germ from which the church or spiritual kingdom could come, in the angel's announcement of the virgin birth of Christ. The announcement of the virgin birth of Christ, is Boll's cycle 1, and if there is of something but not to be 2, the in 2 Samuel 7:11, 12, must be fulfilled in Christ and his spiritual seed alone-David's natural posterity is out of the picture. The house God said he would make David, was not to be a house for David to dwell in, because he already had "a house of cedars'; but it was to be a spiritual house or family raised up for the glory of God, and for the salvation of mankind. That house is spoken of in 1Cor. 15:20, 23; 2 Tim. 3:14, 15; 1 Peter 2:24-25, 2 Peter 1:1, 1 Peter 5:1, 17, and in Acts 15:13-18.

We will now notice the kingdom God promised to establish in 2 Sam. 7:12. God talking to David, said: "When thy days are fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, then shall thy seed after thee arise and do right in mine eyes," thus putting him on David's throne, He made David's posterity observe these conditions? In Malachi 3:7 we read, "From the days of your fathers ye have turned aside from mine ordinances, and have not kept them." Did David's posterity respect these conditions? In Malachi 3:7 we read, "From the days of your fathers ye have turned aside from mine ordinances, and have not kept them." Therefore David's posterity, therefore, having violated the conditions upon which the perpetuity of their country and nation rested, were driven from the land, and throne. Thus ended his natural posterity, as a nation, and with the destruction of Israel as a nation went David's earthly throne. Therefore the house God promised to make David, and the kingdom he promised to establish in 2 Sam. 7:11, 12, must be fulfilled in Christ and his spiritual seed alone-David's natural posterity is out of the picture. The house God said he would make David, was not to be a house for David to dwell in, because he already had "a house of cedars'; but it was to be a spiritual house or family raised up for the glory of God, and
The angel said to Joseph, Matt. 1:20-23, "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins. Now all this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, Behold the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us." Nothing here about the "restoration of the earthly kingdom," but it specifically says it is the fulfillment of Isaiah 7:14, which tells of the virgin birth of Jesus, and that he "shall save his people from their sins." Therefore, in the ascension and coronation of Christ, we have the literal fulfillment of 2 Samuel 7:11, 12, and the fulfillment of Gabriel's announcement to Mary that "God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." In the coronation of Christ, as the "Great King of David's line," we also have the fulfillment of Psalms 103:19, which says: "Jehovah hath established his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." All of fleshly Israel had to be circumcised, or be cut off from their people; but Paul says: "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy and upon the Israel of God" (Gal. 6: 15, 16). I am walking "by this rule," and I am therefore of the Israel of God," spiritual Israel, the only Israel that God knows now. And it grieves me to know that Brother Boll, and other schoolmates, and friends of mine are not walking "by this rule," but are waiting for "the restoration of fleshly Israel," where they will have to be circumcised before they can walk with the "house of Jacob." I cannot conceive of mental delusions more degrading to the Great King of David's line." Just as sure as any prophecy was ever fulfilled, just that sure was 2 Samuel 7: 12 fulfilled when Jehovah "established his throne in the heavens," and put Christ, the "Great King of David's line," upon it, on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ.

We read again from Brother Boll's book. "We might note the peculiar fact here that the Lord Jesus is never spoken of as the king of the church. He is her Head, her Savior, her Lord, her Husband to whom she is betrothed; but is never called her King." Brother Boll mixes terms here, and tries to make the truth appear ridiculous. "The church," and "the kingdom" are different terms; but they are applied to the same people-spiritual Israel. In Col. 1:12-14, we read: "Giving thanks unto the Father, who made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in lights; who 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 our sins. In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins. In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins." In verse of 19, we read: "And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fullness dwell." Paul uses "the kingdom" and "the church" here in uses "the kingdom" and "the church" here in the same people or institutions but he did not mix the terms to make the teaching appear ridiculous, he was making no reservations in his teaching for the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, which is the Alpha and the Omega of premillennial teaching. Follow Paul and you will go to heaven. Follow Boll and you will think you are going to Jerusalem; but Jerusalem is not the antipode of heaven in the New Testament.
A PROPOSITION ACCEPTED

On page 17 of this issue will be found an article by Hugo McCord in reply to some ramblings of Jimmie Lovell. He quotes from Bro. Jimmie as follows: “If I send you fifty names of prominent ministers who answered the questionnaire and were satisfied with it, will you see that the Bible Banner publishes them?”

