The name is not essential to the fact of anything. There were many Christians in the time of Jesus Christ long before their enemies ever thought of calling them "Christians" at Antioch in Syria. For several centuries churches were not given denominational names; nevertheless, churches holding to New Testament teachings and practices continued to exist in every generation under different names. (Baptist Scribe.)

The more I see of these excuses for wearing "denominational names" and using unscriptural nomenclature in religion, the lamer they look. The above mess of wild statements and misinformation is just another wedding sneer at those servants of the Lord who insist on calling Bible things by Bible names. Some of us still insist that Paul's advice to Timothy is still sound and practicable. "Hold the pattern of sound words which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. 1:13) In the nature of the case unscriptural words convey unscriptural teachings and unscriptural practice. If "the fact of anything" is scriptural, the language that does it justice is also scriptural. A preacher who can't see that is pretty wild in his eyes and lacks the qualifications which are essential to show honest people the way to heaven.

It seems strange that a man who claims to be a preacher of the gospel and a servant of Christ should thus talk down the name Christian and seek to destroy confidence in it. In the same article, which is deceptive throughout, he talks up the name Baptist. According to him the name Christian not only had a human origin but originated with wicked haters of Christ and his cause, while the name Baptist came straight from God. This is "going some!

If anybody should ever go so far as to ask him if he is a Christian, he should say "No! I'm a Baptist." Who told him that the name Christian originated with the enemies of Christ and his teaching? The Bible doesn't say so. No other term so fitly describes the Lord's people. It carries Christ right in its bosom. They are never called Baptists in the New Testament and that is reason enough why they should not be called that now. "But if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name." (I Pet. 4:11) There is no authority for glorifying John, the Immerser, or the ordinance he administered, by wearing the name Baptist. Baptists certainly do put an exaggerated emphasis on baptism.

Why should "churches holding to New Testament teachings and practices... continue to exist... under different names" the New Testament does not even mention? They differ from the churches we read about in the New Testament in that respect. "Denominational names" certainly imply denominations and the absence of such names in the New Testament certainly implies the absence of "the fact of anything" of the kind. When a wild scribe has to make faces at the name Christian to justify his party badge, his religious underpinning is distressingly wobbly. Besides, it is freely admitted all around that a man can be a Christian without being a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian or anything of the kind. That is "the simplicity and purity that is toward Christ" Paul so ardently hoped that Christians would maintain. "But I fear, let by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ." (2 Cor. 11:3) We stand with Paul and the New Testament against all corruptions of original and inspired simplicity including human religious denominations and their party names. "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." (Jude 3)

More than a thousand Baptist preachers had been killed in England before A. D. 1529. (Baptist Scribe.)

Some Baptist preachers are putting a heavy strain on their imaginations trying to trace their denominational history back toward the New Testament beyond a comparatively recent date. In the effort they garble church history as awkwardly as they do the New Testament and join issue with the ripest of their own scholars. They know that they cannot produce a history written prior to the sixteenth century that even mentions "the Baptist church" by name. When the term Baptist was used in that time it referred to people who practiced immersion regardless of their teaching on other matters. That "thousand Baptist preachers" this wild scribe mentions did not belong to the Baptist denomination he belongs to for it did not exist then. If they lived now and believed and practiced as they did then, there isn't a Baptist church in Tennessee that would fellowship them. They would be no more acceptable than the hated "Campbellites" who also practice immersion and would qualify as Baptists in the usage of the times during which "more than a thousand Baptist preachers had been killed in England before A. D. 1529." Whatever may be found "in England before A. D. 1529" the determining fact is that the Baptist denomination cannot be found in the New Testament anywhere or any time.

While it is difficult to determine the exact age of the Oakwood Baptist church, it seems plausible, from available sources, that her age is approximately one hundred years. (Baptist Scribe.)

(Continued on page 5)
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he is a cog in the machine which hopes to spread its ism over the globe.

"Out of Russia has come the war in Spain," averred the evangelist, native of Tennessee.

I see in the future a war between fascism and communism, Brewer postulated. "It looks inevitable to me."

"Soviet Russia's agents in this country paint a picture of unfair opportunities in America," the speaker shouted. "They say the door don't get an even break. They talk about oppression. As a matter of fact, Russian people are slandered. They can strike the voter above a whisper against anything pertaining to the Government. Facts are misrepresented."

Brewer denied he was prejudiced against Russia. He disagreed with any objection to communism-in its place. "And its place so far as I'm concerned is Russia," he cried. "If they want communism there, let them have it. I draw the line, though, when they start spreading their propaganda here, or inflict their lies a decease on this country."

"Let me give you my definition of communism," begged the speaker. "Communism is a Utopian dream embroidered with the witchery of deceit."

Interpersed through the course of his lecture was a description of the Second and Third Internationales. The Third Internationale was founded by Lenin in 1919. Communists of this order are out and out revolutionists. Communists of this order, however, are nothing more than mere reformists. In this country the latter group are represented by Norman Thomas, he said.

When we recognized Russia in 1933, Litvinoff, Commissar of Foreign Affairs, wrote over here," Brewer stated. "He promised as part of the agreement signed with the United States that agitation would cease here. Before he even got out of the country, there appeared in a community publication a letter at an impelling Communists in this country to read between the lines. The pact didn't bind communism, Litvinoff claimed. It merely bound the Soviet Union."

"But this isn't strange," the speaker declared. "They admit their ends are only gained after illegal methods, lies, deceit, immorality and blasphemy. If they admit it, can we not expect anything from them?"

Closing his address, Brewer urged, "We don't want war. No. But as the face of the world's increasing armaments, we can't disarm at this time. If this country must go to war again to protect the ideals and government its thousands of brave citizens have died for, I, for one, will fight, and I know every red bled American citizen will do likewise."

Can anybody conceive of Paul making such a speech as that? Jesus would say to Peter, Put up thy sword, and to Pilate, My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight. But Brewer says that "if and when this 'nation must fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, I, for one am ready to give every drop of blood in my veins in the cause my forefathers fought and died for." Of course, Brewer knew that he was too old to be drafted when he said that, and it was only for American Legion consumption. Did Jesus Christ die for "Americanism" on the cross of Calvary? What about Christians in other nations-what should they shed every drop of their blood for? for what their forefathers fought and died for? Such blustering from a gospel preacher before a worldly, political organization ought to make every Christian who reads it flush with shame.

If Brother Brewer says that his language was misunderstood and that he only meant a spiritual fight-we say that his language cannot be so construed. This nation is not in a spiritual fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, and Americanism is not Christianity; it is political, not spiritual. Furthermore, when Brewer's "forefathers fought and died for" Americanism, that was not a spiritual fight, and when he talks about "the increasing world armaments" and declares that "we can't disarm at this time," what does he mean-"we" who? and what "Armaments"?

Then with this final flourish he says, "If this country must go to war again to protect the ideals and government its thousands of brave citizens have died for, I, for one, will fight, and I know every red bled citizen will do likewise." That is not spiritual language. There never was a political advocate of war who ever made a speech more calculated to inflame the war spirit than these words of G. C. Brewer, a gospel preacher, in this speech before the American Legion. If he says what we understand him, we say that the American Legion did not misunderstand him-they understood his language.

But the question is: What is Harding College and J. N. Armstrong going to do about G. C. Brewer's War speech since it runs directly counter to the whole teaching and policy of this school on the war question?

Is G. C. Brewer Acceptable to E. R. Harper?

Resting the first question for the moment, let us turn to another question. How can Doctor Brewer be acceptable to Brother Harper and others involved in the Benson agreement on the Premillennial question? Brother Harper reiterates that he "hates premillennialism" and will not "cease" to fight it. Well, here is what Brewer says on it at David Lipscomb College. Don't skip it-read it:

Talk on Religion Flays 'Bickering'

Declaring that the agitation of premillennial speculation is "bickering," G. C. Brewer in an address last night at the Lipscomb lecture series urged that the matter, agreed by all to be nonessential, be dropped in the interest of Christian harmony. An overflow audience packed a loud-speaker heard the address.
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Can anybody conceive of Paul making such a speech as that? Jesus would say to Peter, Put up thy sword, and to Pilate, My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight. But Brewer says that "if and when this 'nation must fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, I, for one am ready to give every drop of blood in my veins in the cause my forefathers fought and died for." Of course, Brewer knew that he was too old to be drafted when he said that, and it was only for American Legion consumption. Did Jesus Christ die for "Americanism" on the cross of Calvary? What about Christians in other nations-what should they shed every drop of their blood for? for what their forefathers fought and died for? Such blustering from a gospel preacher before a worldly, political organization ought to make every Christian who reads it flush with shame.

If Brother Brewer says that his language was misunderstood and that he only meant a spiritual fight-we say that his language cannot be so construed. This nation is not in a spiritual fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, and Americanism is not Christianity; it is political, not spiritual. Furthermore, when Brewer's "forefathers fought and died for" Americanism, that was not a spiritual fight, and when he talks about "the increasing world armaments" and declares that "we can't disarm at this time," what does he mean-"we" who? and what "Armaments"?

Then with this final flourish he says, "If this country must go to war again to protect the ideals and government its thousands of brave citizens have died for, I, for one, will fight, and I know every red bled citizen will do likewise." That is not spiritual language. There never was a political advocate of war who ever made a speech more calculated to inflame the war spirit than these words of G. C. Brewer, a gospel preacher, in this speech before the American Legion. If he says what we understand him, we say that the American Legion did not misunderstand him-they understood his language.
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"Soviet Russia's agents in this country paint a picture of America that agitation would cease here. Before he even got out of the country, there appeared in a community publication a letter at an impelling Communists in this country to read between the lines. The pact didn't bind communism, Litvinoff claimed. It merely bound the Soviet Union."

"But this isn't strange," the speaker declared. "They admit their ends are only gained after illegal methods, lies, deceit, immorality and blasphemy. If they admit it, can we not expect anything from them?"

Closing his address, Brewer urged, "We don't want war. No. But as the face of the world's increasing armaments, we can't disarm at this time. If this country must go to war again to protect the ideals and government its thousands of brave citizens have died for, I, for one, will fight, and I know every red bled American citizen will do likewise."

Can anybody conceive of Paul making such a speech as that? Jesus would say to Peter, Put up thy sword, and to Pilate, My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight. But Brewer says that "if and when this 'nation must fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, I, for one am ready to give every drop of blood in my veins in the cause my forefathers fought and died for." Of course, Brewer knew that he was too old to be drafted when he said that, and it was only for American Legion consumption. Did Jesus Christ die for "Americanism" on the cross of Calvary? What about Christians in other nations-what should they shed every drop of their blood for? for what their forefathers fought and died for? Such blustering from a gospel preacher before a worldly, political organization ought to make every Christian who reads it flush with shame.

If Brother Brewer says that his language was misunderstood and that he only meant a spiritual fight-we say that his language cannot be so construed. This nation is not in a spiritual fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, and Americanism is not Christianity; it is political, not spiritual. Furthermore, when Brewer's "forefathers fought and died for" Americanism, that was not a spiritual fight, and when he talks about "the increasing world armaments" and declares that "we can't disarm at this time," what does he mean-"we" who? and what "Armaments"?

Then with this final flourish he says, "If this country must go to war again to protect the ideals and government its thousands of brave citizens have died for, I, for one, will fight, and I know every red bled citizen will do likewise." That is not spiritual language. There never was a political advocate of war who ever made a speech more calculated to inflame the war spirit than these words of G. C. Brewer, a gospel preacher, in this speech before the American Legion. If he says what we understand him, we say that the American Legion did not misunderstand him-they understood his language.
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THE GARRULOUS AND GULLIBLE JIMMIE LOVELL

It appears that a general distribution of a “news sheet” bearing the title of West Coast Christian, published by James L. Lovell, of Los Angeles, is again being made. This paper was merged a few months ago into the New Christian Leader. A question is raised in the minds of many if its resurrection portends the demise of the New Leader, especially since it is known that the effort was recently made by the Leader to sell out to other parties. Unquestionably the Christian Leader has not prospered and has been a definite disappointment to its sponsors. The man from North Carolina all of whose supporters sold his share and special providence, has been a millstone around the New Leader’s neck rather than “the great leader” of the Leader that he aspired to be. And, incidentally, where are the one hundred trained writers that Copyright Clinton Davidson announced, as the army of staff contributors to the modern streamlined Leader? One hundred trained writers! Who are they? Where were they trained? Are the articles which have appeared in the Leader to be considered the work of writers trained in journalism? If not, why publish the Leader a year without featuring at least one or two of the trained writers. If so, then we may all know now what Clinton Davidson’s idea of a trained writer is. The general comment heard all over the country has been one word—peashaw!

But this article has to do with rattling, rambling, Jimmie Lovell. The last issue of his West Coast Christian some months ago was a general happy-go-lucky tirade on everything and everybody from himself on up to me. Jimmie admitted that in the past he had done just about everything from gambling and drinking liquor to running after the women. But he talks at random on everything and one need not think that he was ever as bad as he intimated that he once was. I have heard sectarian preachers tell how bad they were once upon a time, so as to present themselves a specimen of great saving power, but it never did strike me as being a very good way to convert others, especially young boys and girls, to be telling how wild they used to be. Some might doubt that he ever quit it, and others might decide to do the same way and be converted later.

But in the opening issue of loving Jimmie Lovell’s West Coast News he starts out loving everybody again and in his rambling way he rattles away on what all the preachers (and everybody else) should do and how they should do it. In other words, he began where he left off when he stopped his sheet several months ago. He is like the old gossiping woman I heard about who laid her mouth down one day and went off and left it for an hour or two and when she came back and picked it up it was still talking. So Jimmie is still rattling and rambling incoherently about everything in general and nothing in particular. An appropriate diagnosis of his trouble would be a diarrhea of speech and a constipation of ideas.

In his late number he announces the approaching events of the Baxter, Pullias and Wallace meetings on the Pacific Coast. He assures the Brotherhood at large that upon our arrival in Los Angeles he, Jimmie Love11 in person, will receive us with open arms and glad hand. We will all have his backings—yes, his backing! How fortunate we are! How fortunate the church on the West Coast is also to have such a man to back us that way! Baxter and Pullias would probably stay in Tennessee if they did not know that Jimmie was going to back them in California. I would stay in Texas and Oklahoma if I really thought he was—or go to Arkansas and apply for a place in Harding College.

Jimmie Love11 “sponsors” the colored preacher Hogan, and now he proposes to take all three of us over, Baxter, Pullias and me, under one management. Excuse me, please. I am not putting on an exhibition and have not applied for a manager nor a sponsor. I think Hogan would be far better off if he would change sponsors, and do like Kleebe, let the Lord sponsor him. Personally, I would as soon have Barney Morehead for my sponsor as to have Jimmie Love11 for my backer. Besides I know that Jimmie has done about everything he can in private to black me instead of back me, and to speak with perfect frankness I do not want him slobbering over me in public.