The Bible Banner would be only too glad to publish such a list of names, with the proper evidence attached to the list, of what these fifty “prominent ministers” said. It is somewhat strange that Brother High Pressure Jimmie would ask Brother McCord to “see that the Bible Banner publishes them” since the Bible Banner has repeatedly asked for such a list in its own columns, and has offered to publish their names, and what they said. We are not interested in publishing a bare list of names on H. P. J’s mere assertion attended by no evidence of what they assertedly said. Such assertions and claims on the part of those promoting the questionnaire have already been proved utterly unreliable.

But why publish fifty names only? They boasted of ninety five percent. If fifty is ninety five percent of the preachers who answered the thing, we have about found out accidentally how many answers they received to their circular sheets!

Since High Pressure Jimmie propositions us-let us proposition him. When the Bible Banner publishes the fifty names you will submit of “prominent ministers” who answered the questionnaire and “were satisfied with it,” will you “see that the Christian Leader publishes” the list of names of the gospel preachers who did not answer it, and were not “satisfied with it?” Time about is fair play.

As for the Bible Banner, we would be delighted to let the public see the names of the fifty preachers who answered the questionnaire favorably and are not ashamed of it. We predict that if they find out their names are about to be published, Jimmie may have to recall his proposition.

-F. E. W. Jr.
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In the last issue of the Bible Banner appeared some things that were of interest to some. I feel that those of us who have not been in full sympathy with Harding College were at least vindicated in part, if not wholly, in the minds of those who read the articles.

But here comes more convincing evidence that Brethren Benson and Sears, in their "Bulletins," have not told "all" about this matter. Again I am saying that brother Armstrong is a Premillennialist, and Brethren Benson and Sears knew it at the time of their articles in the Harding College bulletins.

I now quote from the pen of Brother J. N. Armstrong, as published in The Living Message Dec. 22, 1924. "As pointed out in a former article the kingdom or government represented by the Stone 'cut, out of the mountain without hands' was to abolish world rule, governments of human authority, all of them, until they should 'Become like chaff' and the wind would carry them away, so that no place would be found for them-the governments represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, the iron and clay—and the government represented by the stone in the dream, God's government by divine authority, the government not of this world, was, after having smitten unto 'Chaff' all these kingdoms," after they were abolished from the earth, to fill the whole earth. The interpretation of this prophecy that does not give to the saints, under Christ, a world rid of all human governments, possessed by the rule, the divine rule, represented by the stone 'Cut out of the mountain without hands' is a false interpretation.

Any interpretation that leaves, finally, on the earth a vestige of civil government, human government, or any other kind of government, save the reign of Christ, the subjects of which reign are members of the Church of our Lord, which church was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of our Lord, utterly fails to be faithful to the facts of the dream and to Daniel's interpretation of those facts. He that interprets otherwise must be a wild speculator and dreamer or a bondservant of human theories.

This is the wonderful vision, the inspiring, the invigorating goal, left dangling before every faithful Jew of Daniel's time—a world rid of all human authority but God's. O! what inspiring hope! Enough to bend every effort and to lead to the making of every sacrifice necessary to faithfulness to God. Imagine the glorious anticipations of the Jews! What could it mean—A world wholly under the authority of God! A world in which the will of God is done as it is in heaven. Lord it is enough! 'Even so come, Lord Jesus'!

Comments

We pause here long enough to observe some things. Now we see that every man who does not agree with Brother Armstrong is "a wild speculator, and dreamer and is a bondservant of human theories." This sounds like some charges he makes against me, for in a letter written June 7th, 1938, Brother Armstrong says:

"We do not rave, pull our hair, grossly misrepresent our opponents in order to make out a terrible case against them. But we use Christian methods and do not sow discord and stir up strife and make division as E. R. Harper does." Well, when he wrote the above article in the Living Message he was then much older than I am now, and yet he called them, wild speculators, dreamers and bondservants of human theories." But he says he uses Christian Methods. Those whom he attacked in that article might say that such harsh terms were not what they call Christian. This letter of June 7th, has some "hair-pulling" in it. Seems that more wrath was in evidence than Christianity. Those of us who have opposed these false theories have been making our fight on doctrinal issues and not personalities. But our methods of dealing with error have been attacked we have been branded as "Legalists" and "Void" of the spirit of a Christianity.

He should not blame younger men for that, when they who claim to possess the "Spirit of Christ" and who claim a monopoly on piety will call those who differ with them 'wild speculators,' "dreamers," "bondservants of human theories," "hair-pullers," "gross misrepresenters of their opponents." Of course, they do theirs in the Spirit of Christ and like Christians. We could not be expected to do this, since we are "wild," "bondservants of human theories," "hair-pullers, and raving, discord division, seed sowers! My articles have been with the issue and shall be only when occasions like this arise where I may be able to show to our readers the real spirit possessed by the Harding College Premillennialists and Boll sympathizers. Why will some who say they love the truth, fight and condemn us and stand by and see us take the abuse of the Premillennial sympathizers, see us fight this fight while they stay in the background? If all who know these things would speak out, the Lord in heaven knows what would the results would be. If all the men who oppose these errors would join our ranks, and all the papers would print the material I and others have; stand openly for the truth and refuse to aid those whose positions are in doubt until all doubt is removed, we could soon win the fight and have peace. It will take just that to do it. If every loyal paper would close its columns to every man who in any way sympathizes with or defends Boll and his doctrine, it would soon be over. Brethren, you will be held accountable at the judgment for not helping "stop the mouths of the gainsayers." It is serious.

But what is brother Armstrong's position?

(1.) The kingdom of the Lord is to abolish all other forms of government by smiting them, not converting them. Brother Armstrong never takes the stand that the church or kingdom of the Lord will convert all these nations—He smites them. Do not forget that one point.

(2.) After they have been abolished from the earth by being smitten (not converted) but abolished, destroyed, smitten; not saved, but coerced; then the kingdom of Daniel will fill the whole earth. That is Premillennialism
in the extreme, welcomed by any of them. They all know that it is Premillennialism, and so do you brethren who sympathize with them. Yet you condemn me for fighting it, and at the same time say you believe just as I do, and that you are with me. The voice is that of Jacob but the hand is that of Esau.

(3.) All forms of government will be gone "save the reign of Christ." All who disagree with this reign of Christ on earth idea are wild speculators and dreamers and "bondservants of human theories." Let me ask you, How many of you are with brother Armstrong in this or how many of you are with those of us who are among the wild class? Remember, Brother Armstrong says that this world reign of peace on earth spoken of by Daniel is after all human governments are gone." Hence, Daniel's dream the "Glorious," "invigorating," and "in spiring" phase of it, is yet to come when Christ reigns on earth with his saints.

(4.) Brother Armstrong prays, "Lord it is enough! Even so come Lord Jesus." Now why is he praying for him to come? Get this and do not let it slip your mind. He wants the Lord to come because this will not happen before Christ comes. Christ is coming with the sword of His mouth, which is not the gospel and with that sword he is going to bring about this fulfillment of Daniel. Here is where brother Armstrong's teaching is dangerous and extremely Premillennial. Brethren, I beg of you to get your eyes open.

In a letter I have dated May 28, 1938, Brother Armstrong says: "I do not believe that the whole earth will become subject to Christ just through the preaching of the gospel. For we are expressly told that as Jesus comes back again a sword will proceed out of his mouth and with it he will smite the nation etc.". Now, when will these nations, etc.? Now, when will these comes or after?

He says it is after he comes, and it is after the Lord comes that he will have this "reign of Christ on earth," with all his enemies destroyed. He is coming to earth and by "death blows" is going to make them subject to him. How long will this take? Well, he said in a letter which appeared in the September issue of the Bible Banner that it might be as long as 2,000 years after the resurrection of the saints until the end!

(5.) A world with no reign on it but that of Christ, with all men subject to that reign was the "glorious anticipation of every Jew." He says that has not happened yet. Now, here is what we have. The promise made to the Jew by the Lord in Daniel's dream has not yet been fulfilled but will be after the Lord returns with the sword and conquers-smites-all nations and makes them "subject" to Christ. Then, the Jew will see that "glorious" reign for which his heart longed and his soul sighed for. A world under the reign of Christ with no other kingdom or government existing on earth.

Brethren, if this is not the very heights and depths of Premillennialism then tell what is Premillennialism. If this is not it, then I confess to you I do not know it when I see it. I am against this Armstrong theory of the "future reign of Christ on earth with the glorious anticipations of the Jewish Nation yet to be realized, a world where Caesar's court is killed with physical destruction and the Lord rules this earth with His kingdom, may be for thousands of years on the earth." Brother Wallace, I have these articles and I am coming with more, even stronger than this.

WILL HE QUOTE THE SECOND?

Bro. Jimmie Lovell has said over and over again it is wrong to point out brother-preachers' faults in the papers. However, in People's Bible Advocate, September 1, he does his best to make "the editor" of a "leading paper" among us look bad: he quotes from a private letter, never intended for publication. Well, is there anything wrong in quoting from a private letter? Usually not, for a Christian will not say one thing privately, and be afraid for others to see it; Christians know "whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops." But Bro. Jimmie has urged, "Don't ever publish what I write privately." Repeatedly he has urged that on this writer, and recently wrote he had engaged Bro. Harper along the same line. If that is his "code of ethics" surely he ought to practice it himself. But right now Bro. Jimmie is violently against "the editor" of that "leading paper" and, because of it, broke his own code and quoted from a private letter.