Now, is super-salesman Jimmie right sure that he will indorse any preacher the local church uses? Let us take time out to read an exchange between our loving Love11 and Brother John T. Lewis. Don’t skip it—read it:

729 S. Gramercy Dr., Los Angeles, Calif., December 19, 1939.

John T. Lewis, Minister, 1604 30th St., Birmingham, Ala., Dear Brother “Jack”:

I just this minute finished reading your article “Good News” in the Bible Banner and it made me feel mighty good.

Brother Lewis, I was not satisfied to hook-un with Brother McMillan in the work of the Christian Leader until Brother McMillan, when he submitted the Pullias plan, I was not willing to hook-un with any man connected with the Leader-Cy Young, Ward Halbert, Charlie Ezzell, F. L. Rowe, Lipscomb Davis, or John Kirk until they told me with their lips where they stood. Not only on this question but several more such as Divine healing, instrumental music in worship, etc. Furthermore when I was in Nashville this last time I was worried about the position of the Central church. Since I had read so much about it therefore, I went and asked them many questions—none of my business—but they answered them. The Lord knows I was happy to hear what they said but I was heart sick because so many of my brethren believed otherwise. Now here comes your article—coming in the Bible Banner. To me that is good news for the brethren will believe you where— as I could write forever and not gain the same results.

I asked many questions about the Hardeman meeting, and although I am so sorry about it all, looks to me as if Central had a good reason for doing what she did.

Watch out for 1940. We shall have our troubles but it seems to me as if we were settling down to a real work for our Lord. No man in His service is so happy about it all as I. We are cleaning up our messes and I just hope that you will watch my work and when you go on the wrong foot call me to task. When you see Brother McMillan or the Christian Leader going contrary to Scripture for the Lord’s sake correct us.

Wishing you every blessing. Sincerely,

James L. Lovell. (Jimmie).
brethren believed otherwise?” If you will confide that information to me, I will tell your other brethren, and maybe they will be “happy” too. Again, if you will tell me the “good reason” you think “Central” had for not announcing “the Hardeman meeting?” I’ll tell the brotherhood that also, and may be they will think as you do in the matter. Let’s get “Central” out from under the cloud of suspicion, if we can. I am going to “watch out for 1940.” Finally, if Hardeman or Wallace should come to California during “1940,” could you with a clear conscience announce, and work in their meetings? Yours against undercover work.

“Jack.”

The loquacious Jimmie has just talked too much again. Anybody who talks as much as does will contradict themselves every few minutes—especially when he is trying to back anybody that any local church will use for a meeting. Why, then, does he say that certain brethren did right in Nashville in refusing to “back” the Hardeman meeting which was indorsed by more than thirty local churches in that city? If Jimmie had been there would he have backed it? If so, if those who refused to back it did right, as he claims, he would have done wrong. If he would not have backed it, what about all this gusto in his paper? It seems to me that voluble Jimmie has tripped himself. As for the Hardeman meeting though the Central Church didn’t back it and McMillan wouldn’t announce it—somehow the news got out anyway and Ryman Auditorium overflowed!

Rambing at random, Jimmie continues: “We are cleaning up our messes.” Yes, “we” killed a bear! Jimmie is one of the messes that “we” are always having to clean up. Again he says: “When you see Brother McMillan or the Christian Leader going contrary, etc.—well, it started ‘contrary,’ it was born contrary, it is contrary to the very ethics it espoused, and any man who can’t “see” that it is contrary without being told, cannot see well enough to “watch out for 1940.” There is no use putting Jimmie at the watchman’s post. He has myopia, or the blind stagers. He couldn’t even see the withering irony in John T. Lewis’ “Good News” about the Central Church in Nashville—garrulous, gullible Jimmie!

Salesman Davidson seems to have decided to cancel his copyright, get rid of his white elephant (The New Christian Leader) and look after his insurance business. If Salesman Jimmie would declare a moratorium on talking for everybody’s sake, and confine his salesmanship to the DuPont Company who is supposed to be paying him for his time and talent, the relief would be complete.

Finally, Salesman Jimmie wants us to correct him for “the Lord’s sake,” when we see him “off on the wrong foot,” as though it is only occasional, if at all, that he gets off on the wrong foot! Nearly everybody who reads his ramblings think that he is “off” all the time—on both ends. His hopping around on the wrong foot really does not affect the church enough to demand very much attention “for the Lord’s sake” but we will keep on trying to correct him for his own sake. I am of the opinion, however, that his case is a surgical one, being an over abundance of egotism which has accumulated in the inordinate exercise of high-pressure, super-salesmanship, and which stands only a slight chance of being corrected by the complete removal of the gall bladder.

On the whole, his gratuitous offer to back the three of us in California is entirely too much backing for one man to do—so I hereby release him (I mean dismiss him) from my end of his task, so that he can give all of his attention to brethren Baxter and Pullias. The elders of the churches where I will preach can see after me.—F. E. W. Jr.

BREWER-HARDING COLLEGE, ETC.

(Cont’d from page 3)

So that is the influence the young men and young women will have in Harding College, Benson and Armstrong plus Brewer. One a weakening, one a known Premillennialist and the latter of an attitude and spirit on various issues certainly no less dangerous to the soundness of young preachers and young Christians.

In the past the Arkansas churches have been afraid to use the Armstrong young preachers—from Harding College. Now to turn them over to G. C. Brewer to train is like jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. What can we expect of young preachers who are so trained? They will have a handicap hard to live down—young men, can you afford to go there?

And Brother Harper has blindly agreed to “put his influence behind the school,” advising loyal members of the church in Arkansas to send their dear children to a school where the Head of Bible, J. N. Armstrong, is an admitted Premillennialist and the new associate professor, G. C. Brewer, says “it is not a vital matter.”—thus to be victimized by a combination of Boilism, Brewerism and Davidsonism. God pity them, and the churches into which they afterwards go to be the preachers, elders and leaders.

This action is the latest challenge in the fight for truth and we are still determined that they shall not pass!—F. E. W. Jr.

THE NAME AND THE THING

(Continued from page 1)

“It seems” not only “plausible” but certain “from available sources” including the New Testament, that no Baptist church can back up and hook on to the one the Lord started on Pentecost in Jerusalem, either by succession or identity. The Baptist church is a modern in time and a perversion in doctrine and practice. Brother Srygley once remarked that a Baptist could not sell a jersey heifer to any farmer in middle Tennessee as a registered animal that did not have a better pedigree than any Baptist church in the country. Before the sixteenth century the links in the Baptist chain are rusty and worn and so many are missing the chain won’t even rattle. Baptist succession is a myth which their own scholars have exploded. It may be classified with the sing-song party cry that John was a Baptist—ah, he baptized Jesus and that made it the Baptist church—ah. Christ was never called a Baptist, his disciples are not called Baptists in the New Testament, the church is a fact today. “The name” seems to be the “essential” judging from its extravagant use by Baptist preachers and papers. It appears about ten times oftener than the name Christian does. Its appearance in Baptist literature is about as numerous as cells in a honeycomb. How long could Baptist preachers preach and maintain their party principles and identity without the use of the name? “The name of the thing,” seems to be closely related to the “fact” of the thing.
A FACTION SEeks RECOGNITION

It is a matter of current knowledge that a rebellious element in the church at McAlester Oklahoma created an insurrection against the elders of the church and by petition-circulation, sit-down strikes, the majority-rule methods, gained the control and took over the church property. The leaders of this element had been withdrawn from. The elders could have held possession of the building by locking it up and putting the keys in their pockets and taking charge of all meetings. But to pursue what they thought to be the most orderly course, they asked the court for a restraining order against the occupation of the building by this element until the injunction could be tried upon its merits. A Baptist Judge ruled no jurisdiction refused to even consider the question of property rights and left it status quo, which is the Latin for “the mess it is in.” Rather than appeal the case through higher courts the elders with other older and faithful members of the church retired to another place of meeting, and left the property in the hands of the element who did not have more than ten per cent of the investment in the building, if that much, an element which had come into the church in the recent years who under the influence of certain preachers rose up against the true and tried elders and members of the church who had been with it from its beginning.

The principle of action by which this building was held by this element, which drove out some of the most faithful members of the church, including its oldest elders, is precisely the same method that the digressives used in taking building away from loyal brethren before legal restrictions were placed in deeds to church property. If the element which now occupies the property at McAlester is right, the digressives are right. As for the personnel in the church, among those driven away were some of the best people in McAlester, respectable business men, such as B. M. Strother, D. B. Killebrew, elders and business men; Corbett Donaldson, deacon and merchant; M. L. Stockton, president of the First National Bank, and numbers of other good and respectable citizens. The reader is doubtless asking the usual question: Why make this spectacle public? Why drag it into the papers? The answer so far as the present article is concerned is this: Factions always strive for recognition. The so-called “church of Christ, at second and Washington” in McAlester, though they occupy a building without the right to it, are a faction. They are, as all factions do, seeking recognition, and are using some preachers to help them get it, and some editors and papers. If they can get the recognition of “the brotherhood” they will feel justified in their course. And they will probably get it but they will still be a faction notwithstanding until the egregious sin which cries to heaven to be avenged, as did the blood of Abel against the ruthless act of his brother Cain, has been repented of and rectified.

The following clipping from the McAlester daily paper will serve as an example of the effort to gain recognition: Noted Religious Editor Will Speak at Church of Christ

G. H. P. Showalter of Austin, Tex., will preach at the Church of Christ, Second and Washington, Sunday morning and evening at the usual hours. His wealth of experience and learning makes him a most capable and interesting speaker.

Besides being a gospel preacher, he was for some time president of a Bible college at Lockney, Tex. He is now president of the Firm Foundation Publishing House, Austin, Tex., and for more than 20 years has been editor of a weekly religious journal, the Firm Foundation, which has the widest circulation of any paper among the Churches of Christ.

Mr. Showalter himself is generally regarded as the ablest editorial writer of that brotherhood. The meetings are open to the public.

Other services for Sunday and the week following are as usual with Bible classes Sunday morning at 9:45 and young people’s class Sunday evening at 6:30. Monday night at 7:30 men’s training class meets, on Wednesday night at 7:30 prayer meeting is held, and Thursday afternoon at 2:30 the ladies’ Bible class meets.

Services are also held Sunday morning at North McAlester in the Odd Fellows hall, with Bible classes at 9:30 and communion at 10:30. Ladies’ Bible class meets from house to house, and next Tuesday afternoon it will be at the home of Mrs. I. E. Guyman, at 410 East Crisler.

First, by wooing the Firm Foundation and its editor and office editor, they seek recognition. This has been done by propaganda and misrepresentation, otherwise the Firm Foundation and its editor would never have lent the influence of his name and his paper to this pitiable thing. They invite the editor up to speak for them; they arrange then for the office editor of the Firm Foundation to hold a meeting for them; they then get a “write-up” in the Firm Foundation—and that is their recognition! If the affair should be transferred to Austin to the church in which Brother Showalter is elder, and he should experience what the faithful elders of the McAlester church did, he would feel the hurt to faithful elders who have sacrificed themselves to the thankless task of trying to preserve law and order in the Church of Christ. Their hearts are made to bleed worse when those to whom they should be able to look for aid in their stand for the truth, lend their influence instead to the side of error and condone their wrongs.

Second, by efforts to secure certain evangelists in whom the church as a whole have confidence to “hold a meeting,” they seek recognition. One evangelist of prominence cancelled an engagement with them upon being informed that he was about to be so used. But it is now announced that C. M. Pullias has been engaged in his stead. Brother Pullias doubtless has not looked into the merits of the case.

Third, by announcing a “Preacher’s Meeting,” they seek recognition. There is a mania for such; many preachers will attend any preacher’s meeting, anywhere, especially if they are given a place “on the program.” By announcing the Preacher’s Meeting, the McAlester church(?) sees the opportunity to line up the preachers in Oklahoma and Texas behind them and thus make their victory (?) complete, But what victory! The victory of factious glory in wrongdoing! Gospel preachers in Texas who know the truth, and love the truth, surely will not take the meeting, nor thus be used to advance a faction. If they do not know the actual facts, a request for the booklet containing C. R. Nichol’s testimony before the judge with additional matter on the majority rule method versus law and order in the church, will bring it to you without cost, from B. M. Strother, McAlester, Oklahoma, his contribution to the cause of Scriptural church government.

We know B. M. Strother personally and intimately and do not believe that there is a more faithful man of God in the church, nor a man who has been better qualified in moral and intellectual character or in personal piety as an elder in the church of God, but even so, the Bible Banner is not espousing the cause of a man (he would himself say, nay, God forbid) but rather the cause of Christ. There is no man in the church known to me who has suffered more reproach and deeper heart throbs for the church than has B. M. Strother—but still it is for the cause of the New Testament church that we fight. We know we are right, and the Bible Banner will defend the truth on this issue, as all others, as the occasion may further require. Prestige and prominence on the other side will not intimidate. Nor will the apparent defeat of the cause locally do so. We shall continue to uphold the right principles against all who challenge them either by their actions or the lending of their influence. So help us God.—F. E. W. Jr.
OFF TO CALIFORNIA

By the time this issue of the Bible Banner reaches its fartherest point the editor and part of his family will be off to the Pacific Coast. We went on a similar mission to Los Angeles in September 1927. As a result of a meeting conducted in the old Gamut Club building, arrangements were perfected for us to move to Los Angeles to assist the Central Church of Christ, then struggling for existence in the center of that great metropolitan area. On January first, 1926, we returned to live and labor for a time in Los Angeles and with the Central Church. For two and one-half years an extensive and intensive campaign of evangelistic work was waged in Los Angeles and vicinity. Many gospel meetings were held; the Central church grew; we moved out of the old Gamut Club into a modern downtown auditorium called the Patriotic Hall and paid high rental for its use for two years. Then the present structure of the Central Church Of Christ, 12th and Hoover Sts., was completed by the substantial assistance of friends and lovers of the Cause in various parts of the country, the most substantial of which came from Sister Woodward of Houston, Texas. Only the walls of the building were up when I was called from this field into other work, and I have never preached in, not even seen, the building in which I have so much interest in personal toil and labor and prayer. It has been ten years since we departed from Los Angeles in sad but fond farewell to some of the sweetest people and staunchest friends that have ever come into our lives. The thrill of seeing them again, to grasp their genial hands, to bask in their smiles of welcome, and to labor with them again in a great gospel meeting, will be an experience unspeakable and full of glory. But some will be conspicuous by their absence, for the intervening years have changed the addresses of some of them from time to eternity.

We will be engaged in several meetings in Southern California and one in the San Francisco vicinity. The points in order are: The Central Church, Los Angeles; Richmond, in San Francisco's metropolitan area; then back to the southern coast, to Riverside, Santa Ana and Long Beach. The itinerary will require three months. We join in the fervent prayers and ardent hopes for abundant labors with abounding results and for a safe and sound return to our home and friends at Oklahoma City. Pray for us.—Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

THE UNITY GOD DESIRES

D. H. HADWIN

In the Christian Standard, February 17th, James De Forest Murch has an article on the subject, “The Unity We Desire.” The basic error of our digressive brethren is clearly manifest in the subject of his article. It is not “The Unity God Desires,” but “The Unity We Desire.” They have failed to please God in order to please themselves. For a long time with them it has been “what we want,” not “what God wants.” They wanted societies to do the work of the church, so they got them. They wanted musical instruments to use in their worship, so they got them. They wanted choirs and special musical numbers to entertain the people, so they got them. They wanted more money, so they raised it with suppers, sales, shows, and special sucker-schemes. They wanted women preachers and pastors, so they got them. They wanted organized Sunday schools, so they got them. They wanted union meetings with the denominations, so they got them. But when they talk about the unity we desire with the “Churches of Christ,” that is one thing they are not going to get.