Bro. Jimmie received very soon after the first letter another one which vindicated the wisdom of "the editor" of that "leading paper" and admitted that the writer of the former letter was not informed enough. Now it will be interesting to observe whether or not Bro. Jimmie publishes the second private letter. Fairness and consistency demand his doing so, but his "code of ethics" may prevent.

Bro. Jimmie is over-zealous-so much so he minimizes the truth of the gospel, unintentionally. He, with others, talk much of "unity" and "sweet fellowship," which is good, but the sacredness of truth, and unity of the basis of truth only must come first. When principles of truth are disregarded, we can have unity and fellowship with all Protestants, Catholics, even bloody sinners. The beauty and holiness of truth, God's Divine system, must come before the "sweetness of fellowship." That sweetness will follow of itself when all stand together on the truth. And until all do stand on and for the truth and against error, no amount of talk about love and sweetness and fellowship will ever give them to us.

Bro. Jimmie writes, "If I send you fifty names of prominent ministers who answered the questionnaire and were satisfied with it will you see that the Bible Banner publishes them?"

This writer is not the one who decides what goes in the Banner, but he is certain the editor would be glad to publish fifty names of prominent ministers who answered the questionnaire and were satisfied with it." Really though, a strong article, with or without a name, that justifies a brotherhood "temperature-taker" and questionnaire would be of more utility.

But, Bro. Jimmie, you ought not to disquiet yourself because of the avalanche of preachers reporting to the Banner they are against the questionnaire. If you are right, stand by your questionnaire regardless of how many names you can count on your side. Even if you cannot get one prominent minister to stand by you, stand by yourself. But, why did you mention just "fifty names?" Don't you have more 'prominent ministers' than that who "were satisfied with it?"

Brethren, let us search the scriptures to find out what is best to preach and write; let us search the scriptures to find out how to preach and write; searching the brotherhood is vox populi, vox dei.
As previously announced, the publisher of the Bible Banner recently acquired the B. C. Goodpasture stock of used religious books, which have been shipped from Atlanta, Ga., to Oklahoma City, Okla. Many old, out-of-print and rare books are in this collection, which preachers and teachers need, and which cannot be purchased elsewhere. The following items are only a sample of the many sets and single volumes on hand. A full list will be prepared and published in this space. Preserve these pages as they appear far future reference, and for a complete list. The books in this list are priced at one-half to two-thirds off of the original new prices (except rare, old, and out of print numbers). Our policy is not to Price any ordinary book at more than one-half the original price.

---

### BIBLE COMMENTARIES

1. Adam Clarke, Old and New Test. Complete, six volumes, full sheep, imported, original with author's photo and autograph, fine .............. $200.00
2. Meyer's Commentary on New Testament, eleven volumes, complete, good condition, one of the best 17.50
3. Bloomfield's Critical Digest, 6 vols., fair condition 7.50
4. Schaff's Commentary on New Testament, four volumes, complete, good as new. (By fifteen members of the Revision Committee; edited by Philip Schaff) ......... 10.00
5. The Bible Commentary, eleven volumes, complete, good as new. (The speaker's Bible recommended by J. W. McGarvey) ............. 15.00
6. Benson's Commentary, Old and New Testaments, five volumes, complete, full sheep, old and rare, good ...12.50
8. Weiss's Commentary on New Testament, four volumes, complete, good as new ........... 15.00
10. Patrick & Lowth, Old & New Testament, full sheep, complete, fine ...5.00
12. Jamieson, Fausett & Brown, Old & New Testaments, 2 volumes, full sheep, complete in one volume, good ........... 6.00
13. Horne's Introduction-Old and New Testaments, 4 vols., sheep, good $5.00
14. Scott's Commentary, 3 vols., complete, Old & New Test. ....... 5.00
15. Gill's Commentary, 9 vols., complete Old & New Test., rare, old, fair condition 15.00
16. Wace's Commentary on the Apocalypse, 2 large vols., rare, good 7.50
17. The Pulpit Commentary, 49 volumes on entire Bible, complete set, binding discolored and soiled, but intact (new price, $125.00) ................ 20.00
18. Parker's Peole's Bible. 26 volumes, complete, good ................ 20.00
20. Topical Excerpt Library-5 volumes cloth, good, subjects: (1) Attonement; (2) Christianity; (3) "The Service; (4) Immortality; (5) Heaven. Single vols. .......... 1.00
21. Thirty Thousand Thoughts, 6 vols., complete, (new price $36.00) good ................................ 10.00
22. Biblical Expositor's Library, 9 volumes, complete, Crook and Hurst Series, covering Introduction to Scriptures, Hermetical, Archiology, Systematic Theology, Methodology, Church History, and Evidences, or Grounds of Faith-all in one complete series, good set, (Or in single volumes, $2.00 each) .... 15.00
23. Olshausen's Commentary, Old and New Test., 6 vols., complete, cloth, old and rare, good ... 9.00
24. Whedon's Old and New Test., 14 vols., complete, (new price $28.00), good as new ........ 14.00
26. Practical Studies in the Fourth Gospel (Candler) 2 vols Complete 1.50
27. The Expositor's Bible, 25 vols., complete, good as new .................. 20.00
28. The Abridged Bible (Morgan) 2 vols, Complete .................. 2.00
30. The Gospels (Quesnel) 2 vols., Complete .................. 2.50
31. Commentary on the Psalms (Ewald) 2 vols., Complete ........ 2.50
32. Prophets of the Old Testament (Ewald) 5 vols., Complete .... 5.00
33. New Biblical Guide (Urquhart) 8 vols., Complete, Good as new 7.50
35. Alexander on the Psalms (Alexander) vols. 1 and 2, Complete ..... 1.75
37. Burkitt's Notes on the New Testament, vols., I and II, Complete ... 2.50
38. The Psalms (Perwone) vols. I and II, Complete .......... 2.50
42. The Biblical Museum (Gray) odd volumes, Matthew to John, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus to Deuteronomy, Joshua to Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, Ezra to Job, Book of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel and the Minor Prophets, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, Corinthians to Philemon, each ............. 1.00
43. Notes on Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther (J. F. Rodway) ............... 1.00
44. Notes on Proverbs (Ironsides) ...... 1.50
45. Introduction to the Study of The Gospels (Westcott) ............... 1.50
46. An Introduction to the New Testament (Bacon) .................. 1.00
47. Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures (Nichols) ............... 1.00
49. Suggestive Commentary on Luke (Van Doren) 2 vols. .............. 1.00
50. Clark's People's Commentary on Mark, Luke and Acts ............. 2.00
51. Bush's Notes (Bush) Joshua ............ 50
52. Notes on Genesis (Robertson) .............. 50
53. A Study of the Psalms (Wigram) ............... 50
54. The Book of Revelation (Warren) .............. 50
55. Genesis (Evans) ............... 75
56. Genesis (C. H. M.) ............... 50
57. Exodus (C. H. M.) ............... 50
58. Leviticus (C. H. M.) ............... 50
59. Deuteronomy (C. H. M.) ............... 50
61. Introduction to the New Testament (Salmon) .................. 1.00
62. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Beet) ............... 1.06
63. Thoresby's Commentary on Matthew ............... 1.00
64. An Introduction to the Book of Acts (Stiller) .................. 1.00
65. Studies in the Gospel According to Mark (Burton) ............... 1.00
66. Boice's Notes on the Epistles of Paul ............... 1.00
68. Christian (Adam Clarke) ............... 1.00

---
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**November 1939**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher's Commentary-Acts (Peloubet)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Hodge)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodge's Commentary-Romans 1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges Commentary on Ephesians (Hodges)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott's Commentary-Mark &amp; Luke (Hodges)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on Galatians (Ellicott)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggard's Commentary on Romans (Hodges)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pulpit Commentary (Spence &amp; Exell) (Gray)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Book of Genesis (Bacon)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bible Commentary (Cooks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International Critical Commentary (Barnes)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gospel of Luke (Kelly)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gospel of John (Kelly)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott on Romans</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hebrew Epistles (Anderson)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haldane on the Romans (Haldane)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers on Romans (Chalmers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Prophecies of Isaiah (Alexander)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels (Pusey)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pentateuch, Its Origin &amp; Structure (Bissell)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Summarized Bible (Brooks)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'Ghee on Ephesians (M'Ghee)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Goder)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parables (Guthrie)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker's People's Bible, 27 vols., complete, fine, set</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inner Life of Christ (Parker)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godet's Commentary on the New Testament (Goder) Epistle to the Romans</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie's Commentary on the New Testament (Goder)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on the Greek Testament, 11 vols., (Complete) 15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel the Prophet (Pusey)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusey's Minor Prophets (Pusey)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on Micah (Margolis)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on Psalms, Complete in 7 vols. (Spurgeon)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Miracles (Trench)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Parables (Trench)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tholuck on Romans</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tholuck on the Gospel of John</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taber on the Prophecies, Vol. I</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Chronology (Richardson)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prophets of Israel (Carmack)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Koran-Which Notes &amp; Maps (Sale)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Bible Banner**