In his first statement, brother Murch says, “Unity of ‘Churches of Christ’ and ‘Disciples of Christ’ is imperative and inevitable” (italics by Murch). He might just as well have said that unity of Churches of Christ and Baptists is imperative and inevitable. There is just as much sense in the one as the other.

But notice his reasons (?) for his statement. He says, “Imperative because the success of the Restoration movement, of which both are a part, depends upon it.” I deny that the so-called Disciples of Christ are a part of the Restoration movement. They ceased to be a part of it from the moment that they began to say, “we desire this,” and “we desire that.” You are no part of the movement to restore the church of the New Testament when you plead and work for things for which there is neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament. If you were working for the things God wants, you would go to the New Testament to learn His will, the only means of knowing it—Jesus Christ. I also deny that the success of the Restoration movement depends upon unity of Churches of Christ and Disciples of Christ. I believe that the church of the New Testament has been restored already, and that “the success of the Restoration movement” depends only upon doing what Paul said in Eph. 4.3, “giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” We have a unity to keep.

Again brother Murch says, “Unity among us is inevitable if ‘our plea’ is workable and if there is a sincere effort on the part of all to practice what we preach.” The plea to restore the church of the New Testament is indeed workable as abundantly proved by the Churches of Christ who are successfully operating with a “thus saith the Lord” for everything they do “in word or in deed.” What is needed on the part of the Disciples of Christ (so called) is a sincere effort to practice just what the New Testament teaches and abandon all that the New Testament does not teach. This means that they will get rid of their instruments of music in the worship, their choirs (robed and unrobed), their societies (local, state, and international), their women preachers and pastors, their money-raising schemes, and their whole sectarian setup. These are the things that cause division, and they are all outside of the New Testament. In fact the cause of every division since the beginning of the church has been the things not taught in the New Testament.

But now let us look at the unity God desires. In Rom. 16.17, Paul said, “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the division and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them.” Nearly five years ago I did this. I turned away from the so called Disciples of Christ because I saw that they were causing division and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which I learned from the New Testament. That was the first step toward the unity God desires.

In 1 Cor. 1.10, Paul said, “Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” When I became identified with the churches of Christ, I began to speak the same thing and have the same mind and judgment as my brethren, for we all spoke, “as the oracles of God.” This was the second step toward the unity God desires.

In Eph. 4.3, Paul said, “giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” From that day to this. I have been giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit which I found in the Churches of Christ. This is the third step toward the unity God desires. We have “the unity of the Spirit.” Let us give diligence to keep that unity. If others seek the unity God desires, let them take three steps, and they will find it.
In the February issue of the Word and Work, R. H. Boll has two pages under the above heading. It seems to me to be a labored effort to bemuse, rather than to give light, and if he had added a few "butts" to his "ifs" and "ands," his rigmarole would have been a classic. To understand the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments, one must understand that God is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. That everything is an eternal presence with him, and when he speaks of time in the terms of years, months, days, and hours he is simply addressing himself to the understanding of man. God can see the end of a drama before its beginning, without affecting the free moral agency of its actors. This globe on which we live is nothing more than an infinitesimal speck, created, and hurled into infinite space, and hung upon nothing, by the Creator. In Job 26:7, we read: "He stretcheth out the north over empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." There is not a doubt in my mind but what every act, of every human being who lives, ever lived, or ever will live upon this earth was finished, so far as affecting God's plan was concerned, and passed before Jehovah in panoramic view before man was. This is the only way we can understand such scriptures as Romans 8:28-30; Ephesians 1:4, 5, and 3:10; 11; 2 Thess. 2:13, 14, and 2 Tim. 1:9. To take any other perspecition of God's wisdom and power, is to try to circumscribe his infinite wisdom by the limited purview of men. The Bible, therefore, is God's revelation to man, his history of, and his guide to the peoples of the earth. In the Old Testament, God' gives us the history of his dealings with the human family for four thousand years, as he saw it before history began. In the New Testament, we have the beginning, and the laws to govern the actions of the actors, in the last great drama that will ever be played upon the stage of the universe. And God seeing the end, does not interfere with man's free moral action. The fact that God prepared a kingdom for his people "from the foundation of the world," and "eternal fire for the devil and his angels" is prima facie evidence of God's foreknowledge of the end, before the beginning.

With these thoughts before us, we will wander through the Wilderness of Brother Boll's "Ifs" and "Ands." He says: "A brother kindly requested the editor to tell him just what would have happened if the Jews had accepted Christ." The simple answer to the above request would be, Christ would have given them "the right to become children of God." In John 11:12, we read: "He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." Of course, Christ would have given them all the same right, if they had accepted him. "His own," the Jews, were already God's people through their fleshy relationship to Abraham. But John says: "Those who believed on his name, were born, not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." That is their acception of Christ would have given them a different, and a higher relationship to God. This was in God's "eternal purpose," as shown in his promise to Abraham, "and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." Paul explains how this relationships is brought about in Galatians 3:26-29, and he says it includes "all nations." Therefore, Abraham must have understood that "the great nation" God promised to make of his fleshy descendants, would some day merge into a spiritual Israel, made up of those of "all nations" who would accept Christ, the spiritual seed that was to come through Abraham. In Galatians 6:15, 16, 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." The "great nation" that God made of Abraham's fleshy descendants was marked by circumcision, but Paul says that mark has been obliterated, it is nothing now; but baptism, as stated in Colossians 2:11, 12, is the circumcision that marks spiritual Israel, the seed of Abraham made up of "all nations." Surely Brother Boll will not deny these A B C truths of the Bible.

To view God, the Creator, as a great architect with his plans dealings with the destinies of the human race, perfected and set before him, as a perfect, unchangeable plan, to be executed by both the good and the bad, who fit themselves into the divine scheme, before creation began, is the only way we can conceive of God as being above the realms of human thoughts and human ways. In Isaiah 55:8, 9, we read: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." I do not believe any action of any human being has ever changed God's "eternal purpose," and plans, one iota. He sets before man life and death, and points out the two ways, man's actions will determine the road he travels; but can change neither the roads nor their ends. "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:10, 11). With these facts before you, look over the menu of Brother Boll's "ifs". and "ands". and "what thens," and see if you can stomach a mess of them. Here is his bill of fare. "If our friend will tell us what would have happened if Adam had not sinned, or if Noah had refused to build the Ark, or Abraham had not responded to God's call, if Moses, had accepted the proposition God put before him (Exod.. 32:10), or if Saul had been obedient to the Lord (1 Sam.. 13:13); or, coming down to the New Testament, if Judas had not betrayed Christ; if Pilate had refused the Jews' demand to crucify Him-will one please tell us what would have happened in those cases? For manifestly it could have been otherwise than it was. God did not compel Adam to sin, did not desire that he should; He did not make Noah build the Ark or force Abraham to obey. And Moses was perfectly free to let God wipe out the nation and make him the forefather of a new nation; though, if he had, how the promise to Judah (Gen. 49:10) would have been fulfilled, no mortal can see or tell. And if Saul had obeyed, the kingdom would have been forever his-therefore belonging to Benjamin; and what would have become of God's purpose toward Judah and David! Neither did Judas have to betray Christ, nor Pilate have to deliver Him up. So there are any number of "ifs" that could be put, and an equal number of "what thens" could be asked which no man could answer."

Such a consummate conglomeration of absurd "ifs" and "ands" removes God from the realms of an infinite Creator, and sets him before his creatures as a God of in-decision, hopelessly shackled with the "ifs" and "ands"
of man, and not knowing that any of his plans would ever be executed, therefore making a nonentity of His "eternal purpose." These babyish sectarian "ifs" and "ands" were conceived in a speculative mind, and brought forth to make palpable the nonsensical theory that when the "Word became flesh and dwelt among us," His mission was to become an earthly King, to re-establish the earthly kingdom of Israel, and to rule on the earthly throne of David for one thousand years, in the earthly city of Jerusalem. That, "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John," to prepare the people for the reception of their earthly King, and to herald the approach of the re-established Kingdom of Israel. After the baptism of Jesus, he himself began to preach that the earthly kingdom was at hand. In John 6: 15, we read: "Jesus therefore perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him King, withdrew again into the mountain himself alone." Therefore by this threatened act of the Jews, Jesus was disillusioned, and learned that the Jews were not ready for their kingdom to be re-established. Jesus, therefore, had to cease preaching "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and begin to announce in parabolic language according to Boll, "the new and unexpected aspect the kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the King's rejection and absence from the world." "The new and unexpected aspect of the Kingdom," of course, is the church. Just think of what a predicament Jesus would have been in, after he learned (?) the Jews were not ready for their earthly King, and kingdom, "if" he had not thought of "the new and unexpected aspect of the Kingdom." "What then" would he have preached? Doubtless Brother Boll's learned answer would be, "No mortal can see or tell." I do not believe that a single plan in the "eternal purpose" of God Almighty was ever changed by man. I will notice some of the "ifs" and "what thens," that Brother Boll thinks are beyond the comprehension of man. He says: "Neither did Judas have to betray Christ, nor Pilate have to deliver Him up. So there are any number of 'ifs' that could be put, and an equal number of 'what thens' could be asked which no man could answer." Brother Boll certainly draws heavily upon the ignorance of his readers when he puts before them such "juvenile" "ifs" and "what thens" as being unanswerable. Of course "Judas did not have to betray Christ," but if he had not done the dastardly deed, some one else would, and that would have only changed the agent, but not God's plan. I told you in the beginning of this article that God used both the good and the bad in executing his divine plans. But man, of his own free will, must qualify himself for the job, and that is what Judas did. During the last Passover supper, with Judas present, Jesus Christ said: "The Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him; but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed, good were it for that man if he had not been born. And Judas, who betrayed him, answered and said, Is it I Rabbi? He saith unto him, Thou hast said" (Matthew 26: 24, 25). It was "written" that Jesus had to be betrayed, and go the way of the cross; but it had not been written that any particular man had to do the betraying. Judas, therefore not only qualified for the job, but named himself as the betrayer. Any responsible being can understand these facts if he wants to understand them. Brother Boll would put an "if," and "what then" before every prophecy, and promise, that God ever made concerning his spiritual kingdom, and the salvation of man; but not a shadow of an "if" or "What then" would he put before his theory of the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, with Christ sitting on David's earthly throne, ruling an earthly kingdom, in Jerusalem, for one thousand years. According to Boll's theology, the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, is the only unalterable promise (?) God ever made. I envy no one's spiritual relish, who can swallow Boll's theological, theoretical, materialistic hash.

We will follow him on in his meanderings. "There are some brethren who cannot for the life of them see where or how the church could have come in if Israel had accepted Christ, and the promises made to them and to their fathers had been fulfilled; and why, in that view of it, the church would not be an "afterthought." It is only those who have been confused by your vagaries, Brother Boll, who "accept that view of it." We believe that the promises made to the fathers have been fulfilled, and there will be no retracing of God's plans, and promises to conform to the whims of man. Again you say: "According to the same view the whole scheme of redemption must have been an "afterthought," for it did not come in view till Adam had sinned." Did not come into whose view, Brother Boll, your's or God's? Of course, if there had been no Adam there would have been no Christ, no fall, no redemption; but it does not follow that God did not see the fall till after it happened. If you had simply asked: "If" God had not created man, "What then?" You would have saved yourself from two pages of absurd questions, which only belittled the omniscience of the Eternal God. In the 5th chapter of Romans, and also in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, the story of Adam and Christ are so interwoven that they stand or fall together. The first Adam, and the last Adam, are the Alpha and Omega of human existence and human redemption. Between them stands all of God's dealing with the human race, as revealed in the Old and New Testaments. But Boll goes on: "Perhaps some wise- acre could reason that God meant to have a man to govern the earth for him, but He couldn't do it because the man chose to disobey, and so God had to revise His plans and work things another way. (It is only men in your camp, Brother Boll, that present man as the chooser, and changer of God's plans; but I would not call them "wise-acres," that covers too much ground. I would call them peanuts in Biblical exegesis J. T. L.) Thus all the dispensations, the coming of Christ, the Cross, the gospel, and everything could be made to look like an "afterthought." (There is one of two things certain, Brother Boll, if your theory of the kingdom, as announced by John the Baptist, and Christ is true, the church was either an "afterthought" or John the Baptist, and Christ were preaching something they knew was not true. (J. T. L) This would be but a sample of the juvenile sort of reasoning often seen in the papers, and not rarely shouted from the pulpits by 'champions of sound doctrine. (I will go ahead cracking your supposed uncrackable nuts, Brother Boll, and leave it with the readers to judge in what papers, and pulpits this "juvenile sort of reasoning" may be found. J. T. L) Well, brethren, you have run up against a granite boulder on which full many strong heads have been broken, namely the old problem of 'God's sovereignty and man's free agency'-how both can be. We'll never solve that question. (I think I have rolled that "granite boulder" out of the way, Brother Boll; but it is the earthly throne of David that you have broken your head on-just a theory, not a boulder. J. T. L.) We merely know that things are as they are. Men were left free, and yet God worked out his sovereign will. (This is one truth you have right. J. T. L.) No, God did not compel Adam to sin, did not want him to sin; God did not want to destroy the world by a flood; God did not desire that, Saul should fail; or that Israel should go in to captivity; (God said to Abram before his name was changed to Abraham, and before Israel was: "Know of a surety that (Continued on page Thirteen)
THE ONLY SAFE COURSE FOR “OUR” COLLEGES.

JOHN T. LEWIS

We have studied the antipodal ideas of Alexander Campbell and Tolbert Fanning, the founders, and Presidents of the first two colleges of the “restoration” movement, as to the good or harm a college might do. Mr. Campbell argued, “A college that makes the Bible an everyday text book, cannot but be a perennial fountain of multiform and multitudinous benefaction and blessing to mankind,” and that, “such an institution ought to have paramount claim upon the heart and conscience of very true hearted christian.” The advocates of some of “our” colleges today, have almost added a threat of damnation to the above “claim.” Mr. Campbell was so imbued with the great possibilities of such a college, that he appealed to “philanthropists of every name” to endow Bethany. History is repeating itself today. This enthusiastic, but mistaken course of Mr. Campbell ultimately made Bethany College just a college among other colleges, with no distinctive plea. I doubt that a dozen graduates have gone from its campus in the last fifty years pleading for the restoration of the “ancient orders of things” as Mr. Campbell plead. Therefore instead of Bethany College being a “perennial fountain of multiform and multitudinous benefactions and blessings to mankind,” as Mr. Campbell dreamed it would be, it has been a “perennial” source of digression, modernism, and infidelity for three quarters of a century. The tragedy is, all the churches under the influence of its students have gone with it, as well as all the colleges that come from its influence. This is not an idle dream of mine. Edwin R. Errett, Editor of the Christian Standard, and Mr. Stephen-son, Chairman of the Conglomerate of incompatible elements that arrange our Sunday School literature, say: “All the colleges of the Christian Church are honey-combed with infidelity, and there is nothing we can do about it.”