95. Expositions of Holy Scriptures (Macleary) Matthew-Chapters IX to XVII, Isaiah Chapters I to XLVIII, Genesis, each 1.50 |
96. Bonar's Commentary on Leviticus (Bonar) | 1.00 |
97. Exposition of Isaiah (Kelly) | 1.60 |
98. Carroll's Notes | 1.50 |
99. Four Gospels (Tyng) Fine copy 2.50 |
100. Christian Works-Commentary Old & New Testament (Gray) | 3.00 |
101. The Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age (Burton) | 5.00 |
102. Studies in the Acts and Epistles and First Thessalonians (Brown) | 1.00 |
103. Commentary on the Psalms (Neale) Vols. II and III | 1.00 |
104. The Practical Commentary on the New Testament (Neall) | 1.00 |
105. Delitzsch Commentaries, Job, 2 vols., Psalms, 3 vols., Isaiah 2 vols., per set | 2.50 |
106. Odd vol. on Joshua, Judges and Ruth | 1.00 |
107. Book of Psalms, (Conant) | 1.00 |
108. Book of Genesis, (Conant) | 1.00 |
109. Commentary on Exodus, (Murphy) | 1.00 |
110. Commentary on the Thessalonians, (Ellicott) | 1.00 |
111. Commentary on the Epistles, (Elliott) | 1.60 |
112. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, (Elliott) | 1.00 |
113. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, (Elliott) | 1.00 |
114. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, (Elliott) | 1.00 |
115. Commentary on Acts of the Apostles, (Cook) | 1.00 |
116. Commentary on Genesis, (Murphy) | 1.00 |
117. Commentary on Leviticus, (Murphy) | 1.00 |
118. Hodges Commentary on Ephesians (Hodges) | 1.00 |
119. Commentary on St. Luke Gospel, (Goder) | 1.00 |
120. Commentary on Isaiah (Delitzsch) 2 vols. | 2.00 |
121. Commentary on Books of Samuel, (Delitzsch) vols. 2 and 3 | 2.50 |
122. Commentary on the Psalms, 3 vols. | 2.00 |
123. Commentary on Joshua, Judges & Ruth (Delitzsch) | 1.00 |
124. Commentary on the Book of Job (Delitzsch) 2 vols. | 2.00 |
125. Commentary on Romans, (Shedd) | 1.00 |
126. Exposition of First Peter, (Demarest) | 1.00 |
128. Vol. II-Chronicles-Proverbs | 1.00 |
129. Vol. V-Roman-Revelation | |
130. Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, (Lang) Vol. II-Mark | 2.00 |
131. Vol. III-John | 2.00 |
132. Vol. VIII-Genesis | 2.00 |
133. Hodges' Commentary on Ephesians, (Hodges) | 1.00 |
135. Commentary-Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, I II Timothy | 2.00 |
136. Commentary—Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, I II Timothy (Elliott) | 2.00 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher/Author</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined, by David Strauss, translated</td>
<td>Geo. Elliott</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck's Lexicon (Buck)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life of Jesus For The Young, (Newton)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine for the Time Christ (Stapfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarkable Characters &amp; Places of the Holy Land (Elliott)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's Life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life of Christ, (Burgess)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Heart of Christ (Weizsacker)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neander's Life of Christ (Neander)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oehler's Old Testament Theology, (Marten)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Dogmatics, (Marten)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Theology, (Boyce)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Christian Ethics, (Dorn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Theology of the New Testament, (Westcott)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Christian Doctrine, (Sheldon)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Theology, (Foster)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Light of Truth as Revealed in the Holy Scriptures (Rightmeyer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture (On The XXXX Arche)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcosmus (Lotze)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jewish &amp; Mohammadan Calendars, (Burnaby)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revival of the Baptist Church (Fairbairn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophecy, (Fairbairn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, (Fairbairn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbairn Hermeneutical Manual, (Fairbairn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Propaedeutics, @chaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship in Life Eternal, (Findlay)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Principal of Authority, (Forsyth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologetics (Beattie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, Prayer &amp; Power, (Pilgrim)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sins of Science, (Klyce)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller on the Christian Doctrine of Sin, (Muller)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for Leadership, (Kleiser)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Creedless Gospel and a Gospel Creed, (Satterlee)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Treasure of Scripture Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God in Freedom, (Luzzatti)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve Baskets Full, (Huse)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science, (new 5.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy 2 vols., 5 Christian Scientist (Maurer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christian Religion, Ours, (Allen)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of the Christian Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Rationalism, (Hagenbach)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliotheca Theological, (Hurst)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodicy, (Bledsoe)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, (Weidner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Dogmatics, (Terry)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays on Supernatural Origin of Christianity, (Fisher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Evidence, (Hodges)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of Theology, (Hodges)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of Christian Religion, (Gerhart)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in the Roman Empire, (Ramsey)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation of Popery, (Edgar)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Theology, (Davison)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker Works, 2 vols, complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Dogmatics, (Marten)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Science (Behr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Divinity (Behr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologetics, (Brice)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philosophy of Religion, (Galaway)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apostolic Age, (McGillert)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Theologica Phenomenon of Christianity, (Cutten)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Testament and its Leaders, (Lee)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Symbols, (Brandt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Case Against Evolution, (O'Toole)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in the Text of the New Testament (Robertson)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing The Scriptures, (Pierson)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in the Philosophy of Religion, (Thompson)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revelation of the Risen Lord, (Westcott)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Harmony of the Gospels, (Kerr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion in History and in Modern Life, (Fairbairn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Patmos Letters, (Campbell)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Age of the Writings of John Wesley, (Welch)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God and the War, (Smyth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Class Manual (McDowell)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Thought in the Reformation, (Workman)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Agnosticism, (Bell)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pathfinders of Christianity (Rowe)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Threshold, (Howard)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Conference with the Best Minds, (Kirkpatrick)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eternal God Revealing Himself, (Cooper)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prove All Things, (Fleming)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Man and The Moment, (Hudson)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Christianity with Heathenism, (Uihlorn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Controversy, (Elliot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion, (Christian)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of The Study of Theology— (Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Approprate Theological Question, (Peabody)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Christ and The Social Question, (Peabody)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptismos, (Armatudo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism, (Ditzler)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Theology, (Grant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Truth of Christianity, (Turton)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God's Fellow-Workers, (Kunleyse)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synopsis of the Books of the Bible (Darby)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A History of New Testament Times in Palestine, (Matthews)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christ of History, (Young)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy, &amp; Heterodoxy (Shedd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Through, (Kerr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christ in English Literature (Combs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The King's Keys To His Kingdom, (Kerr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Growing Miracle, (Aylishworth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reason in Faith, (Flewelling)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America or Rome, Christ or the Pope, (Brandt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New Congregation in Indianapolis

The youngest congregation of the Church of Christ in the city of Indianapolis occupies this building located at the corner of 40th Street and N. Capitol Avenue, which they have leased with an option to buy. This building was constructed by the Christian Church and dedicated in 1921 and was used by them for a place of worship and Bible study and as a community center for a number of years.

This property is very valuable as it is in a strategic part of the city, being only a few blocks from Butler University, Shortridge High School and across the street from a large grade school, and surrounded by the richest and largest denominational churches, and is only two blocks from a rapidly growing commercial center.

This building is a three-story brick structure with two large auditoriums, each seating about 500, a large gymnasium which will be converted into Bible classrooms, and the building also contains adequate living quarters for the minister and his family.

Resulting largely from the Gospel preaching: over a number of years of Brother E. G. Creacv of Horse Cave, Kentucky, and Brother Hugo McCord, now of Washington, D. C., the Church of Christ in Indianapolis has made substantial growth. About 100 members or more from denominational churches renounced their errors and came into the Church during the ministry of these two brethren. Some few members of this group living in the northern section of the city realized the need of the gospel in that section and attempted to secure this building some three years ago, but not until the summer of 1938 were they successful. In December of that year, a especially invites all members of the church while visiting the capitol city meeting was held with Brother Creacv as the evangelist and a congregation of 36 charter members was formed.

In February 1939 Robert F. Turner, who at that time was completing his work at the University of Illinois, was secured as the congregation’s first minister. His strong gospel preaching has already shown results. His ability to preach it straight and his pleasing personality have won the admiration of many, and even attracted the attention of some of Butler University professors. With the congregation of one mind and determination and with one of the best song leaders in the city, Brother Carl Miller, great things can be accomplished for Christ in this section, which is the richest in earthly goods, the poorest in heavenly treasures, the most intellectual in scholastic training, but the most ignorant in the knowledge of God’s word.

This is but a bird’s eye view of the possibilities of this baby congregation, who proposes to maintain always a strict loyalty to the word of God, and of the Hoosier state to worship with them. Bible school at 9:45, preaching at 10:45 A. M. and 7:45 P. M. each Lord’s Day, and bible study each Tuesday evening.

The building can be reached by a N. Meridian bus or Illinois street-car or by auto directly north on Capitol Avenue to 40th Street.