Thus Bethany College, founded, and manned for more than two decades, by that outstading exponent, and defender of the “ancient order of things,” became the anvil on which was forged the wedge that pried open the flood-gate and turned the streams of digression and infidelity into the course of the “restoration” movement, the movement that was dearer to Mr. Campbell’s heart, than life itself. A generation of the “restoration” movement, the movement that in the last fifty years pleading for the restoration of the “ancient orders of things,” inclusion was the check and stay to digression in the South for more than a half century. If endowed and running, as Bethany College, the story might be different, and the churches today might be where they were in the beginning of the nineteenth century. We will study the influence of Franklin College, after it closed, by noticing the life’s work of only two of its students-David Lipscomb and T. B. Larimore. Early in 1868 Brother Larimore left Franklin College and came to Alabama to teach at Mountain Home, in Lawrence County, where the brethren under the leadership of Brother J. M. Pickens were trying to build up a church college. The Mountain Home enterprise failed, and during 1869, and 1870, he taught school and preached in West Tennessee. On August 10, 1868, he was married to Miss Esther Gresham, near Florence, Alabama. That was the year he left Franklin College, and taught school at Mountain Home, Alabama. Mrs. Larimore received a spot of ground, worth perhaps $250, from her mother’s little estate, and this constituted their earthly possessions. On the summit of one of the cluster of little hills, on this tract of land, a site was selected for a school. On his faith in God, and in his brethren, Brother Larimore went in debt $10,000 for buildings, and on January 1, 1871, he opened Mars Hill Academy. The school was not established as a business to make money; but as a means of building up the church. For seventeen years he conducted this school, teaching six months in the year-from January through June, and giving the other six months to evangelistic work. This arrangement was not satisfactory to the patrons of the school, and by 1887 the attendance was discouragingly small; but all the time the demands for this services as a gospel preacher became greater, these facts reinforced by the advice of his closest advisers caused him to abandon Mars Hill College, to give all his time to preaching the gospel. In 1888, he wrote: “Well, the foot-prints are on the sands of time; I have done the best I could. Mars Hill school lived seventeen years, and the amount spent here during that time to advance the cause of Christ—it was all spent for that—was not less than $30,000. At times fully sixty per cent of the school was charity work—everything furnished free. Seventeen years of incessant toil, with no compensation but the good we have done. We have laid up nothing.” Brother Larimore, therefore, ran Mars Hill College the equivalent of eight and a half years, 12 months in the year, for $30,000. “Our” colleges meeting the requirements, and demands, of the educational associations they are members of, figuratively speaking, would spend that much before breakfast. I will mention the names of those whom I have known personally, or in whose fields of labor,
I have labored, who went out from Mars Hill College preaching
the word. J. H. Halbrook, H. F. Williams, J. R. Bradley,
J. T. Underwood, Walter Norwood, H. North, J. C.
McQuiddy, F. D. and F. B. Syrgley, E. A. Elam, got his
Bible training at Mars Hill, Lee Jackson, B. F. Hart, and
F. C. Sowell. Some of these names have been household
words in the South for nearly a halflcentury. Out of the
above names, only two, B. F. Hart and F. C. Sowell, are on
this side of the river. The influence of Mars Hill College,
is the post-mortuary influence of Franklin College eman-
ating and radiating through one of its students, T. B. Lar-
imore.

Mars Hill College was just an ordinary school, run at a
great sacrifice upon the part of Brother and Sister Lar-
imore, for the good it could do in training boys and girls
for usefulness in the church, and communities in which they
lived. This is the only kind of school today that can offer
a Christian education to the poorer class of boys and girls,
the class from which some of the world's greatest have
come. It is also the only kind of school that can have the
assurance that designing men and women will not be in-
interested in trying to take it over. In 1874 Brother Lar-
imore conceived the idea of building a great University at
Mars Hill, he went so far as to have the proposed campus
cleared off and fenced. For lack of financial gases to in-
flate his balloon, the University did not rise. If there had
been as many brethren of Wealth interested in colleges as
we have today, doubtless the enterprise would have gone
through. If so, it would have been a second Bethany,
and a great hinderance, and a curse to New Testament Chris-
tianity in the South. Brother Larimore was noncombative
and non-committal on digression that was sweeping the
country in that day, and Isaac Errett had been selected to
represent his University. Errett had founded and was edit-
ing the Christian Standard, in defense of missionary socie-
ties and instrumental music in the work and worship of
the church.

David Lipscomb, the other Franklin College student, of
whom I am writing, was also associate editor of the Gospel
Advocate with Tolbert Fanning, his old preceptor in col-
lege. His influence, wielded through the Gospel Advocate,
became the bulwark against digression in the communities
where the Advocate was circulated. Possibly there was no
other man dreaded more, or hated worse, by the digres-
sives, than David Lipscomb. His strong opposition to the
inventions and devices of men in the work and worship of
the church, his influence and association with F. D. Sry-
gley and J. C. McQuiddy got their feet on the rock, and
they became outspoken defenders of the truth. David Lips-
comb never put his articles in sugarcoated capsules to
palliate the feelings of the advocates of error. If his ar-
ticles didn't give the opposition spiritual indigestion, they
would at least give them a bad case of mental heartburn.
Tolbert Fanning's frank and opened hearted manner and
bold method of dealing with the disturbing issues of the
times, were both portrayed and exemplified in the writings
of David Lipscomb, who was more than a match for a
whole army of the Bethany progeny.

In 1891, just four years after Mars Hill College was
abandoned, David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding opened the
Nashville Bible School to give those who were not able to
go to college a chance to prepare themselves for usefulness
in life. The school was run, as Mars Hill College had been,
at a great sacrifice on the part of its teachers. I have heard of
some of the teachers borrowing money at the close of school to get them clothes to go into their
meetings during vacation. Some of the students through
vacation would be in Warren, Cannon and other counties
thundering away against sin and wickedness with but little
thought of remuneration. In those days college Street
Church in Nashville furnished tents for the boys to use in
destitute fields. It would be interesting history to know
the hardships and results of some of those tent meetings,
but that is not my subject. I have heard Brother Lipscomb
say more than once, that he did not want a college, it
took money to run a college, he just wanted a school where
the word of God, along with other useful subjects, could be
taught, and it if ever became just a school like other
schools there would be no excuse for its existence.

Since "David Lipscomb College Bulletin" carries the
pictures of David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding, and over
them written "The spirit of the Founders," I will list the
following things that could not have been done while Broth-
er Lipscomb lived. 1st: The change from the Nashville
Bible School to David Lipscomb College. 2nd: Member-
ship in the Southern Association of Jr. Colleges. 3rd: Hir-
ing a high powered sectarian agency to put on a high pres-
sure campaign to raise $350,000 from any and every source
for the college (the campaign was an abortion). 4th: Play-
ing three of the outstanding Digressives of Nashville in
the leading role of the campaign- enough to make David
Lipscomb and J. A. Harding turn over in their graves. 5th:
Having the Nashville Banner suggest: "Gifts from major
foundations which have been the largest supporters of the
large private colleges in the South may follow, it was point-
ed out, when the friends of Lipscomb free it of debt,
and provide the minimum required endowment." Who set
the "minimum required endowment?" Not one of these things
could have been done while David Lipscomb lived. "The
spirit of the Founders!!" I believe if all "our colleges had
stood together; but aloof from these self appointed, dicta-
torial, educational associations, and fought for the merit
system, attested by fair examinations, instead of the
money, athletic, and degree systems, they would have won
their rights in the fields of education, and their degrees
would not only be honored, but their students would stand
higher in the educational, and business world, than the
more degree chasers and possessors. If "our" colleges
have to be heavily endowed, on the ipse-dixitism of these
self appointed educational incubuses, and hold member-
ship in their associations, neither of which is a guarantee
of scholarship, or New Testament loyalty, and be controll-
ed by their dictates, and standards, what are they but just
colleges among other colleges? Do you ask, What is the
point? Here it is:

"College Ruled As Ineligible" by United Press,
St. Louis, Dec. 31, 1935. "Recommendations that
the University of Pittsburgh be placed on the ineligible
list of the American Association of University
Professors was made to that organization today by
its committee on academic freedom and tenure.
The action was based on the dismissal of four pro-
fessors on grounds of alleged irrereligious teaching"
(Italics mine J. T. L.).

This will help you understand Mr. Stephenson's state-
ment to Brother Boles. "All the colleges of the Christian
Church are money-motived influential in nothing we
thing we could do about it." I hope no one is so stupid as
to think this could never happen to one of "our" college-in
the same associations. If you don't think "our" colleges
are puppets to the whims of those associations, ask David
Lipscomb College why S. P. Pittman, who had taught for
more than a quarter of a century in the Nashville Bible
school with no one questioning his qualifications had
to take a leave of absence, go to Knoxville, Tennessee
and hang around the University there for three years
and get a degree before he could teach in David Lipscomb
College? You see these self-appointed Lord High Commisioners
of education tell "our" colleges if their teachers don't have
degrees from colleges on their eligible list, their students
are bastards in the educational world. It is not merit, but

(Continued on page twenty-one)
The New Testament Church

E. G. Creacy

The New Testament abounds with teaching concerning the church. The more we know about the church, the better prepared we are to be efficient members. We must divorce our minds of the denominational idea of things divinely appointed in order to have the right conception of the church. The church is not just another church—it is not a denomination. As a divine, blood-bought institution, it ranks far above human institutions. The Lord is the founder of the church; men are the founders of denominations. As members of the church, we should learn to "behave" ourselves in the church (1 Tim. 3: 15). We shall deal with some of the problems that have to do with the proper conduct of church members.

The word "church" is used in different senses in the New Testament. It is used in the catholic or universal sense, including all the saved. There are no saved people out of the church. The Lord adds to the church such as should be saved (Acts 2: 47). People do not join the church, but many join denominations. Quite often I am asked why I belong to the church of Christ, and my answer is, "Because I cannot help it." When one is saved from sin, is born again, obeys the gospel, he automatically becomes a member of the church of Christ which is his body (Eph. 1: 22, 23). When we have in mind the church in its universal sense, we can truly say that we are members of the church wherever we may be. According to 1 Co. 11: 18, the word church is used in the sense of an assembly—"When we come together in the church." Then the word is used in a local sense—a congregation. There are about 100 references to the church in this sense in the New Testament. We shall now devote our time to a discussion of the church in its local or congregational sense.

The organization of a New Testament church is simple, yet it is profound. It consists of members, and when material is available, elders and deacons should be appointed (Acts 14: 23; Tit. 1: 5). A church with elders that "rule well," and deacons that serve, and members that work is a "paradise" on earth. Thus a scriptural congregation consists of members, each of whom faithfully performs his part; it is a body of the "called out" united for some end or work, striving together to glorify God and save souls. "Where there is no vision the people perish." Hence, the church should labor in word and doctrine, and ever be militant in all her pursuits.

Another cardinal principle of New Testament doctrine is the autonomy of the church. Each congregation is an independent body, should direct her own affairs, (being scrupulously careful always to abide within the realm of New Testament principles) and not rely upon others for protection and support. Two or more churches are not "tied" together in a kind of conference, synod, or association. God's plan is always right. The autonomy of the church saves it from disaster if a "sister church" should go wrong. Churches, as well as individuals, go wrong some times. The autonomy of the church does not mean that two or more congregations may not cooperate in any scriptural work. They should. But when a plurality of churches are "organized" into a kind of district-union, which inevitably creates some one to direct affairs, we have an organization larger than a local church. We may not admit it, but its there just the same. Any organization larger than a local church is too large, and any organization smaller than a local church is too small. A local church of Christ is the only organization recognized by the God of heaven. The church is also suffering today on account of some "one man" promoters of missionary and kindred endeavors. Churches should not allow these self-appointed agents to fleece them and dictate to them. It is wholly incompatible with the spirit and teaching of the New Testament. In the very recent past, one of these one-man-society promoters became very angry because the elders of a certain congregation did not allow him to dictate to the church just what and how it should do.

Every Christian should be amenable to a church, that is, he should be a "member" of a congregation of Christians, and thus be under the careful watch-care and protection of the church through her elders, and never shirk in doing his full duty in the work of said church. There are some who argue that they are members wherever they are and do not attend regularly and work at any place—just "scout about" here and there. They are not responsible for any body or any thing. A sort of "freelance" Christians. I heard a good preacher refer to such practice as "stray dog Christianity," and until I learn a better definition, I will be content with his diagnosis.

Another practice which is all too common: A brother becomes offended at some one and he strolls off to another congregation! Nothing is said or done about it, only he is recognized and fellowshipped as a "loyal" member!! When such a one comes into your midst he should be rebuked and exhorted to go back to his "home church" and adjust matters, and then if he wishes to affiliate with you, he can come with a clean slate. But if the church of which you are a member departs from the faith-perverts apostolic doctrine and worship—it ceases to be a New Testament church, then there is only one alternative for you, and that is to "come out from among them."

Suppose some one is duly withdrawn from and he presents himself for "membership" in another congregation. This is done some times. Should that congregation receive him into her fellowship? A novice should know that to do so would be wrong and contrary to New Testament church discipline. In the event the congregation did "receive such a one," then it would be harboring sin and rebellion, and also puts herself out of the fellowship of all true churches. Whenever a church commits such a heinous sin, she becomes factional, and until she repents and make proper amends, must stand condemned before God. It seems that some are so anxious for numbers they will receive anything with open arms and thus become a dumping-ground for every thing that comes along. I know I am dealing with delicate matters, and what I am saying will draw fire, but shall we be driven from speaking the truth by the lash of public sentiment? I don't aim to.

When members move to a new community to reside, they should find the true church immediately and definitely take their stand with it. Elders should admonish departing members along such lines, and it would be well to notify the church in the vicinity of these members to look after them. Many have been lost to the church on account of neglect along this line. For example: I have knowledge that there are hundreds in some of our northern cities who were fairly good members in Tennessee and Kentucky, but when they moved to the city did not locate the church and line up with it. They have grown cold and become indifferent. The church should operate along sane and safe lines. "Cursed be he that doeth the work of Jehovah negligently." Should we not tremble at such a divine pronouncement?
As stated in the February Bible Banner, the church was planted at Horse Cave, Kentucky in pioneer days and grew to be an influential church which adhered strictly to New Testament teaching and practice. This church was not seriously affected by the wave of digression that swept through Kentucky many years ago.

D. H. Friend was preaching at Horse Cave when the Boll Movement was launched in Kentucky near a quarter of a century ago. Brother Friend sided in with Boll, and the seeds of discord were planted in this great church. His soft preaching, conniving with the denominations, and speculative teaching, weakened the church, and she began to slip away from her safe mooring. H. L. Olmstead followed Friend and the apostasy continued to develop. The type of preaching done by these men and their kind, filled the "church" with the unconverted and an overwhelming digressive element was created.

Seeing the evil influence of the Boll Movement and the vitiating work of soft, compromising preachers, the churches in this section severed any and all connections with the insipid influence of Bollism. and today, Bollism is killed in southern Kentucky.

As the last resort, Kenneth Spaulding, the preacher in charge at Horse Cave prayed to be accepted into the "co-operative fellowship" of digressive churches in this section, prepared the following petition and circulated it among most of the members:

We, the undersigned members of the Horse Cave, Kentucky Church of Christ, because of conditions that greatly impede the work of our Master, and striving, to eliminate such impediments, do hereby declare it our wish to be accepted into the cooperative fellowship of Christian Churches in this section, henceforth and always. To be specific, we mean such churches as those called "Christian" at Cave City, Hiseville, Glasgow, Smith's Grove and Bowling Green, Kentucky, and elsewhere.

By shrewd, undermining schemes, he secured the signatures of the majority (including children), and the "church property," which was made possible by God-fearing men and women whose bodies now sleep amid the dust of the dead, is conveyed to the digressives "in this section and elsewhere." This is decided the dirtiest piece of work ever done in southern Kentucky. Such high-handed wickedness as done by Spalding and those who backed him, will ever be frowned upon by all lovers of truth and righteousness. Many fine citizens of this community, though affiliated with denominational bodies, are expressing utter disgust of a man that will brazenly do the deed that Kenneth Spaulding accomplished, and preached for some time that that Kingdom was at hand. Of course, "No one has ever explained" the "ifs" and the "ands" and "what thens" about three times in the above.

The trouble with his theory is, it keeps God ignorant of "the kingdom which is coming with power: for the Kingdom of this world is come to an end." (Matt. 24:14) Scripture nowhere says that the Kingdom is coming in a "sweet-spirited," compromising way. It is the responsibility of all of Christ's people to spread the Gospel, to keep the Kingdom pure and holy. (Num. 16:30) For this sad plight, we are indebted to D. H. Friend, and what this "ism" and softpedal preaching has done at Horse Cave, the same deadly results will follow wherever such is permitted and tolerated. Yes, Horse Cave is a warning to churches everywhere. If an apology is necessary for this second article, charge it to those who have made it an imperative duty to obey the divine injunction "them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." It is hoped by some faithful brethren that a remnant may yet be saved at Horse Cave.

THE "IFS" AND THE "ANDS"

(Continued from page Nine)

thy seed shall be sojourners in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years." (J. T. L.) or that the Jews should reject Christ when he came. Was not the Lord Jesus sincere when he wept over them? (He certainly was, but he was not weeping because they rejected him as an earthly king, or ruler; but because they would not accept him as the Messiah J. T. L.) Yet it was by their fall that salvation came to the Gentiles. In fact all those events of the past were necessary factors in bringing about the church. Yet the church was in God's "eternal purpose." (Eph. 3:10) Who will explain it? No one ever has; and it is safe to predict that no one ever will. But so it is, just the same." Brother Boll vamped and rehashed the same "ifs" and "ands" and "what thens" about three times in the above. The trouble with his theory is, it keeps God ignorant of "all those events of the past," till they had happened, yet they were all necessary factors in bringing about God's "eternal purpose." For instance God did not know that the Jews were not ready for the restoration of their earthly kingdom, until after John the Baptist, and Christ had announced, and preached for some time that that Kingdom was at hand. Of course, "No one has ever explained" such vagaries, "and it is safe to predict that no one ever will." Therefore, I cannot understand why Brother Boll keeps preaching such nonsense.

He goes from bad to worse, he says: "The Editor also received a query as to whether or not the church was ever foretold in the Old Testament. It was foreshadowed in Adam and Eve (Eph. 5:31, 32); and dimly prophesied of in such passages as Psalms 45. But no direct and plain prophecy of the church is found in the Old Testament." Thus the Seer of Louisville deposes. In Eph. 5:31, Paul quotes Gen. 2:24, it is what God said to Adam when he made Eve and brought her to him. Yet this same teacher (?) of prophecy had told us in the same article that the "scheme of redemption did not come into view till Adam had sinned." Please read Isaiah 2:2, 3; 9:6, 7; Daniel 2:44; and Micah 4:2, then ask yourself the question. What were these prophets foretelling? Then read Luke 24:44-47, and Acts 2:38, and see if those prophecies were not fulfilled on Pentecost.

I have given Brother Boll's article to our readers. Will he be fair enough to let his readers see my reply.
J. N. ARMSTRONG’S POSITION AS STATED BY HIMSELF

GEORGE B. CURTIS

The Dean of Bible in Harding college has been up for discussion in relation to his position on the second coming of Christ and an earthly reign of Christ. Bro. Armstrong denies being a Bollite, and words have been bandied freely over his position. Why should Bro. Armstrong’s position be of such interest to members of the church of Christ? Bro. Armstrong is head of the Bible department in Harding, and as such is the most influential man of the college from the standpoint of the indoctrination of the student body. Under his teaching come all the preacher boys of the school. These go out into the field and spread the things learned under his instruction. His is an important and responsible position. It is one that concerns every member of the body of Christ. His opinions and teachings are a matter of concern of all lovers of truth. What is his Position on Pre-millennialism? I propose to let Bro. Armstrong answer this question for us.

The following quotation is from the Living Message, Morrilton, Ark., under date of December 25, 1924, and written by J. N. Armstrong:

"As pointed out before in a former article, the kingdom or government represented by the stone ‘cut out of the mountain without hands’ was to abolish all world rule, governments of human authority, all of them, until they should become as 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 the clay—and the government represented by the stone in the dream, God’s government, government by divine authority, the government not of this world, was after having smitten into chaff, ‘all the kingdoms’ after they were abolished from the earth, to fill the whole earth. The interpretation of this prophecy that does not give to the stone 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 this earth a vestige of civil government, save the government, 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 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 bond servant of human theories."

Notice a brief summation of the thoughts of Bro. Armstrong’s article: 1. Stone cut out of mountain to grind all authority represented by gold, silver, brass, iron and clay to pieces. 2. Wind to carry them away. 3. The government represented by the stone to fill the whole earth. 4. Not a vestige of civil government left upon the earth. 5. Saints under Christ, rid of all human governments rule the earth. 6. Any other interpretation of this prophecy than the one given by the writer marks one as a wild speculator and a dreamer.

We shall now raise the question: When is Bro. Armstrong’s utopia to begin? It will take place when every enemy of Christ is destroyed, When will this be? Let Bro. Armstrong answer.

The following quotation from Bro. Armstrong is from a letter written to E. G. Couch. "I do not believe that the whole world will become subject to Christ even though 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 he will smite the nations, etc. Rev. 19:11. This is no doubt a part of the abolishing of all rule, authority and power in his subjecting all things to himself. The scripture for my faith that finally the kingdom of Heaven, the Church, that was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of our Lord, will possess the earth are these: Dan. 2, and 1 Cor. 15:24-29. If we are right in saying that this second chapter of Daniel refers to the establishment of the kingdom, and if the stone “cut out of the mountain without hands” was the kingdom prophecy and promise, then the obliterating of the image which represents four great earthly powers, and becoming a great mountain and filling the whole earth, could mean nothing else but that this kingdom is destined to fill the whole earth.” (From a letter written by J. N. Armstrong, to E. G. Couch).

In this quotation from Bro. Armstrong, we find, 1. The gospel will not be the power that will subject the whole world to Christ. 2. A sword will proceed out of his mouth. 3. This sword will not be the word of God, the gospel. 4. The subdividing of all authorities will take place after his second coming. 5. Christ will rule here on earth with his saints after his second coming. By this we are taught by the Dean of Bible that there will be an earthly reign after Christ’s second coming. Now we are getting somewhere. Will this reign be before or after the resurrection from the dead? Again let Bro. Armstrong answer.

This quotation is taken from a letter from Bro. J. N. Armstrong to B. G. Hope of Paragould, Ark. The comments are on 1 Cor. 15:24-29.

"In commenting on the fact the ‘Thens’ in the passage means ‘Afterwards’ or ‘Later,’ I often say that the space of time between the Resurrection of the saints and the end could be a thousand years, even two thousand years. This is no doubt what our Brother Bland remembers. As we all know the first ‘Then’ has already covered two thousand years, and the ‘Then’ goes on. How much the second ‘Then’ may cover over none of us know. Yours sincerely, J. N. Armstrong?"

Notice this: 1. Armstrong contends that ‘then’ in 1 Cor. 15:24 implies a period of time. 2. There will be a period of time between the resurrection of the saints and the end. 3. This is after the resurrection, during the slaying with the sword of the former quotation. 4. Men are yet dying on the earth. 5. Christ is here on the earth killing his enemies with something that is not the gospel, a carnal sword. 6. Is ruling here on earth in person with his saints. 7. Every vestige of government, human, has been destroyed, and saints possess the earth. 8. This rule here on earth with Christ after his second coming may last a thousand years, or two thousand years. 9. Any other interpretation is dreaming and speculation.

Brethren, if J. N. Armstrong can say what he believes this expresses his own particular brand of Russellism. This is not a misrepresentation of him. It is his own expression of his own views. It is not nearly it. This is it. We fight Russellism in its various forms. It is a system of infidelity. I challenge Armstrong and the whole Harding fraternity to defend the written teachings of J. N. Armstrong on the kingdom of Christ in its character as depicted by Bro. Armstrong upon the return of Christ to raise the dead. Why not in the presence of the Harding student body let Bro. Armstrong avow or retract his former
teachings on the subject. It will do the cause of the Lord good to get his position plainly before the public.

I am convinced that Armstrong and Boll are not of precisely the same opinion relative to the millennium, but they are so nearly alike that there is no friction between them in their teachings. In fact when Bro. Armstrong thinks that it will not be to the detriment of his interests at Searcy they make common cause, as this correspondence will show:

Bentonville, Ark. August 1, 1939

Mr. Cecil B. Douthitt, Louisville, Kentucky

Dear Brother Douthitt:

Recently I saw a report in the Firm Foundation by Don Carlos Janes stating that brother J. N. Armstrong of this state was to hold a meeting in Louisville, your home city.

What is the position of that church for which Brother Armstrong is to hold the meeting in regard to the Boll theory? I will sincerely appreciate hearing from you on this subject, and what brother Armstrong's disposition really is toward the Bollite churches while in your city.

Thanking you in advance for any information along this line,

Fraternally yours,
Ted W. McElroy

Reply:

"Bro. McElroy:

Brother Armstrong's work in the Louisville is with the Bollite churches. He never comes near us while here. The Camp Taylor church and the Highland church for which brother Armstrong has been preaching are among the rankest of all Premillennial Churches. It was the Highland church that withdrew from Taylor and Rubel for objecting to Jorgenson's speculation.

Cecil B. Douthitt"

May I add, "Tell me thy company and I will tell thee what thou art?"

Again, those very near to Harding college within the past six months have boasted that the Harding sympathy for Boll was bringing them many Premillennial students. A young man, a former student in Harding, while out with a brother Stroud of Searcy and Bro. Geo. S. Benson, president of Harding College, during the summer of 1939 A. D. heard brother Stroud say, to which brother Benson acquiesced, that Harding's friendly attitude toward R. H. Boll was bringing them many Premillennial students. This young man whose integrity is not doubted by any who knows him will make affidavit as to the truth of the above.

Another evidence of Harding's friendliness to softism, Bollism, and general unsoundness is their catering to Clinton Davidson. Harding is noted for bulletins, and not very long ago some three months, almost a whole bulletin was devoted to Davidson, one of the biggest dangers to the growth of the New Testament church since the division over instrumental music. They have taken to their breast the man who would muzzle the truth, copyright error that it can not be fought, and buy the souls of men. Yes, that pious, godly, backslapping fraternity at Harding has formed an alliance with Davidson. They, too, would like to cover something up. They are so sweet of disposition that they would not defame a man's character in the open at all. No, they will just whisper some sweet morsels of slander against some of the loyal preachers of the church into slander loving ears and let nature take its course. This, Harding is trying to do. The time has come to let Harding know that they cannot serve two masters-Boll and loyalty to truth. They are drawing their chief support now from sources friendly to Premillennialism. I am predicting that soon we shall see Harding college definitely in the hands of the Premillennial crowd.

As an example of Baptists narrowness C. O. Simpson covers a whole page of the Baptists and Reflector in an attempt to show that simply being a Christian does not qualify one to partake of the Lord's supper. He would cut off some of the Lord's children from their Father's table. He contends that "Baptist Christians alone have valid baptism," and no one without valid baptism is qualified to eat the Lord's supper. Even a visiting Baptist cannot eat the Lord's supper in a congregation of Baptists assembled for that purpose. Baptists are considerably narrower than the New Testament in their "distinctive doctrine" of communism. According to them Paul and his travelling companions could not have eaten the Lord's supper when the disciples in Troas met "on the first day of the week to break bread." Travelling about as he did, Paul would have been excluded from the Lord's table most of the time of his high ministry. It is just a batch of Baptist foolishness with no New Testament support whatever.
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In order to give an appearance of Scriptural sanction of the Book of Mormon they refer to Isaiah 29:11-12 and tell us that this was fulfilled in the coming forth of the BM. We propose to examine this contention. First, let us quote and then apply the prophecy.

"And all vision is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed: and the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I am not learned." (American Standard Version.)

"And the revelation of all this will be to you like words of a sealed writing, which they give to him who understands writing, saying, Pray, read this; but he says, I cannot, it is sealed. And they give the writing to one who does not understand writing, saying, Pray, read this; but he says, I do not understand writing." (Delitzsch.)

It is interesting to see how Smith's reports of Harris' visit to Professor Anthon, (we have no direct record of Harris' account of the visit) which was made to N. Y. C. in Feb. 1828. Smith tells us of Harris' visit to Professor Anthon, (we have no direct record of Harris' account of the visit) which was made to N. Y. C. in Feb. 1828. Smith tells us that this was fulfilled in the coming forth of the BM. But as we continue the investigation, we find the confusion in its application we shall receive a greater shock.

Smith tells us of Harris' visit to Professor Anthon, (we have no direct record of Harris' account of the visit) which was made to N. Y. C. in Feb. 1828. "I went to the city of New York, and presented the characters which had been translated, with the translation thereof, to Prof. Anthon, a gentleman celebrated for his literary attainments. Prof. Anthon stated that the translation was correct more so than any he had before seen translated from the Egyptian. I then showed him those which were not yet translated and he said that they were Egyptian, Chaldean, Assyrian, and Arabic, and said they were the true characters. He gave me a certificate certifying to the people of Palmyra that they were true characters and that the translation of such of them as had been translated was also correct. I took the certificate and put it into my pocket, and was just leaving the house, when Mr. Anthon called me back, and asked me how the young man found out that there were gold plates in the place where he found them. I answered that an angel of God had revealed it unto him. He then said to me: 'Let me see that certificate.' I accordingly took it out of my pocket and gave it to him, when he took it and tore it to pieces, saying that there was no such thing now as minimizing angels and that if I would bring the plates to him, he would translate them. He informed him that part of the plates were sealed and that I was forbidden to bring them. He replied: 'I cannot read a sealed book.' I left him and went to Dr. Mitchell, who sanctioned what Professor Anthon had respecting both the characters and the translation" (Church History, Vol. 1, p. 19. Quoted on p. 74 P. P. Pratt, Voice of Warning; p. 521 Charles A. Shook, Cumorah Revisited)

It is interesting to see how Smith's reports of Harris' visit would forestall any demand upon the part of his enemies to produce the certificate which Smith said Anthon gave to Harris. Smith has Anthon to ask for it and destroy it. That they regard this as a fulfilment of prophecy is evident from the following.

"He asked that 'the book which the young man had dug up' might be brought to him; and stated that out of his worldly learning he would translate the whole work. Harris repeated that a considerable portion of the record was sealed and might not be opened to human gaze. Then Anthon contemptuously responded that he could not read a sealed book. And thus was fulfilled the word of Isaiah who wrote twenty-six centuries ago: 'And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot. for it is sealed.' (p. 56 The Life of Joseph Smith the Prophet, the George Q. Cannon, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1888).

The only direct testimony which we have of this event is given by Anthon. The Mormon version did not appear until May 2. 1842 and then it was not made by Harris but by Smith. His motive seems to have been to give authority and credence to the claim that the BM was the object of Hebrew prophecy. Harris never gave direct testimony. The following is Professor Anthon's account written by him to E. D. Howe Feb. 17, 1834.

"The whole story about my having pronounced the Mormonite inscription to be Reformed Egyptian hieroglyphics' is perfectly false. Some years ago, a plain, and apparently simple-hearted young man called upon me with a note from Dr. Mitchell, of our city, now deceased, requesting me to decipher, if possible, a paper, which the farmer would hand me, and which Dr. M. confessed he had been unable to understand. Upon examining the paper in question, I soon came to the conclusion that it was all a trick, perhaps a hoax. When I asked the person, who brought it, how he obtained the writing, he gave me, as far as I can now recall, the following account: A 'gold book,' consisting of a number of plates of gold, fastened together in the shape of a book by wires of the same mental, had been dug up in the northern part of the State of New York, and along with the book an enormous pair of 'gold spectacles!' These spectacles were so large, that, if a person attempted to look through them, his two eyes would have to be turned towards one of the glasses merely, the spectacles in question being altogether too large for the breadth of the human face. Whoever examined the plates through the spectacles, was enabled not only to read them, but fully to understand their meaning. All this knowledge however was confirmed at that time by another man, who had brought a trunk containing the book and spectacles in his sole possession. This young man was placed behind a curtain, in the garret of a farmhouse, and being thus concealed from view, put on the spectacles occasionally, or, rather, looked through one of the glasses, deciphered the characters in the book, and, having committed some of them to paper, handed copies from behind the curtain, to those who stood on the outside. Not a word, however, was said about the plates having been deciphered by the gift of God. Everything, in this way, was effected by the large pair of spectacles. The farmer added, that he had been requested to contribute a sum of money towards the publication of the Golden book, the contents of which would, as he had been assured, produce an entire change in the world and save it from ruin. So urgent had been these solicitations, that he intended selling his farm and handing over the amount received to those who succeeded to publish the annals of the Prophet. As a last precautionary step, however, he had resolved to come to New York, and obtain the opinion of the learned about the meaning of the paper which he brought with him. If it had been read and was given to him as a part of the contents of the book, although no translation had been furnished at the time by the young man with the spectacles. On hearing this odd story, I changed my opinion about the paper, and, instead of viewing it any longer as a hoax upon the learned, I began to regard it, as part of a
scheme to cheat the farmer of his money, and I communicated my suspicions to him, warning him to beware of rogues. He requested an opinion from me in writing, which of course I declined giving, and he then took his leave, carrying the paper with him. This paper was in a singular style. It consisted of all kinds of crooked characters disposed in columns, and had evidently been prepared by some person who had before him at the time a book containing various alphabets. Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes, Roman letters inverted or placed sideways, were arranged in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in a delineation of a circle divided into various compartments, decked with various strange marks, and evidently copied after the Mexican calendar given by Humboldt, but copied in such a way as not to betray the source whence it was derived. I am thus particular as to the contents of the paper, inasmuch as I have frequently conversed with my friends on the subject, since the Mormonite excitement began, and well remember that the paper contained anything else but 'Egyptian hieroglyphics.' Some time after, the same farmer paid me a second visit. He brought with him the golden book in print and offered it to me for sale. I declined purchasing. He then asked permission to leave the book with me for examination. I declined receiving it, although his manner was strangely urgent; I adverted once more to the roguery which had been in my opinion practiced upon him, and asked him what had become of the gold plates. He informed me that they were in a trunk with the land pair of spectacles. I advised him to go to a magistrate and have the trunk examined. He said the 'curse of God' would come upon him should he do this. On my pressing him, however, to pursue the course which I had recommended, he told me that he would open the trunk. If I would take the 'curse of God' upon myself: I replied that I would do so with the greatest willingness, and would incur every risk of that nature, provided I could only extricate him from the grasp of rogues. He then left me.

I have thus given you a full statement of all that I know respecting the origin of Mormonism, and must beg you, as a personal favor, to publish this letter immediately, should you find my name mentioned again by these wretched fanatics."

Charles A. Shook points out the following difference in the two accounts. (1) Harris declares that he called upon Anthon first and afterwards upon Mitchell; Professor Anthon claims that he came to him with a note from the Doctor. (2) The characters, which Harris says he submitted to Anthon, are arranged in horizontal rows; those which Anthon saw were arranged in perpendicular columns. (3) Harris claims that some of the characters were translated; Anthon makes no mention of such a translation. (4) Among the characters which Anthon saw were a number of stars and half-moons; these do not appear in the transcript which Mormons claim Harris had. (5) Harris ascertained that Anthon gave him a certificate 'certifying to the people of Palmyra that they were the true characters'; Anthon says that Harris requested his opinion in writing, but that he declined giving it. (6) Harris declares that Professor Anthon said, 'I can not read a sealed book.' Anthon mentions no such admission, and from his condemnation of the characters one would infer that no such declaration was ever made. (7) Harris says that Professor Anthon pronounced the characters Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian and Arabic; the professor says that the whole thing was a 'hoax,' and that it consisted of distorted Hebrew, Greek and Roman letters, crosses, half-moons, stars and flourishes.

"The case stands thus: Anthon vs. Harris. Which will you believe? On the one hand we have a scholar of acknowledged ability and veracity, and on the other an ignorant farmer, whom even the Mormons admit lived under other circumstances." (Cumorah Revisited, p.526) "There is no harmony between Isaiah's prophecy and Smith's application."

Even if Smith's account of the visit to Anthon were correct Isa.28:11-12 has no more reference to the BM than it has to the Koran. Russell's Studies in the Scripture or Mrs. Eddy's Science and Health.

(1) It was not a book but a vision as"the words of a book. (2) Instead of being unable to read the book—to ring true to I adverted once more to the roguery which I knewledged ability and veracity, and on the other an ignorant farmer, whom even the Mormons claim Harris had. (3) If Anthon did not decipher the inscriptions copied from the plates, and thus verified Smith's translation then the Lord deceived Smith when he made him believe that Urim and Thummim were necessary in order to translate them. (4) If Anthon did not decipher the inscriptions copied from the plates, and thus verified Smith's translation then the Lord deceived Smith when he made him believe that Urim and Thummim were necessary in order to translate them.

Some time after, the same farmer paid me a second visit. He brought with him the golden book in print and offered it to me for sale. I declined purchasing. He then asked permission to leave the book with me for examination. I declined receiving it, although his manner was strangely urgent; I informed him that they were in a trunk with the land pair of spectacles. I advised him to go to a magistrate and have the trunk examined. He said the 'curse of God' would come upon him should he do this. On my pressing him, however, to pursue the course which I had recommended, he told me that he would open the trunk. If I would take the 'curse of God' upon myself: I replied that I would do so with the greatest willingness, and would incur every risk of that nature, provided I could only extricate him from the grasp of rogues. He then left me.

I have thus given you a full statement of all that I know respecting the origin of Mormonism, and must beg you, as a personal favor, to publish this letter immediately, should you find my name mentioned again by these wretched fanatics."

Believe the Mormon contention if you can but I cannot see any connection at all between the statement of Isaiah and Smith's application. It looks like another one of Smith's blunders and misinterpretations.

**COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL**

A. J. Veteto, Bell Buckle, Term. "The number of prayer songs, invitation songs and funeral songs as found in the Complete Christian Hymnal, will cause the title of the book to ring true to all who examine and use it." He then says, "The editor Esther Croxeth, Miss., have thoroughly examined Complete Christian Hymnal and found it, from many viewpoints, a most wonderful book. It is scriptural, its music is such as will meet the requirements of true worship, and its mechanical make up will grace any place of worship. You have in it a wonderful collection of songs. You have rendered a great service to the church of Christ by making possible the right kind of singing."
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A SHORT CATECHISM

GEORGE W. DeHOFF

1. Question: Does the church of Christ own any colleges? Answer: The church of Christ does not own any colleges.

2. Does the church of Christ own any orphan homes? The church of Christ does not own any orphan homes.

3. Does the church of Christ own any religious papers? The church of Christ does not own any religious papers.

4. Are the colleges operated by the members of the churches of Christ responsible for inducing most of the preachers of the church to begin preaching? They are not. Many of the preachers have been to college. Most of that number decided to preach and went to college to prepare themselves for greater service. They did not decide to preach as a result of going to college; rather the converse is true. Many of the finest preachers in the church never went to college. Nearly every section of the country has first heard the gospel from preachers who did not go to college. The heads of the Bible departments in at least two colleges operated by members of the churches of Christ are not products of colleges operated by members of the church.

5. Does the future of the church depend on the colleges? It does not. The future of the church depends on the local congregations and their faithfulness.

6. Have the colleges “saved the church from digression?” They have not. Digression has nearly always been born in the colleges and has spread to the congregations.

7. Is it legitimate, ethical and scriptural for preachers to criticise the colleges seeing that they do not own them? It is. Should a school, paper, man, farm or beer joint have influence in one locality which makes it a detriment to the church in that place, the elders, preachers and members in that locality should yell so loud that all members in that locality would be warned against this pernicious influence. Should its detrimental influence reach two communities, the Christians in two communities should join in. The area of criticism should certainly be as wide as the sphere of influence.

8. Can we be certain that any of the colleges will remain true to the faith? We cannot. The school founded by Alexander Campbell drifted. Even the influence of McGarvey, Lard and lately Calhoun could not save the school at Lexington, Kentucky. We cannot even be certain that any local congregation will remain faithful-many have drifted. Even the “restrictive clause” in the deed usually does not restrict anything as the majority nearly always gets the property anyway when a case comes up in court. It is more difficult, however, to corrupt five hundred congregations that it would be to corrupt a single source of influence in the same territory.

9. Have the college officials criticised preachers in their classes and assemblies before students who did not know the preachers and then refused these preachers an opportunity to defend themselves? They have.

10. If we criticise the colleges will not some members who are weak in the faith and many outsiders misunderstand? They will. Many weak in the faith misunderstood Christ and Paul when they criticised. Outsiders misunderstood (or did they?) so well that they killed Christ and also others. A hundred converted, working members are better than a thousand otherwise. Whom shall we try to please: weak members, outsiders or the Lord?

11. Have colleges made infidels of some preachers? A few of the preachers have gone to college and have become infidels. No one knows what they would have done if they had not gone to college.

12. Have colleges helped many preachers? In my judgment they have.

13. Is there danger in large religious papers? There is. Papers have the same tendency to digress that colleges have. When a paper is small and its publisher must sacrifice to publish it, the danger is at a minimum. When it (and its allied interests) become large and show a profit, the danger is increased.

14. Have papers sometimes presented one side of a story and then refused to give the other side? They have.

15. Have papers sometimes tried to become powerful enough to smash any competitors? Apparently it has been tried.

16. Have papers tried to control preachers? They have. One way is by getting a great crowd of them to agree to write for no other paper and paying them a pittance or perhaps nothing to write for that one. This is comparable to a church hiring a preacher and making him agree not to teach a Bible class for any other group while preaching for them. (Preachers should issue a declaration of independence.)

17. Have colleges and papers tried to get into the budget of the churches? They have. Some college officials have invited themselves to a congregation, turned the services into a college rally and taken up contributions and pledges at the end. Some services of the church have been turned into paper sales to such an extent that one would think he stepped into Mr. Coughlin’s shrine at Royal Oak, Michigan.

18. “Don’t you think our criticism must be in the right spirit?” The question is silly. Everything a Christian does must be in the right spirit. Most of those who say we must criticise error “but in the right spirit” don’t do it in any spirit at all. If they don’t like the way it is being done, let them show by their works—not words—the right way.

19. Is the author of this catechism an enemy of colleges, orphan homes and papers? Indeed not. I graduated from three colleges operated by members of the churches of Christ (Burritt, Freed-Hardeman and Harding) and am ever grateful for the help I received there; I support the work of caring for orphans as liberally as possible and think any preacher who isn’t giving as much as Jacob vowed in Genesis 28 he’d give ought to go to hell for stinginess. I write for any paper I get ready to write for.
(they use their judgment about printing it) and have helped
to sell some subscriptions to religious publications. I give
away all the literature I can afford to buy and distribute
and have helped to influence several young people to at-
tend colleges conducted by members of the church. But
I do not intend to be controlled by any paper or college.

20. Will articles such as this hurt the influence of the
one writing them? No, of course not, too many preachers
are finding it necessary to criticise error and then stop and
brag about their courage and how they are “persecuted.”
In the first place it is impossible for a man to act such a
donkey that he will not have a place to preach (even R.
H. Boll after teaching a false doctrine for twenty years
is still able to carry on) and, then, who cares what folks
think about what one writes just so it’s the truth?

21. Are the papers and colleges taking themselves too
seriously? They are. Most members of the church do not
read any paper, do not know anything about the colleges.
The sooner papers and colleges realize this and stay off a
“holier-than-thou” high horse and busy themselves about
saving souls the better it will be.

23. Is there such a thing as local, evangelistic and mis-
nionary work in the church of Christ? There is not. If a
preacher “locates” at a place two weeks or two years and
does his duty he is doing evangelistic work. If he lo-
cates in Capetown, South Africa or Nashville, Tennessee it
is still evangelistic work (if not, why not?)

24. Is a gospel preacher the pastor of a church? He is
not. The elders are the pastors—the preacher is their
hired hand.

25. Is a gospel preacher the minister of a church? He
is not. If he does his duty he is a minister but he is not the
minister—every member of the church is a minister in his
own congregation.

26. Are preachers part of the clergy? Yes, they are
part of it. Every member of the church is a member of the
Lord’s “clergy.” (“Kleeroys”—heritage-in 1 Peter 5:3
shows that the entire church is God’s heritage, God’s lot,
God’s clergy.) Why introduce two members of the church
by calling the preacher “Brother Jones” and the other
member “Mr. Smith.” There is no clergy and laity in the
Lord’s church and Christians should dispense with the idea.

A PERTINENT QUESTION

HOMER HAILEY

A question pre-millennialists should be able to answer
for us today, and one we should like to see answered, is this:
“By what sacrifice and covenant will sinners in the
so-called millennial age be saved?” Usually, the an-
swer is “by the blood of Christ,” “by the gospel.” But,
will that be possible? If that is a different “age” or “dis-
pensation” to the present one it cannot be possible.

In Hebrews 13:20 the apostle writes, “Now the God of
peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd
of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our
Lord Jesus***.” From this, we reason as follows:

1. “Eternal” means “age-lasting.” The word here
translated “eternal” is from the Greek “aiooonos,” which
is sometimes translated “for ever,” as in Philenom 15,
where Paul tells Philemon he may have Onesimus “for
ever.” Many times it is translated “everlasting,” as in
the King James version; and “eternal,” as in the Standard.
That the word means “age lasting” is seen from the fol-
lowing statements:

In the Old Covenant the Hebrew word “olam” is used
to denote the duration or time of existence of certain things.
It is used of the priesthood, Exodus 40:15; of the annual
atonement, Lev. 16:34; and the Sabbath as a covenant,
Lev. 24:8, where it is translated “eternal” in the Standard
version, and “everlasting” in the King James. These things
hence, were to be “eternal,” “everlasting;” yet these
things passed with the Jewish age, hence the word meant
“age-lasting.”

The Greek equivalent of the Hebrew “olam” is “aio-
ona,” as seen from the following two passages: Psalm
110:4 reads, “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of
Melchizedek.” In quoting this in Hebrews 5:6, and in
kindred passages, the writer uses the Greek word “aioona,”
therefore, it is equivalent. Since the one in the Old coven-
ant meant “age-lasting,” the Greek equivalent meant the
same. Therefore, when the words “eternal,” “for ever,”
“everlasting” are translations of “aioona” and “aioonios,”
they mean “age-lasting,” as long as the age referred to
lasts.

2. The “blood” and “age-lasting covenant” pertain to
the same age. In the passage in Hebrews 13:20 the apos-
tle speaks of the blood, and calls it “the blood of the ever-
lasting (age-lasting) covenant.” Jesus said “this is my
blood of the covenant,” Matt. 26:28. The blood and the
covenant, therefore, are inseparably linked, the covenant
being sealed with the blood. But since the covenant is
an “age-lasting” covenant, and the blood pertains to it; and
both to this age, for now are we saved by the blood;
therefore when the age ends the covenant will have ac-
complished its divine purpose. Since the two are insepar-
able, when the covenant ends the blood will have filled its
appointed period for redemption. Putting it in the form
of a syllogism, we have:

(1) The blood is the “blood of the covenant;”
(2) The covenant is an “age-lasting” covenant;
(3) Therefore, when the age ends the covenant ends;
and when the covenant ends the blood will have fulfilled
that for which it was shed.

This being true, should another age follow this, govern-
ored by another covenant, as per the theory of pre-millen-
ialists, the blood of Christ will not pertain to it, for it pertains
to the one now. So the question becomes, “What will be
the sacrifice or blood by which that covenant is made of
force, and saves?” We should like to have someone who
thinks he knows, answer.

3. The blood shed purchases the citizens for the King-
dom, to be priests unto his God and Father.” (Rev. 1:5, 6)
from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a king-
dome, to be priests unto his God and Father.” (Rev. 1:5, 6)
Whom did he make to be a “kingdom?” Those loosed from
sins by his blood; but the writer of Hebrews says it id “the
blood of the everlasting covenant.” Now since those pur-
chased by his blood constituted the kingdom; but the blood
was the blood of the covenant, the three become insepar-
ably linked together. The blood, the covenant, and the
kingdom all pertain to the same age, which is the present
age.

Now our point and question is simply this: if the coven-
ant, the blood, and the kingdom pertain to this age; but
there is another age to follow, (according to the theory)
and the covenant spoken of by Jeremiah, chapter 31, is to
be made; then what blood, what sacrifice will seal it, and
loose from sins? If it is a different kingdom, with a
different covenant, it will have to have a different sacri-
çifice. Or if it is argued that it is simply an enlargement of
the present kingdom, and an enlargement of the present
covenant; then in what way will the blood of the present
covenant be enlarged? I believe premillennialists should
answer this question. But probably they will answer as
usual, “God will take care of that.”
"MARK THEM WHICH CAUSE DIVISION"

GILBERT E. SHAFFER

The words used in this heading are taken from Paul's writing to the church in Rome. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause division and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Rom.16:17-18)

What does it mean to "mark" some one? Adam Clarke in commenting on this passage has the following to say: "Give them no countenance, and have no religious fellowship with them." (Vol. 6 page 164) Macknight has this to say on the same verse: "It is worthy of notice, that the apostle desired the faithful to mark them who cause divisions, not for the purpose of disputing with them, but that they might have been infected with their errors and vices among them. For, as the apostle told Timothy, 2 Epistle, "their word will eat as doth as gangrene." (Macknight On The Epistles) These two great commentators agree on the meaning on this verse which is so needed today. One said: "no religious fellowship with them." The other said: "Avoid their company." The conclusion is that this doctrine that causes division might not spread.

If one that causes division could be quarantined, as we do some contagious disease, the trouble might not spread. But since that can not be done, it is up to the well member to avoid the germ carrier. We are to "mark them," and "avoid them."

It has been my experience, in dealing with those who cause division, that they always try to justify themselves. They are never guilty in their own sight. If possible they look to someone else and cry "look what he has done." They build around them a group of sympathetic spirits and cry "What does it mean to "mark" some one? Adam Clarke in commenting on this passage has the following to say: "Give them no countenance, and have no religious fellowship with them." (Vol. 6 page 164) Macknight has this to say on the same verse: "It is worthy of notice, that the apostle desired the faithful to mark them who cause divisions, not for the purpose of disputing with them, but that they might have been infected with their errors and vices among them. For, as the apostle told Timothy, 2 Epistle, "their word will eat as doth as gangrene." (Macknight On The Epistles) These two great commentators agree on the meaning on this verse which is so needed today. One said: "no religious fellowship with them." The other said: "Avoid their company." The conclusion is that this doctrine that causes division might not spread.

If one that causes division could be quarantined, as we do some contagious disease, the trouble might not spread. But since that can not be done, it is up to the well member to avoid the germ carrier. We are to "mark them," and "avoid them."

Recently I wrote an article for the "Bible Banner" on "Bollism In Jacksonville, Florida." In that article I mentioned the name of Homer Hawse as being one of the number that has preached for the Premillennial congregation in Jacksonville. Brother Hawse states that he is not a "Bollite," in a letter to the Bible Banner. He admits, however, that he preached for a church that was "said to be Bollite." The congregation of the church of Christ in Jacksonville, at least two of them, lost several members who made up the premillennial congregation for which brother Hawse preached. They went out from these congregations because they did not like the preaching Brother Wallace did against the premillennial doctrine. The congregation that was formed by these members is known to be strong for premillennialism.

But here is the letter from Bro. Hawse:

Dear Brother Wallace:

I have just read a copy of the January issue of the "Bible Banner." I notice on page seven an article by Brother Gilbert E. Shaffer: "Bollism In Jacksonville, Florida." In this article my name is mentioned in such a way that the impression is left upon the mind of the reader that I am a "Bollite." This is not the first time that my position on the Boll issue has been misrepresented but it is the first time that such false insinuations have been published in one of the brotherhood papers.

It is true that I preached for some time in Jacksonville at a church that was said to be Bollite. As long as I claim to be a preacher of the gospel I shall claim the liberty to preach the Truth where the truth is needed-and it certainly was needed in Jacksonville. The brethren I worked with in Jacksonville were not Bollites, there were some Bollites there, but we certainly didn't work together. Before I left Jacksonville the loyalty to which I came out for was the truth. Mark Church and a true-to-the-Bible congregation was started, which now meets in a new building on Willow Branch Avenue—something Brother Shaffer did not mention in his article. I hope that he will have the opportunity to preach the truth and combat error. The way to defeat error is not to ignore it, as some people do, but recognize its existence and then with God's word oppose it.

As a result of my nine months work in the city of Jacksonville a number of people learned the fact that Premillennialism is a pernicious evil and took their stand against it. That group today is known as the Willow Branch Church of Christ and is one church that has no Bollites—perhaps, perhaps I say, the only congregation in the city that has no Bollites.

I have never preached or believed that Christ is to return to the earth to set up an earthly kingdom, that the Jews are to be restored to Palestine, or any other peculiar doctrine of Premillennialism. My record is open for investigation to anyone interested in knowing what I have taught in the past or am now teaching in regard to this question. Any one who makes accusations should be able to verify them or shut up. I refer any person desiring such information to the following: the elders of my home congregation, the Murray Hill Church of Christ, 103 Mabel Avenue, Flint, Michigan; the Willow Branch Church of Christ, Jacksonville (the brethren I worked with during my stay in Jacksonville); the Church of Christ, Gainesville, Fla., who know something of my activities while I was a student in the University of Florida there; or the Ninth Avenue Church of Christ, 1315 Ninth Avenue, North, St. Petersburg, Florida, the congregation with which I am now laboring.

I hope, Brother Wallace, that you will through the columns of the Banner correct the false impression that has been left by Brother Shaffer's article. Simply by supplying a few more of the facts of the case, as I have endeavored to do in this letter, an entirely different impression is left. I believe you will try to correct this matter as I feel sure that you would not want the Banner to be an agency in causing a brother, who has never believed any form of premillennialism, to be branded a "Bollite.

I am enclosing a copy of our weekly bulletin which contains my sermon for last Lord's day at the Ninth Avenue Church.

You have my sincere appreciation for anything you might do to clarify the situation and best wishes for your continued success in the work of the Lord.

Fraternally yours,

Homer Hawse

The "Woodstock Park Church" has had premillennial preachers to preach for it ever since it was formed. Homer Rutherford has held several meetings for it since I have been in Jacksonville, and their building was financed by the "Boll group," in Louisville. Brother Hawse said in a business meeting of the three congregations that the checks were mailed each month to Don Carlos Janes, to pay off the indebtedness. For this congregation Brother Hawse preached for eight or nine months and during all this time he did not attend the services of the three congregations that have stood together in the fight against premillennialism. If he did not believe that doctrine, which he says he does not, it appears to me that he would have been trying to find out why the churches of Christ in Jacksonville did not fellowship the congregation with which he was working. I would expect a Methodist church to employ a Methodist preacher, a Baptist church to employ a Baptist preacher, and a premillennialist church to employ a premillennialist preacher. In my former article, I only stated that Brother Hawse was one of the preachers who had preached for this church.
Brother Hawse further claims that before he left that congregation he brought out with him a number who did not believe premillennialism, and established another congregation that is now known as the “Willow Branch” church of Christ. There was a division and such a congregation established. However, some of the number that left the Riverside Church to establish the premillennial congregation, are among the number that pulled out with Brother Hawse to establish what is now “Willow Branch.” It is hard to believe, that those who could not stand to have the premillennial doctrine condemned, while they were at Riverside, were so soon converted by Brother Hawse. It is the general understanding among the churches of Christ in Jacksonville that the division in the Woodstock congregation was over who should rule. Some of the members of that congregation have stated repeatedly that the division, of which Brother Hawse speaks, was not over his teaching against premillennialism but over who should have the say in that congregation.

Just after Brother Hawse and several of the premillennial group pulled out, and started another congregation, he was invited into a business meeting. There were six-teen or seventeen brethren from the three loyal congregations present. Brother Hawse was asking for recognition for his group. These brethren told Brother Hawse that those members who had left the two congregations should come back and make acknowledgement of wrongs, and they would be a part of the congregations they had left. He stated that it would be an insult to their dignity to ask them to do such a thing. It was the judgment of those sixteen brethren that the way to repent was by repenting, and coming back as the “prodigal son” did to the congregation they had left.

It was also understood by those brethren, who met in that business meeting, that J. C. Hollis who was working with the church in Saint Petersburg, Florida, desired to put Brother Hawse in his place, which he was to give up in a short time. Brother Hawse stated in that meeting that he should go regardless of his standing in Jacksonville that location. In other words “it was all cut and dried” that he should go regardless of his standing in Jacksonville.

He did go to Saint Petersburg and that over the protest of two of the three elders and perhaps over the protest of all three of them. His going there caused a division in the congregation, and caused the resignation of two of the three elders. These elders told Brother Hawse that if he came there it would cause a division. Just a few weeks ago those elders told me that if Hawse would leave, the church could adjust its trouble, but that nothing could be done as long as he is there.

I would like to see him make right the wrong he has done, and save himself. Not only can he save himself, he can be instrumental in restoring peace, and in saving a broken, bleeding congregation. He says he does not believe “premillennialism.” People will accept his statement more readily if he will confess the wrong he did, by giving his support to such a congregation, for nine months. He can back up as far as he has gone in the wrong direction, and he will be where he was when he started wrong. Any preacher who has trouble following him in his locations as a local evangelist can hardly hope to accomplish much. He is the one over which the church in Saint Petersburg divided. Will he leave there and use his influence in adjusting that trouble? He and Brother J. C. Hollis can do much in undoing what they did there and restoring peace.

Brother Hawse has been marked by the three congregations in Jacksonville because of his connection with the “pre-millennial” congregation here, and because of his part in dividing the church in Saint Petersburg. Hawse, Hollis, and those that recommended Hawse to Saint Petersburg church are responsible for that division. When the elders are “over-powered” by popular vote, and the preacher takes charge, the preacher and the popular vote are wrong. The elders did not want to employ Hawse because he was out of fellowship in Jacksonville. The elders wishes were set aside, the people voted Hawse in, the congregation divided, and still Hawse thinks he has done no wrong.

The Willow Branch congregation is composed in part of the very ones that left Riverside Park congregation to form a “Bollite” church. They have never repented of their mistake and no confession has ever been made of the sin committed. Therefore, this group is looked upon as a faction. It has no fellowship with the Riverside, Springfield, and Kings Road congregations.

There is entirely too much rebellion and division in the church. Any time some one gets disgruntled he feels free to pull out and start something he can manage. Until the church quits recognizing factions, and factional spirits, we will continue to have people who disregard the elders and the unity of the church.

THE ONLY SAFE COURSE FOR “OUR” COLLEGES

(Continued from page Eleven)

a degree from our “association of colleges” that counts with these educational illuminators, and dictators. If it were possible for Brother Lipscomb to return to earth, imagine President Ijams telling him David Lipscomb College, over whose campus “The Spirit of the Founders” brood, had been put on the standardized accredited list of colleges, and he would either have to get a degree from the boys who are running the college, or go off to another college and get his degree before he could teach in the college. Of course while David Lipscomb is away any “novice” with a “degree” can fill the Bible chair in David Lipscomb College. This is nonsense and tomfoolery gone to seed in “our” college, since they joined the “Southern Association of Junior Colleges.” Let no one think those seeds will not bear fruit, it may not be in our life time; but the echoes of history running through the corridors of time tell us of the denominational swamps ahead. As sure as history repeats itself, and so long as human weaknesses are the same, just that sure “our” colleges are nursing serpents in their bosoms. I would rejoice to see just one of “our” colleges cut loose from these infidel educational associations, stand on its own merit, run its own business free from the dictates of all alien associations, and use the funds they are trying to endow the college with to educate young men who are willing and anxious to preach the gospel in destitute or mission fields. I know the answer is, no body would patronize such a school, if not, then close the college, and let the preacher teachers do like Brother Larimore did, give their time to the ministry of the word. One school like Mars Hill College, or like the Nashville Bible School was, would be worth more to the church during the next fifty years than an endowed college in every state in the Union. A school like the above would not bankrupt the brotherhood, neither would its doors be closed to the poorer class of people. Those who run it, would have to look to heaven for their reward, and to history to vindicate their course. It is unthinkable that a renter on a farm, with a house full of children, could send them to an endowed college. So far as the church, and the future is concerned, I believe a question mark should be put after every endowed Bible College among us. It is not a question about who is at the head of them now; but who will be running them in twenty-five years from now,
The list of books appearing in this space will soon be completed and the publication made, with a printed list to be put on a permanent catalog. The sale of these books will help the Bible Banner. There are a wealth of old commentaries and general religious books which those who are building up their libraries should not overlook.

**CATALOG OF BOOKS**

The Sermon Bible—12 vols., consisting of sermon outlines on the prominent texts of the entire Bible, by various authors. 3 good sets $10.00...

3597. The Menace of Immortality in Church & State (Straton) 1940 50
3598. Science and the Bible (Thompson) 1.00
3599. The Ministry of the Modern Church (Horne) 1.00
3600. Revival Sermon Notes (Stan ton) 1.00
3601. Moral Leadership and the Ministry (Keedy) 25
3602. The Wonderful Teacher (Burrell) 1.00
3603. The Apocryphal New Testament 50
3604. The Principles of Jesus (Speer) 50
3605. Christ Is All (Monle) 1.00
3606. Short History of the English People (Green) 50
3607. The Son of Man (Ludwig) 50
3608. Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy (Tupper) 1.00
3609. Manual of the Primitive Baptist Church 1.00
3610. The 143 (the King) 1.00
3611. A Prophet of The Spirit (Longacre) 1.00
3612. Confessions of An English Opium Eater (DeQuincey) 1.00
3613. Muhlenberg (Johnstone) 1.00
3614. Foot-Prints of the Creator, 1856 (Miller) 1.00
3615. The 'I Will' of the Psalms, 1863 (Power) 1.00
3616. Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy (Tupper) 1.00
3617. Founders and Rulers of United Israel (Kent) 1.00
3618. The Bards of The Bible (Gillflower) 1.00
3619. The Success of Defeat (Babeck) 25
3620. Gospel According To Moses (Rodgers) 1.00
3621. Chesterfield's Letters (Chesterfield) 1.00
3622. The Inspiration of History (Mulchahey) 50
3623. The Christian Sabbath (Rice et al) 1.00
3624. La Follette's Political Philosophy (Torelle) 25
3625. The Revolt of Youth (High) 50
3626. Antisemitism (Lazar) 75

BASTINGS NINE VOLUME SET
1. Hasting Dictionary of the Bible, five volumes $20.00
2. Hastings Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, 2 volumes $10.00
3. Hastings Dictionary of Apostolic Church, 2 volumes 10.00

The full set of this world's best and most complete Bible Dictionaries, all of which are rare and out of print at a special price of $85.00.

3627. Expository Thoughts on the Gospels (Ryle) 25
3628. Adolescences and High School Problems (Pingle) 50
3629. The Tongue of Fire (Author) 50
3630. A Compend of Baptism (Hamilton) 50
3631. Missions Among The Telugus (Trabert) 50
3632. The Jews Under Rome (Morrison) 50
3633. The Gin of Swedenborg (Smyth & Wemisch) 50
3634. Collapse Christless Civilizations (Wilson) 50
3635. The Boy and The Church (Foster) 25
3636. The Arian Controversy (Gawtian) 50
3637. The Royal Road to Friendship (Chapman) 50
3638. The Book In The Light of Its Books (Doehms) 75
3639. The Christians Secret of a Happy Life (H. W. S.) 50
3640. Advanced Catechism (O'Brien) 75
3642. Psychic Power In Preaching (Kendall) 50
3643. Toward The Understanding of Jesus (Simkhovitch) 75
3644. Calvinistic Controversy (Fisk) 75
3645. Church Troubles (Liddon) 25
3646. Back From The Mouth of Hell 50
3647. The Christians Secret of A Happy Life (Smith) 25
3648. Personal Soul-Winning (Evans) 50
3649. The Great Physician 50
3650. The Social Gospel (Mathews) 50
3651. Blake's Natural Philosophy, 1829 (Byrum) 50
3652. The Meaning of Prayer (Fosdick) 50
3653. Vinny Leal's Trip to the Golden Shore (Bigham) 50
3654. Answer May-Yes or No (Cappelon & Potter) 1.00

3655. Proof of The Genuiness of Writings of the New Testament (Olahsen) 75
3656. Shem, a Story of The Captivity (Ellis) 25
3657. The Day of Glory (Canfield) 10
3658. The Christian Retrospect and Register, 1850 (Baird) 2.00
3659. What Is A Christian? (Clarke) 50
3660. Devotional Hours With The Bible (Mille) 50
3661. Diagnosing The Tongue (Fry) 50
3662. Every Man's Story of The New Testament (Nairne) 50
3663. One Gospel (Finley) 50
3664. Christianity and The Social Crisis (Rauschenbusch) 50
3665. The Crucial Race Question 50
3666. History of Lutheran Missions (Lawry) 75
3667. The Message of Sadsher (Rice et al) 75
3668. The Higher Ministries of Recent English Poetry (Gunsaulus) 50
3669. Getting Together (Hay) 50

Adam Clarke's Commentary, Original edition, six volumes, sheep bound, good condition, price $18.00...

3670. Speculating in Futures (Lovejoy) 50
3671. Making Most Of Life (Miller) 50
3672. The Returning Tide Of Faith (Talbot) 75
3673. Endeavours After The Christian Life (Martinu) 50
3674. Christianity The Means of Civilization, 1837 (Coates et al) 50
3675. Life of Abbott, 1830 (Firth) 1.00
3676. Life of Chief T. Channing (Browshope) 75
3677. Pliny's Letters Books VI to X 50
3678. Representative Men (Emerson) 25
3679. The Life of Martin Luther (Rien) 75
3680. Patriarchal Dynasties-Adam to Abraham (Crawford) 75
3681. The Sinlessness of Jesus, 1870 (Ullman) 2.50
3682. Philosophy of Church History (Ditzler) 1.50
3683. Christ Triumphant (Royden) 50
3684. The Religo-Medico Masquerade (P. E. A.) 75
3685. The Christ of Nineteen Centuries (Bendrords) 75
3686. The Footsteps of St. Paul, 1855 1.00
3687. The Common Life (Brierley) 50
3688. Our Sixty-Six Sacred Books (Rice) 50
3689. Uncle Jon Vassar or The Fight of Faith, 1879 (Grenol) 1.00
3690. African Methodism in the South (Stoole) 2.50
3691. The Changed Life (Drummond) 25
3692. Isaac Taylor Tichenor (Dill) 1.00
3693. This Side of Jordan (Bradford) 50
3694. History of Latin Christianity-Vol. VII (Miltman) 50
3695. Days of The Son Of Man (March) 1.00
3696. Story of Daniel The Prophet (Haskell) 75
3697. The Record-Title Letters of the Apostolic Age (Burton) 75
3698. Theological Institutes-Vol.111 (Watson) 50
3699. Philological Proofs of the Original Unity and Recent Origin of The Human Race (Johnes) 1.00
3700. A Tune-Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1859 50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bible in the Public Schools</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bible (Vap Fel)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Not of Man (Spring)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Analysis of The Holy Bible (West)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Cyclopaedia-Vol. VI (Kellogg)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Religious Poetry</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay in the Bible (Schaft &amp; Gliman)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Values for To-Day (Olson)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Discovery of God (King)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Can Surely Believe (Johnston)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Footprints of Time, In Analysis of Ord. System of Government (Bancroft)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures On The Philosophy of Mind 2 vols (Bred)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revelations of a Square 1554 (Oliver)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature And The Bible-Vol.II (Reusner)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Antidote (Coles)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Proph t in Babylon (Dawson)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Moral Science (Hickok)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Devil in Robes (Carr)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Discovery of God (King)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proof of Christ's Resurrection (Morgan)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Can Surely Believe (Johnston)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God In Christ (Bushnell)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quirk of His Nucleus (Walsh)</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Lends A Hand (Myers)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of 131st Anniversary of The Union Society 1881</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong's Encyclopaedia of Biblical Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holy Bible, Sheep, good (McIntyre &amp; Strong)</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration of The Holy Scripture</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary Vol. I poor (Fallows)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Book I &amp; III (Hunt &amp; Todd) each</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggles and Triumphs (Barnum)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lutheran Lesson Commentary 1917</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jennings Bryan (Herrick)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Origin and History of Missions Vol. I (Smith)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Analysis of The Holy Bible</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Analysis of The Holy Bible (Hitchcock)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education and American Democracy (Athena)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Doctrine of Evolution (Wingate)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Economic Philosophy (Dinsley)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sure Word of Prophecy (Luther)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Quarterly Register-Vol. X, 1835 (Edwards &amp; Cogswell)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Hymnal (Beazley)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Course of Christian Missions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver pub. at. 3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coming of The King (Babcock)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year (Archibald)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Room Only (Stiger)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Version of New Testament (Teacher's Edition)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Story of Harvard (Pier)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity As Taught By Christ (Bradley)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Religious Consciousness (ratt)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Humaniaty of God (Buckham) pub. at. 2.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N by E Voyage to Greenland</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science (Mark Twain)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foot Prints of The Jesuits (Thompson)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies In Theology (Denney)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL (RENAN)**

1. Till the reign of David
2. From the reign of David to the Capture of Samaria
3. From the time of Hezekiah to the return from Babylon
4. From the rule of the Persians to that of the Greeks
5. Period of Jewish independence and Judea under Roman rule

This rare set, in good condition, $5.00
WHY I BELIEVE THE NEW TESTAMENT

C. B. DOUTHITT

To believe the New Testament is to believe: (1) that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; (2) that he wrought miracles, died for our sins, was buried and rose again the third day; (3) that he sent the Holy Spirit to guide chosen disciples into all truth; (4) that the Old Testament Scriptures are inspired of God. For all this is taught clearly in the New Testament. Every obstacle in the way of the unbeliever may be removed by proving the genuineness, the integrity, and the credibility of the New Testament. Therefore I shall present three reasons.

Why I Believe The New Testament

I. Because I believe it was written during the first century by the eight men whose names it bears, and from the first was considered authoritative among the churches.

The name on the title page is taken usually as evidence of authorship in the absence of counter testimony. We accept the name of John Bunyan on the title page of “The Pilgrim’s Progress” as evidence of authorship, and continue to do so until reliable testimony to the contrary is presented. Then why not accept the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James and Jude on the title pages of the books of the New Testament as evidence of authorship, until somebody proves to the contrary?

There is an unbroken chain of quotations from the New Testament reaching back to the first century. Our oldest manuscripts date back to the fourth century; therefore it is unnecessary to cite quotations from works later than the third century.

Origen of Alexandria was born in Egypt 186 A. D., and died about 253 A. D. In four of his volumes he gives more than 5,000 quotations from 25 New Testament books. There-fore the New Testament was in existence when Origen wrote.

Clement of Alexandria was born 160 A. D. and died 220 A. D. He calls the Scriptures divinely inspired and his writings contain 389 quotations from 21 New Testament books.

Tertullian of Carthage (160-220 A. D.), a Roman Lawyer who became a Christian, gives evidence of the existence and genuineness of the New Testament by 1802 quotations from 24 of its books.

Irenaeus of Lyons lived from 120 to 202 A.D., He wrote much in refutation of the Gnostics and Ebionites, and gives 767 quotations from 26 books of the New Testament.

Justin Martyr died in Rome in 167 A. D. He made about 125 references to the books of the New Testament in his works.

Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius and Polycarp all lived in the first century and their writings contain many quotations from the New Testament.

These many quotations and references to the New Testament by all these early writers can be explained only upon the ground that the 27 books were in existence at that time and that these writers considered it authoritative from the very first.

All the heretical sects that sprang up among the early Christians accepted the New Testament books as authentic. Both the Ebionites and the Gnostics tried to rest their theories on the New Testament. Heracleon, a Gnostic, wrote a commentary on the Gospel of John, trying to show that John taught Gnosticism.

All the early opponents of Christianity granted the authenticity of the New Testament books. The Emperor Julian who wrote about 360 A. D., Hierocles who was President of Bithynia in 303 A. D., Porphyry of about 270 A. D., and Celsus of about 176 A. D., all were bitter enemies, cruel persecutors and sarcastic writers against Christianity, and in their works they proceed upon the concessions that the books of the New Testament were the genuine works of their reputed authors, and held in high esteem by the churches. It is unreasonable to suppose that these enemies would have done this, if there had been any way for them to prove to the contrary.

II. Because I believe the testimony of the eight reputed authors is worthy of our absolute confidence.

No writer of antiquity, whether Pagan, Jew, or apostate Christian ever presumed to deny the facts recorded in the New Testament, though many of the recorded events could have been exposed easily, if they had not been true: such as the slaughter of the infants of Herod, beheading of John, raising of Lazarus, crucifixion of Jesus, tongues on Pentecost, healing of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful, and many others. The very fact that no one of the enemies of Christianity among the writers of antiquity attempted to prove that these events were frauds is strong evidence that they are historically true.

The eight writers of the New Testament had ample opportunity to know the certainty whereof they wrote. They saw, heard, touched, and had a part in the events they recorded. They could not have been deceived.

Their martyrdom is a seal of their honesty and proof of the facts they proclaimed. If a person dies for a theory, he proves his sincerity; if he dies in attestation of a sensible fact, his death proves the fact. Many of the New Testament writers died in attestation of facts they had witnessed in person.

Their statements agree perfectly with the geography, customs, and profane history of the first century. Not fewer than 36 events mentioned in the New Testament are mentioned also in profane history; there is perfect agreement between the two.

Their statements of history are corroborated by existing proof in the form of monuments—the Lord’s Supper, Lord’s Day, and baptism—which have been observed from the beginning of the church.

III. Because I believe the New Testament has come down to us substantially and essentially as originally written.

No adversary of Christianity has shown a single doctrine, or event, or duty added, diminished, or changed from the original productions. Well-read unbelievers have abandoned this form of attack.

Quotations found in the works of all religious writers of antiquity are substantially the same as it now appears in the New Testament.

The sects that sprang up in the early church scrutinized the quotations and translations of their opponents, and would have exposed and condemned an interpolation that changed the meaning, just as severely as Martin Luther was opposed for adding the word “alone” to Rom 3:28.

The proof of the genuineness, the integrity, and the credibility of the New Testament is so abundant that reasonable men will always accept it for what it claims to be, namely, the word of God. The Bible invited examination. The religion it sets forth thrives in the light of the most advanced civilization.