Ax-Grinders

Truth is never to be feared. “Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.” One of the stark tragedies of the time is the deception practiced by minorities, ax-grinders and special pleaders. Their effort is not to bring the truth before the people but to see that the people do not get the truth. Certain false doctrines will not be discussed by them, because they love the teachers thereof. Their only hope is to stampede those who are willing to fight for the right. The destructive work being done by certain men in certain localities is gradually spreading to other communities. The average man would read about this if he could.

Why not tell him the facts? Why not tell him who these men are that are preaching their theories even to the dividing of the church? Why not tell him who these men are that are preaching their theories even to the dividing of the church? Yes, let him know who they are and where they are? Those that sin rebuke before all that others also may fear.” Every elder in the church should re-read Paul’s instructions to the elders of the church at Ephesus. “I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock,” * * * speaking perverse things * * to draw away disciples after them.”-G. K. Wallace

585. The Parables of the Old Testament, (Barry) 1.00
586. Studies in Romans, (Soper) 2.00
587. Bible Study by Books, (Sell) .50
588. The Religion of Babylonia & Assyria, (Rogers) 2.50
589. Christian Archaeology, (Bennett) 1.50
590. Authority & Archaeology-Sacred & Profane, (Hogarth) 2.50
591. Layard’s Nineveh & Babylon, (Layard) 2.00
592. Bible Lands-Their Modern Customs & Manners, (Van-Lennepp) .60
593. The Testimony of the Rocks, (Miller) 2.00
594. Jahn’s Biblical Archaeology, (Jahn) 2.00
595. Testimony of the Ages, (Morris) .50
596. Neander’s History of the Christian Religion & Church, (Torrey) 3 vol., complete 5.00
597. An Outline of Christianity, 3 vol. 3.00
598. Milman’s History of Christianity, (Milman) 1.00
599. Mosheim’s Church History, (Mosheim) 1 large vol., complete 2.00
600. Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History, (Mosheim) 3 vols., complete 2.50
601. Historical Lights, (Little) 2.00
602. Biblical Lights, (Little) 2.00
603. Scientific Lights, (Little) 2.00
604. A Psychological Study of Religion, (Leuba) 1.50
605. The Doctrine of Justification, (Loy) .75
606. Theological Works of Thomas Paine 2.00
607. Sacred Geography, (Parish) 1.00
608. Our New Testament-How Did We Get It ?, (Vedder) .50
609. The Law of the Tithe, (Babb) .50
610. The Chief Musician, (Bullinger) 1.00
611. The Educational Function of the Church, (Drummond) .50
612. Things Eternal, (Kelman) .75
613. Making The World Christian, (Mosheim) .75
614. Side-Steppe Saints, (Peck) .75
615. The Council of Trent, (Froude) 1.00
616. Letters on Baptism, (Fairfield) 1.00
617. Christian Ethics, (Wittke) 2 vol., complete 2.00
618. A Working Faith, (Rall) .75
619. Erasmus His Life and Character, (Drummond) 1.00
620. The Resurrection in the New Testament, (Bowen) 1.00
621. The Evolution of the Kingdom, (Riley) .50
622. Jesus and Civil Government, (Cadoux) 1.00
623. The Old Testament, The Shorter Bible, (Kent) 1.00
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COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL

Compiled and Edited by MARION DAVIS

Two Hundred Fifty-six Pages-Two Hundred Eighty-nine Songs

Best Standard Hymns and Greatest Gospel Songs

Some of the most popular copyrights have been secured from the following foremost publishers:

Hope Publishing Company
Rodeheaver Hall-Mack Company
Biglow-Main-Excell Company
Tabernacle Publishing Company
Gospel Advocate Company
Lillenas Publishing Company
Grant Colfax Tullar
Firm Foundation Publishing House
Robert Coleman
Austin Taylor
Tillit S. Teddie
A. J. Showalter Company

The Most Popular OLD SONGS

The Most Popular NEW SONGS

Spiritual AND Scriptural

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., was requested to read every song with editorial detail in order to detect all error in teaching which is inevitably found in songs of sectarian writers and publishers. He has read every line of every song, marking the errors found. Considerable expense has been incurred by changing plates in order to make the corrections necessary in the elimination of all such errors.

NO OTHER BOOK LIKE IT HAS EVER BEEN PUBLISHED

This book will be off the press in a few days. Send your advance order now for a copy of the first edition of Complete Christian Hymns.

Bound in cloth-board backs .......... 50c the copy.
Bound in limp covers ............... 35c the copy.

Special Prices For Advance Orders In One Hundred Lots.

And Many Others Too Numerous To Mention. Write For These Quotations.

SEND YOUR ORDERS TO

THE MARION DAVIS CO.,
BOX 162
FAYETTE, ALABAMA

OR

TEE BIBLE BANNER
BOX 1864
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA