"POTHER AND CONFUSION"

CLED E. WALLACE

The digressives would like to classify the instrumental music controversy as "a dead issue" and be left free to play their organs and blow their horns without being interrupted with cries of "Chapter and verse, please." The strength of the opposition to instrumental music in the churches is emphasized by the fact that the controversy continues to rage and the pages of even the Christian Standard is a witness to the fact. Dr. Kershner, Dean of the School of Religion, in Butler University, calls the controversy "all of this pother and confusion," but nevertheless makes a personal contribution to it by adding a few paragraphs in The Christian Standard in an effort to belittle the opposition to the organ in worship. It is significant that he, scholar as he is, makes not the slightest effort to furnish any scriptural authority for the practice he so ardently defends. He stands on the defensive without any scripture to back him. I take peculiar pleasure in pointing out that he cannot waive aside the issue as coolly and simply as he seems to think he can. He seeks to make it appear that the main opposition to instrumental music in the churches arose in the South, due to the general backwardness and lack of culture that followed the Civil War. We will take a look at his appraisal of the situation.

Not only the American Christian Review, but a host of other ably edited journals, led by the Gospel Advocate, of Nashville, Tenn., took up the cudgels for conservatism. They were popular in the South because they gave the people what they wanted. They were read with eagerness and avidity because they furnished Scriptural grounds for the brethren doing what they desired to do. They anathematized the organ, and, contrary to Campbell’s fundamental position on creeds, made a test of fellowship out of its use in the worship. The Scriptural arguments justifying all of this pother and confusion were only convincing to those who were already convinced on other grounds.

This is not even a left-handed compliment to either the intelligence or the honesty of those who “took up the cudgels for conservatism” or those who “read” them “with eagerness and avidity.” Since Dr. Kershner chooses to carry the controversy to this plane, I take it that he will not expect me, out on Brother Murch’s “lunatic-fringe,” to waste any courtesy on him. I’ll answer him in kind by suggesting that a possible reason for the Christian Standard’s, and some other digressive papers,’ popularity in the North, and some parts of the South, was due to the fact that they catered to a worldly spirit in the church which has proved none too conscientious in its loyalty to the New Testament order in either organization, doctrine or worship. It was no respect for the scriptures that brought the organ in.

and I think Dr. Kershner knows it. They wanted the organ, scripture or no scripture, and the Standard “furnished” unscriptural excuses for the brethren doing what they desired to do.” If Dr. Kershner doesn’t like the “pother and confusion” of this type of controversy he has introduced, we will be glad to accommodate him if he will shift to the real issue. If he prefers to make faces and call names, I believe my vocabulary along that line is extensive enough to prevent him from obscuring the issue. He cannot break “the cudgels for conservatism” by putting on airs and acting snooty. That game was worked to a frazzle and collapsed before Dr. Kershner was born.

If I am correctly informed “They anathematized the organ, and .... made a test of fellowship out of its use in the worship” after about the same fashion they did infant rantism, the burning of incense, the lighting of tapers and other like things which are unauthorized in the New Testament. This “test of fellowship” cry is another digressive bogey-man which has lost its power to scare anybody except “those who are already convinced on other grounds.”

An appeal to prejudice and pride is about all the doctor seems capable of in behalf of the organ in worship. As for running “contrary to Campbell’s fundamental position on creeds” I’m not enough of a Campbellite to be too much concerned about that. If Brother Campbell was as freakishly changeable as Dr. Kershner represents him in his survey of the “Stars” then he would not make a very solid rock to stand on anyway. In a tug of war over Campbell, I think I could win, but what for? I’m willing to take Paul and let him have Campbell for what he may be worth to him. Paul said: “I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.” I don’t think even Campbell ever said he would play with the spirit, and I know Paul didn’t. The organ was not introduced into the churches until after Campbell died, and if he had personally introduced it and carried a picture of a woman playing one, in the Millennial Harbinger, it wouldn’t change the issue any.

In his zeal for the organ, Dr. Kershner comes dangerously near a disposition to surrender singing and other authorized worship rather than dispense with the organ.

The New Testament notoriously lays down no authoritative order or style of worship. In order to make it do so it became necessary to affirm a negative. Whatever the Scripture text did not expressly stipulate was not legitimate for Christians. In one or two casual passages, singing is mentioned, but there is no specific reference to the instrument. Therefore we must sing, but we must not util-
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When God commanded the brethren at Rome, through the apostle Paul, to "mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them," it was not for the destruction of the ones marked, but for the saving of the church. A person causing divisions and occasions of stumbling by teaching or apologizing for a false theory, is destroying himself already. The object of marking him is to hinder his work, and save the church from his "occasions of stumbling" and disruption.

No one in this section has anything against Mr. Davidson personally, few of us know him. He has been in Abilene twice, but I was away in meetings both times, and saw him neither time. My controversy with him, therefore, is not personal, but doctrinal. The fight which the three older churches here in Abilene, i.e., Highland, College, and North Side, have made against "Bollism" in this place has been too long and earnestly waged to have some apologist for the theorizers come in and try to undo whatever success has met the efforts, without a voice raised against him. There is no better place than Abilene to see the fruits of Boll's theory. What is known as the "South Side" church here in Abilene has been pre-millennial for years. Such men as O. E. Phillips, Earl Smith, Frank Mul- lins, and Robert Boyd have preached for it. However, several divisions have taken place within its ranks, and many have left it to return to the faith, till there are only a few left. We have nothing against the brethren left there of a personal nature; our only wish for them is that they turn from the error of their way, and return to the gospel faith.

R. H. Boll has been engaged for meetings with this church for years. The last time he was here was the first time I ever met him. I wrote him a letter at that time, challenging him to debate his theory here in Abilene, a very appropriate place for such a debate, which he refused to do. His work here in Abilene has caused untold grief to brethren, and injury to the church. But it is dying, and not by being left completely alone, either.

And now comes Mr. Davidson, assuming to speak to a group in Abilene Christian College, at his own request, on the subject of "Salesmanship." But instead of discussing this subject, he merely used it as a ruse under which to apologize for Boll, and to denounce the men who have fought the pernicious theory for the past few years. It seems to me that such tactics show the true colors of the man, and that those who have honestly been mistaken in him should now see him in his true light. Well, what should one so mistaken do about it?

The Bible teaches that if a member of the church has sinned, or has acted in such a way that reproach has been brought upon the church, he should acknowledge his error, and make amends for it. One's acknowledgement of his sin should be as broad as the influence of the sin. If one's fault is between himself and another, he should go to the other; if between himself and God only, then to take it to God alone is sufficient. But if the influence has affected the church as a local congregation, or the brethren as a whole, then the confession should be before the local congregation, or before the entire church as a whole. Many good men have been deceived in the motives of Davidson; and now the only honorable thing to do, is for those of influence who have defended him openly, to openly acknowledge that they have been mistaken in him. To just say that they now see him in his true light, and until he repents and changes, they are ready to "mark him" as commanded by the Lord.

Clinton Davidson's Speech

On April 30 Clinton Davidson came by Abilene Christian College on his way from California to New York, and talked in chapel. Immediately after chapel he talked with the Junior and Senior classes for twenty minutes. He addressed the classes on salesmanship, and Brother Cox later told several of us preachers that he understood that he was to address us on that subject.

Brother Davidson began his speech to the two classes by insisting that he did not ask for the Freshman and Sophomore classes because he did not know whether they were far enough advanced to do independent thinking. He then suggested to the classes that they ought to think for themselves, not just because some preacher said it was so. Up to this point everything was well said, but after making the above statements he began his denunciation. He said that in the church of Christ there are several hundreds of thousands of sheep who blindly follow what a few preachers tell them. Then he began to denounce those who have fought premillennialism. He said that if John T. Lewis, and the Gospel Advocate denounce premillennialism thousands will, like sheep, do the same. By intimidation he brought in Foy E. Wallace and N. B. Hardeman, and there was a note of bitterness in his voice when he told us how his wife and two sons who are premillennialists, had been attack. He then tried to placate whatever feeling there may have been against R. H. Boll by saying he would not believe Boll teaches that the church is an accident until he hears Brother Boll say it. It seems to me that such tactics show the true colors of the man, and those who have honestly been mistaken in him should now see him in his true light. Well, what should one so mistaken do about it?

The Bible teaches that if a member of the church has sinned, or has acted in such a way that reproach has been brought upon the church, he should acknowledge his error, and make amends for it. One's acknowledgement of his sin should be as broad as the influence of the sin. If one's fault is between himself and another, he should go to the other; if between himself and God only, then to take it to God alone is sufficient. But if the influence has affected the church as a local congregation, or the brethren as a whole, then the confession should be before the local congregation, or before the entire church as a whole. Many good men have been deceived in the motives of Davidson; and now the only honorable thing to do, is for those of influence who have defended him openly, to openly acknowledge that they have been mistaken in him. To just say that they now see him in his true light, and until he repents and changes, they are ready to "mark him" as commanded by the Lord.
DANGERS EMANATING FROM CHRISTIAN COLLEGES

A. L. Harbin

I hope I shall not be misrepresented on what I shall say, and I do not intend to be misunderstood. I am a friend of all the schools, in spite of their faults. I think none of them would deny having plenty of faults, or that there are plenty of dangers connected with them.

Anything that has much power is dangerous: Fire, electricity, and dynamite are examples; but a thing that has no power is worthless. Hence, to say a thing is dangerous is not saying that it is bad. There are dangers, emanating from religious journals, “preachers” meetings,” and even the church. In Acts 20:30 Paul said to the elders of one congregation, “And from among your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away the disciples after them.” And, of course, there are dangers emanating from Christian colleges.

To honestly consider these dangers is not being unfriendly to the schools, and to speak warning words is not a deed of disparagement but an act of kindness. Being then a staunch friend of Christian education, I now proceed to a discussion of some of those dangers.

I. The Danger of Softness and Compromise in Doctrine

Most college professors have devoted their time to literary achievements to the neglect of a careful and thorough study of the Bible, also neglected is their study of its enemies and their “methods of approach.” Many of these teachers thus become predisposed to weakness and softness in doctrine and are ill-prepared to meet the temptations along that line that are so soon to be encountered. To maintain the best standing a school must stay in the good graces of other institutions. A strong stand against their errors does not bring such favor, neither does it make the school popular among students.

The above statement reveals Clinton Davidson in his speech to the classes twelve or fifteen of us preachers spent a couple of hours with him. Brother Davidson told us he had never read an article nor heard a sermon on premillennialism. We asked him this question, “If you were to learn what the theory is, and found that it is out of harmony with the Bible would you condemn it?” That question he refused to answer although it was put to him a number of times. He even refused to study the theory on the grounds that he does not claim to be a leader in the church. He said that if he were a leader in the church he would study the theory. If Brother Davidson knows nothing of the theory why does he think he is qualified to condemn those who do know it and are fighting it?

Jesse P. Sewell of San Antonio heard his speech to the classes and he had a note read in chapel the next day saying he did not endorse the speech.

So far as I have been able to learn Abilene Christian College had nothing to do with what Davidson said. Brother Davidson wired for permission to make the address and the leaders in the school thought he would discuss some phase of salesmanship. Don Morris and Charles H. Roberson both denounced what he had to say—that is, his unfortunate illustrations.

Everyone knows that Clinton Davidson has been criticized for his leanings toward the theory of premillennialism which has divided churches. Inasmuch as this theory has caused division, and since premillennialists admit that it is not necessary to salvation, why does not Clinton Davidson oppose it instead of trying to prejudice young Christians against those who are opposing it?

James D. Willeford

The above statement reveals Clinton Davidson in his true light, and puts every person who has defended him on the spot of acknowledging the mistake, or leaving the brethren wondering just where he stands.

(Note: We all wonder why Bro. Sewell, who “heard his speech” did not repudiate it in Davidson’s presence, on the spot, instead of waiting to send a little note to chapel!—Editor)

II. The Danger of Worldliness

The same principle, working through other channels, creates, or at least increases, the danger of worldliness in the church. In any college of today, athletics are likely to be over-emphasized. Comparatively few students are interested in a college without at least a fair showing in this field. Athletics once introduced, soon tighten their grip on students and teachers. The school’s home town, which is no small factor in its support, insists on athletics in the school, and thus encouraged, students make demands and sometimes go on strikes to keep athletics going strong.

Such things chill spirituality, in some measure severe conscience at this point, and become an opening wedge to be followed by other forms of worldliness, such as picture shows, cards, swimming, dancing or what have you. These things are dangerous in state schools, but in Christian colleges they are doubly dangerous. In a state institution the student may be persuaded to look upon them as a necessary evil, to be shunned as much as possible, but in a Christian school under the supervision of men who are not only members of the church but even preachers of the gospel, he is likely to regard them as being harmless and above reproach.

Almost without exception these things are at first only reluctantly tolerated by school authorities. But soon opposition and criticism from without the school and from within, force the management into one of two courses: either on the one hand repudiation of such practices and reform, involving more or less backtracking and apology; or on the other hand a defense of these things with its implied approval and a fuller participation in them. Usually the latter course is taken.

III. The Danger of Unsound Teaching

Any teacher supported by those taught is sometimes tempted to teach what is wanted rather than what may be needed and not wanted. This principle is often seen working in the school. In I Cor. 9:14 Paul said, “Even so did the Lord ordain that they had proclaim the gospel should live of the Gospel.” The Lord knew the dangers that would assail the church at this point and warned “us against them. “But the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the later time some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons” (1 Tim. 4:1), and, “For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine, but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teacher after their own lusts and will turn away their ears from the truth and turn aside unto fables.” (2 Tim. 4:3). And in keeping with these warnings there has been apostasy after apostasy among the people of God. The same principle operates in Christian colleges.

To demonstrate this I need only briefly refer to the (Cont. On Back Page)
ANCIENT PERILS AND PRESENT PROBLEMS
HOMER HAILEY

It is easy for us to think our problems and church troubles today are so different to those of past generations, but they are always about the same. Our fight today is, in principle, the same as that of Paul. After establishing the churches throughout Galatia, the apostle saw his work confronted with a two-fold menace which endangered the integrity of the church, and threatened a complete apostasy. The two-fold menace was Judaism and worldliness. Apostasy was the danger, Judaism and worldliness presented the avenues by which it could be effected. We are confronted with the same danger today, through the same two means.

No sooner were the infant churches born through the labors of the apostle than teachers of Judaism made their appearance, threatening the liberty, purity, and integrity of the faith. This they sought to do, not by preaching “another gospel,” but by perverting “the gospel of Christ.” The apostles begin his fight against the Judaizers by declaring the anathema of heaven against any, either man or angel, who should come to them with any gospel other than that which he and his co-laborers had preached unto them. The anathema of Galatians, chapter one, still stands, bound and ratified in heaven. God has no more love for those who would “pervert the gospel of Christ” today than he had then.

These men who would pervert the gospel didn’t come among the Galatians as browbeaters or venturers threatening them with injury and destruction; but they came among them as “angels of light,” as “messengers of righteousness,” posing a piety and wisdom designed to beguile even the hearts of the innocent. They had “bewitched,” that is, charmed, fascinated them with their appearance, threatening the liberty, purity, and integrity of the faith. This they sought to do, not by preaching “another gospel,” but by perverting “the gospel of Christ.” The apostles begin his fight against the Judaizers by declaring the anathema of heaven against any, either man or angel, who should come to them with any gospel other than that which he and his co-laborers had preached unto them. The anathema of Galatians, chapter one, still stands, bound and ratified in heaven. God has no more love for those who would “pervert the gospel of Christ” today than he had then.

The Throat of Judaism Today
A number of species of Judaism may be passed over, which have done untold harm to the life of Christianity, threatening it through the ages, such as Adventism, infant covenant relationship with God, sprinkling, and the like. These are all Judaistic. Only two are noted: Instrumental Music, over which many battles have been fought, but which still presents a threat; and Pre-millennialism.

There is not an appeal that can be made to the New Testament for the use of instrumental music in the worship; every appeal to the Bible must be made to the Old Covenant. To appeal to the Old is to reject the authority of Jesus Christ, which severs one from Him. Since the highest appeal the Christian Church can make for its authority for the instrument is the Old Testament, it has therefore become severed from Christ, it is fallen from grace.

In Hebrew 9 the apostle argues that all things used in the tabernacle worship of the Old Covenant were dedicated with blood, the blood of animals. But the “heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.” A thing was holy; other things were “profane.” Now the things of the “heavenly Jerusalem” have been dedicated by the blood of Christ, and only these are holy, to be used in the worship and service of God today. Anything else is “profane.” Our bodies are made fit for service only as they have been “bought with a price,” redeemed and sanctified by the blood of Christ. Our singing and praise, the fruit of lips, is made acceptable only because sanctified by the blood of Christ, the “blood of the covenant” which authorizes such. The contributing of money, our material substance, is made holy because likewise consecrated by the blood of Christ. The same can be said of prayers, the expressions of the heart through the lips. To offer anything that hasn’t been dedicated by the blood of Christ to that end, is to offer that which is profane, common, unhallowed.

Now why is the offering of instrumental music in worship? Simply because it is profane, unholy, not having been sanctified by the blood of Christ to that end. Why is the introduction of instrumental music in worship a return to Judaism? Because its only scriptural appeal is to the Old law; and an appeal to the law for justification of religious practice is to return to that from which delivered; a return to bondage of the elements from which once made free.

Pre-millennialism is the particular specie of Judaism that threatens the church today. It would revive the ancient order, return one to the very thing the Jews sought when they crucified the Christ. The heresy is not taught in the New Testament; it was not a part of the preaching of Paul. Therefore those who would preach it today preach “another gospel,” but would “pervert the gospel of Christ.” A perverted gospel brings one again into bondage. Everyone today preaching the various phases of premillennialism preach a perverted gospel, allign themselves with the Judaizers of Paul’s day, are severed from Christ (if ever in Christ), and live and labor under the anathema of heaven. Paul’s fight is our fight. The danger of his day was apostasy through Judaism; the danger today is apostasy through Judaism. The issue then was circumcision, the issue today is instrumental music in some sections, pre-millennialism in some, and both in others. But the end is the same, severance from Christ, and a corruption of the truth and purity of New Testament Christianity.

Worldliness
The other wing of danger was worldliness, which presents a constant threat of apostasy. Worldliness in the church usually begins with a let-down in doctrinal preaching and teaching, a general softening of the spiritual brain.
and heart. Individuals make the “I see no harm in it” argument over things apparently innocent, but subtly dangerous. The practice of these lead to disruption of congregational unity, and the practice of grosser sins. The only logical conclusion is that things questionable are to be shunned by all who love truth and righteousness.

Man is the same now as when Paul wrote the Galatian letter; he is tempted to do the same things the apostle warned against in chapter five of the epistle. These works of the flesh present the same dangers today; and the end now is the same as then, “They who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”

The apostle presents to the Galatian churches the only remedy to the situation, and aversion of the danger. These are: (1) Refuse to give “place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour;” thereby refusing to become entangled in their yoke of bondage, but adhering to the truth. (2) Walk after the Spirit, not after the flesh. (3) And finally, by being crucified with Christ, glorying in the cross of Christ, not in the things of the world. This same remedy will solve our problems in the church today, and preserve the purity and integrity of the truth for our own generation, as well as for that to come.

In The Plains of Moab

The forty years wandering in the Wilderness of Sinai were drawing to a close, as Israel encountered old Sihon, king of the Amorites, at a place called Jazer. Here they utterly defeated the king and possessed his land from the Arnon unto the Jabbok. Flushed with victory over this tribe, Israel pressed on northward through Bashan, where they met Og, king of Bashan at Edrei, utterly defeating him, and possessing all of his land. From thence the Hebrews journeyed on, encamping “in the plains of Moab beyond the Jordan at Jericho,” where they found themselves confronted by a people distantly kin to them, but who feared and hated them. What should Balak, king of Moab, do? He was afraid to fight them, and he was afraid to let them alone. He must have help to meet the crisis.

Then follows one of the strangest incidents in Hebrew history. Balak sent to the land of the east, by certain princes, and elders, for a man known as a prophet, to come over and curse this people encamped in the plains of his own country. When the princes and elders arrived at the home of Balaam, they found a man of strange mixture; one who was religious in his nature, worshipping the true God after a fashion, but one who “loved the hire of wrong-doing.” A man ready to sell out for a price.

The story of Balaam’s journey is too familiar to everyone to be repeated here. Upon his arrival, altar after altar was erected, while attempt after attempt was made by the prophet to curse the people of God. But each curse simply was made a blessing. The prophet soon realized nothing could be accomplished in this way; the king, too, was becoming discouraged and disgusted with old Balaam. He could not curse them, so he must change his tactics, he must propose some form of compromise whereby God would do the rest. This he immediately did.

Upon the suggestion of Balaam, the king of Moab sent forth the fairest of the daughters of his land to entice the children of Israel to come worship with them; thus enticing them to play the harlot with the daughters of Moab. To this the Israelites yielded, bowing to their gods, and playing the harlot with their daughters; whereupon God sent a plague among them by which twelve of four thousand perished. It was through the counsel of Balaam that Balak conceived this stratagem; it was simply the doctrine of compromise which he preached to him. He soon saw he could not curse God’s people, but that would be unnecessary if he could advise some form of compromise. This he advised; to this the people of Israel yielded; and God did the rest.

Modern “Plains of Moab”

This incident may find a parallel in the history of modern Israel, the “Israel of God” today. For near seventy five years now two peoples have existed here in our own land, akin in spiritual matters from the past, but with less in common as the years have come and gone. These are the two bodies known as “The Christian Church” and the “church of Christ.” For years the Christian Church has feared the church of Christ, with new挖s to great a feeling of love for it. During these years they have sought to curse the church through their papers, through their pulpit, and with an occasional debate. They have called up some of their greatest “cussers” to do the job, but the curse has always turned out to be a blessing to the church.

The church has grown, making strides for the cause of right while the “digressive” body has died in many places, and in others has barely held its own.

And now, realizing that they cannot curse, what is their next move? It is the suggestion of compromise. Detroit seems to be becoming the modern “Plains of Moab,” along with “historic Lexington,” where sweet unity meetings are wont to be held. This is a gesture on the part of the “digressives” to entice the spiritual Israel to go with them after the abominations of the nations.

It seems strange that any person who knows the truth should not realize that the only way to restore unity and harmony over an unscriptural practice is for those practicing the thing contrary to truth to give it up. If the Christian Church wants unity, let them give up the things separating us, and take their stand on the Book. If they are not convinced that instrumental music, societies, and open fellowship with denominations is wrong, then let’s get on the dotted line with some good strong debates, clarifying the issues in the minds of the people and the leaders.

No, it is easier to try to curse,” and when that fails, to bargain on the “plains of Moab” in “unity meetings,” seeking to entice the faithful to bow to their man made doctrines and gods, than to debate the issues. Anything except a fair and open battle on the polemic platform, for error has too much to lose, while truth has nothing to fear.

I suppose no one would argue that Balaam loved wrong-doing itself. The Bible says he “loved the hire” of wrong-doing. The hire of wrong-doing today may not be gold and silver, although that may be it; but it may be popularity, it may be power, or it may be the sentimental slobbering of men who pat one on the back, and speak of him in high sounding words of emptiness. But whatever may be the hire immediately, ultimately it is death! In the battle that followed old Balaam lost his life, being slain with the sword. A like end comes to those who would curse God’s people and cannot, but would then propose compromise; likewise to those who would be enticed by the compromise proposed by another. The one who yields to compromise must certainly loses the respect of those on the side of right, and even those with whom he compromises have no admiration for him.

It is a time when every man must take care not to be enticed by the beautiful daughters of Moab, but take an unquestionable stand on the side of that which is right. With sword unsheathed, let every man “contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.” Doing this, he will have no time to listen to the compromises offered by the Balaams of today, “in the plains of Moab” either of Palestine or of Kentucky and Michigan, or of Tennessee and Texas.
I mean by the word “Model,” that which is taken as a pattern. The artist who paints portraits, engages the model; usually, the most perfect specimen physically that can be obtained. Likewise, the Lord gave us one perfect church—the Jerusalem Church. All other local congregations should be patterned after it. The Jerusalem church was a model in unity, for “they were of one heart and one soul.” It was a model church in strictness of discipline, for sin was not tolerated. The first public offense was that of Ananias and his wife Sapphira, and resulted in their death. It was a model church under the preaching of Paul on his second missionary journey. He went into the synagogue of the Jews, and preached the word. When Christ gave the Great Commission to the apostles, He went into the synagogue of the Jews, and preached the word. When Paul wrote Timothy to “hold fast the form of sound words,” he meant for Timothy to preach the gospel as he and other apostles had preached it. Suppose I should change the order as it is given in the New Testament, and place baptism first and teaching second; would that be the “form” as it was given in the New Testament? I might illustrate with four letters from the alphabet: L I V E. As given here they spell, “live.” I can transpose the letters thus, E V I L and we have a different word—the word “evil.” The same four letters in the following order, V E I L, give us the word “veil.” And again we rearrange them as follows, V I L E and we have the word “vile.” Thus by changing the form four times, we have four different words. Likewise, when we change the “form” of sound words, as given by Inspiration, we have something other than the Gospel of Christ. The model church will be satisfied with nothing short of a “thus saith the Lord” in all matters of religion.

The Divine Foundation

In 2 Pet. 2:21, we are told that Christ is our example in everything. That is Christ is the great model for humanity. When he met his disciples at Caesarea Philippi, Peter said unto him, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Then Christ said to Peter, “Thou art Peter, (Greek, Petros, and upon this rock (Greek, petra,) I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” (Matt. 16: 16-18.) Thus Christ is the builder of the church. It rests upon the rock, “petra” which signifies a ledge of rock, and in this instance it refers to the fact confessed by Peter—"thou art the Christ the Son of the living God.” The word Peter is from Petros, a stone, and the word rock is from petra a ledge of rock. The phraseology is changed seemingly for the very purpose of avoiding the terrible mistake of claiming that the church rests upon the apostle Peter.

This great Model when viewed from another angle is the head of the church. To the Ephesians Paul said, that Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, was made "head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all and in all." (Eph. 1:22, 23.) To the Colossians he said, “and he is the head of the body, the church.” (Col. 1:18.) Thus Christ is “the head of the church, the body,” or he is “the head of the body, the church.”

Christ died that Jews and Gentiles might be reconciled in one body. (Eph. 2:16.) When we think of the two walls—Jews and Gentiles—being joined together, we think of the following: “And are built upon the foundation of the apos-
toles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." (Eph. 2:20.)

In order for a building to endure, it must rest upon a solid foundation. The prophet Isaiah looked into the heavens and caught the vision of the builders laying the foundation in Zion for the great spiritual temple, the church. He declared concerning it, that it would be "a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation." Then he added, "your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand." (Isa. 28:16-18.) This prophecy was fulfilled when Christ was rejected of the Jews, crucified upon the Roman cross, buried in the tomb of the Roman senator, and came forth the third day triumphing over death and hell. Then on the day of Pentecost the "tried stone" was placed in its proper position in the great spiritual temple, the church. In speaking of Christ Peter says, "This is the stone which is set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." (Acts 4:11.) Paul became a "wise masterbuilder," when he was called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ. As such, he entered Corinth and preached the gospel and founded the Corinthian church. Later he addressed them a letter in which he said, "As a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus." (1 Cor. 3:10, 11.) Thus when the church is considered from the standpoint of a great superstructure, Christ is its foundation.

In order that man might have peace with God, Christ is said to be our Mediator. "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. 2:5.) Literally the word mediator means one who stands equal distance from two sides. Christ stands between God and man. He is himself Man. We learn that there is but one Mediator. This Mediator, came to earth and was born of the virgin Mary. Then after having lived upon the earth for more than thirty years, he returned to the Father, and now rules at his Father's right hand, in heaven. We have the blessed assurance that one from the earth, ascended to heaven to intercede for us. Of course he is "the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth;" but he lived among men, then bore our sins in his body on the cross, and finally returned to Heaven where he shall reign until death, the last enemy shall be destroyed. Christ is not the Mediator of the convenant which came from Mount Sinai; but he is the mediator of the New Covenant which is established upon better promises than the old. Many men fail here in their efforts to approach God. Christ is our Mediator-that is, he represents us to God. Every act of worship should be in his name. Many times people attempt to pray to God independently of the name of Christ. It would be as easy to climb a moonbeam to "the land of fableless day," as to reach Jehovah and ignore the name of his Son, Jesus Christ.

While John was baptizing in the Jordan, he said in speaking of Christ, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease." (Jno. 3:29, 30.) An angel appeared to John the apostle on Patmos, and said, "Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." (Rev. 21:9.) The church is the bride of Christ, for we learn that "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it: that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. 5:25-27.) The church is now married to Christ, and children are being born into the family of God as a result of this union. However the marriage did not occur while the law of Moses was binding upon the Jews. To the church at Rome Paul said, "Ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that ye should bring forth fruit unto God." (Rom. 7:4.)

The Divine Creed

The Head and Founder of the church has given us a creed which needs no revision. It is the New Testament which is sealed by the blood of Christ, and signed by the great name of Jehovah. Paul says, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 16, 17.) While our Lord was here in person teaching the multitudes and preparing the apostles for the work which they were to perform in the kingdom soon to be established, he said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now. How be it when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come." (Jno. 16:12, 13.) Peter declares that "according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue." (2 Pet. 1:4.) Jude exhorts us that we "should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." (Jude 3.) Paul says there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Eph. 4:5.) And Paul in writing the church at Corinth instructed them "to speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. 1:10.) This we can do, when we read the same book, practice the same ordinances, and walk by the same rule. (Gal. 6:16.) And hence, the Bible itself is the only infallible and reliable standard of our faith and practice.

In reading the history of the church we find that man was not satisfied with the Inspired Creed delivered by the apostles, but began at an early date, to reduce to writing the rules which should govern his religious life. Then a second creed was formed, and a third, a fourth and a fifth; but every attempt at creed-making has only served to destroy the unity of faith, and to multiply sects and parties. It is obvious to all who have studied this problem, that we cannot hope to unite upon any book but the Bible. You may be ready to inquire, "Why object to man-made creeds?" They are objectionable for the following reasons:

1. They were made by men, and therefore unreliable. If a creed contains more than the Bible it contains too much. If it contains less than the Bible, it contains too little. If it contains just what the Bible contains, it is the Bible.

2. Creeds are revised at regular intervals. A creed which was popular thirty years ago, may teach an entirely different doctrine from the creed which is published by the same organization of today. For that reason they are very imperfect.

3. The New Testament teaches unity. All religious bodies talk about unity. But we cannot have unity as long as we perpetuate the manmade creed.

4. There is no authority higher than a group of men behind the creed.
5. Creeds are in conflict with each other. Let us suppose that there are twenty-five gospel preachers in Paris. Are they not all authorized by the Bible to preach the "whole truth and nothing but the truth?" Indeed, any man who is a gospel preacher, is duly authorized and instructed by the Holy Spirit, to proclaim everything that is necessary to man's salvation from sin now, and his eternal happiness hereafter. But we do not all preach exactly alike. What is wrong? I submit to you my friends, that the Bible has not changed. It reads just as it did, when the pen of Inspiration in the hand of John the beloved, completed the Divine volume, near the close of the first century. But somehow down the line man has changed. There is but one thing for us to do; namely, open our Bibles, walk about Zion, travel over the paths which were trodden by the Apostles, preach as they preached, worship as they worshipped, and then we will "see eye to eye, and speak the same thing."

The Divine Organization

The New Testament contains a complete description of the church which was founded by our Lord. To obtain an accurate account of the organization, work and worship of the church, we should not go to the writings of men who lived this side of the apostolic age, but to the book of Acts, which contains the history of the establishment and training of the church. Then, as we get the facts relating to the church, we should see that every church established today, is the same as that of the New Testament church in its organization, doctrine and practice.

Let me say here, that the church is not a democracy, nor is it a republican form of government; but it is a monarchical. Jesus Christ is king with all authority-judicial, legislative and executive. As such, he has given a law by which the subjects of the kingdom shall be governed.

As respects organization, it is called a body, with Jesus Christ as the head. All Christians are the members, and the Holy Spirit is the vitalizing, or life-giving power.

When we consider it as it pertains to the world, it is the church, the called out, the separated from the world. So far as I know, or have reason to believe, these statements will not be denied by any scholar of any age since the establishment of the church on the great day of Pentecost, in the year A. D. 33.

After the establishment of the church, preachers of the gospel under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, went into every community, preaching and teaching the word of the LORD. In the parable of the sower we are told that "the seed is the word of God." Hence, the seed of the kingdom was sown into the hearts of honest hearers, where it sprang up and produced children of the kingdom. A striking example of the beginning of a local congregation is the history of the Corinthian church. After Paul's experience with the Athenians, he left Athens and came to Corinth. And entering into the synagogue every sabbath, he testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ. Then we are told, "that 'Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized.'" (Acts 18:5-8.) Paul left Corinth, and wrote them a letter in which he called them "the church of God which is at Corinth." (1 Cor. 1:1.) How was this church established? In the same letter, Paul answers as follows: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain." (1 Cor. 15:1-2.)

Churches were first established, and later were organized. And now, to the history of the organization of the church, I invite attention. One of the first things about the church of the New Testament which impresses the Bible student, is its simplicity. Each local church was an independent organization. The New Testament knows nothing of a group of churches under one head. When Paul and Barnabas became missionaries under the direction of the Antioch church, they first established the church, then later appointed elders in every church. The established order as given by the inspired writer is as follows: "And when they (Paul and Barnabas) had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." (Acts 14:21-23.) After Paul had preached the gospel in Crete, we find that he left Titus there, and wrote him as follows: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Titus 1:5.) In the Ephesian church there were a plurality of elders. And from Miletus he (Paul) sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. (Acts 20:17.) In the twenty-eighth verse of the same chapter, these elders are called "overseers."

The Divine Offices

Every body of people must be governed. In the affairs of the state we have our officers from the local community, to the Governor of the state. In the nation the same principle obtains. We have our senators and representatives and then the Vice-President and the President. In the church, Christ is king, or the chief Shepherd, and elders are the undershepherds. There are no privileged classes in the church. The eye may guide the movements of the members of the body, but does not boss them. The hands and feet serve the body, but are not slaves to the body. In the church of our Lord there can be no domineering of one member over another. To the church at Rome Paul said, "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." (Rom. 12:3.)

There are a number of names applied to the same class of men in the church. Let us notice them in the following order:

1. "Elder." Elders of the church are chosen on account of their age and experience. The word is of patriarchal origin, and one to be an elder of the church must be old enough to have good judgment, and must be wise enough to direct the work of the church in all things.

2. "Overseer." This word is of Greek origin, and from its five uses in the New Testament, it denotes simply one who has been appointed to oversee and superintend the work in the local congregation.

3. "Bishop." This word is but a corruption of the Greek word for "oversee," and has the same meaning.

4. "Pastor." This word comes from the Latin verb "pasco," which means to feed, and corresponds to the word shepherd. Thus the same class of men in the church are called "elders" on account of their age, experience and wisdom. They are called "overseers" because it is their duty to watch over and superintend all that pertains to the edification and welfare of the congregation. They are
ed “bishops,” “pastors” or “Shepherds,” because they are required to watch over the flock with the same degree of solicitude as the shepherd on the hillside looks after his sheep, and protects them from vicious, wild beasts. It is significant that there were a plurality of elders, bishops or pastors in each local congregation.

It is to be regretted that religious people no longer give heed to the New Testament teaching as it respects the organization of the church. Today, when men speak of the “pastor” of the church they usually refer to the preacher, or the servant referred to in the New Testament as the “evangelist.” It is a subject of regret that men no longer have the proper regard for the teachings of the Scriptures. A man might be invited to preach for a local congregation established upon New Testament principles, and never be a “pastor” of the church. Neither is he a “reverend.” The word “reverend” occurs one time in the Bible, and is applied to God. Here is the passage: “He sent redemption unto his people: he hath commanded his covenant forever: holy and reverend is his name.” (Ps. 111:9.) Why should a man take a title which belongs to God, and is applied only to God in the Bible, and apply it to himself?

Just imagine how ridiculous it would have been, if Paul had addressed a letter to the church at Jerusalem and had said, “For recommendations I refer you to the Rev. Simon Peter, D. D., who lives at Jerusalem.” Peter in referring to Paul simply called him Paul. Paul in referring to other coloabers, referred to them by name. There are no such classes mentioned in the church of the New Testament as reverends and D. D.’s and, we should not have them in the church today.

By consulting church histories, we learn that departures along this line, began in the second century. There we read of the “Laity and the Clergy.” The New Testament speaks about lying church members, but it nowhere mentions the “Laity and the Clergy.” Then, as this evil continued to manifest itself in the churches, we find that men began to exalt themselves in their own estimation, and it was not long until they appointed one man as Bishop over a district. Thus this departure continued until the church fled into the wilderness where it remained for more than one thousand years.

The Character of Officers

As to the duties of the elders or bishops of the church I refer you to 1 Tim. 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9. To occupy this responsible position in the church of Christ, a man is required to possess the following positive qualifications.

1. “He must be blameless.”

2. “The husband of one wife.” Polygamy was not tolerated.

3. “Vigilant.” He must not go to sleep, but be watchful with regard both to himself and the congregation.

4. “Sober.” This means that he should be a man of a sound and well balanced mind, possessing a large amount of good, common sense.

5. “Modest,” or well behaved. He should be chaste, courteous and polite.

6. “He must be given to hospitality.” He should possess the same spirit as did the good Samaritan. He should be a lover of strangers, and ready at all times to entertain.

7. “Apt to teach.” He should have a working knowledge of the whole plan of Redemption, and be able to communicate it to others.

8. “Patient.” He should be distinguished for his general mildness and pleasing personality.

9. “One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity.” Confucius, the great Chinese philosopher said, “He who knows not how to govern and reform his own family can not rightly govern and reform a people.” But a greater than Confucius said, “If a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?”

10. “Having a good report of them that are without.” This means that men of the world who know him, must have confidence in him, as an upright man, who is doing his best to live in harmony with his teaching.

11. “He must be a lover of good men.”

12. “He must be just.”

13. “He must be holy,” exercising self control.

14. “Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayer.”

Negatively considered, the elder or bishop must be:

1. “Not given to wine.”

2. “Not a strike.” That is, he must not be quarrelsome, in a physical sense, but a peaceable man.

3. “Not greedy of filthy lucre.” He must not be one who gains money by questionable means, but he must deal honestly.

4. “Not a brawler.” He should not be quarrelsome in his nature, always ready to stir up strife and contention; but be quiet and peaceable, always ready to contend earnestly and faithfully for the faith as it was delivered to the saints.

5. “Not covetous.” He must not be a lover of money, for the “love of money,” we are told, “is the root of all evil.”

6. “Not a novice.” He must not be a new convert, “lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.”

7. “Not self-willed.”

8. “Not soon angry.”

Thus I have given positively and negatively the qualifications of that group in the church known as elders, pastors or bishops. I do not contend that these characteristics must be possessed by every elder, in the absolute sense; but every man who is selected by the church for this responsible position, should possess these qualifications in a marked degree. Elders of the local congregation are among the finest men in the church, for they are the pick of the local congregation. In selecting them, we should realize that no congregation can rise higher than its leadership, and hence, men who are recognized leaders should be selected for this important position.

Paul says, “If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.” (1 Tim. 3:1.) Here we learn that in order for a man to be an elder or bishop in the church, he must desire the work to the extent that he will qualify himself for the work. While the word “office” is in the text, it does not sanction the idea that the bishop is an official dignitary. It is a work, and when we realize that elders, members and evangelists, all compose the body, and each has a work to perform, then we will grow just to the extent that we labor in the Lord’s vineyard.

But what should be the attitude of the congregation toward the elders? Paul says, “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.” (Heb. 13:17.)
To assist the elders, each local congregation will also have a plurality of deacons. The word “deacon” is from a Greek word which means a servant, an attendant, waiter, or minister. That it refers to a class of ministers in the apostolic church is clearly seen from the following: “Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” (Phil. 1:1.) Here Deacons are distinguished from the saints, and are classed with the bishops, as servants. Their qualifications are given as follows: “Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double minded, not given to wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.” (1 Tim. 3:8-13.)

As to the nature of their work and the manner of their appointment, perhaps we should return to the history of the Jerusalem church. “And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you wise men, whom we may appoint over this business.” (Acts 6:1-2.) The twelve selected men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, to minister to the spiritual needs of the congregation, it seems that the deacons were looking after the temporal needs of the church. If going, they were to make war on everything that was calculated to destroy the kingdom of God. Thus the gospel is an aggressive message. Christians who serve the Lord, wage an aggressive warfare upon sin.

The Divine Obligations

When the apostle Peter delivered the first gospel sermon under the reign of Jesus Christ, the convicted Jews inquired, “Brethren, what shall we do?” Peter told them, and we are informed that about three thousand obeyed the gospel, and were “added unto them.” Then Peter concluded his exhortation by saying to the baptized penitent believers, “Save yourselves from this untoward generation.” Today, when we begin to tell men that they must “do” certain things in order to be saved, and that after becoming members of the body of Christ, they must continue to “do” the commands of Christ in order to go to heaven, we are scoffed at. But Peter belonged to that class of preachers, who taught sinful humanity the will of the Lord.

Of course there is a sense in which man cannot save himself. He cannot make an atonement for his sins. Jesus did that. On the other hand, there is a sense in which, if a man does not save himself, he will not be saved. In the Scheme of redemption, who is it that is to believe? Christ cannot believe for us. We do the believing. Who is it that must repent, or turn away from sin? God, Christ or angels can not repent for us. We must repent. Who is it that must go down into the watery grave and be buried beneath its waves in the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit? It is utterly impossible for one person to be baptized for another. We obey that command. So then, when Peter told the Pentecostians to “Save yourselves,” not a man in that great audience was so stupid as not to understand what he said. If you were to see a man out in the lake struggling for his life, and should toss him a rope, would he not have judgment enough to take hold of the rope in order that he might be pulled to safety? In tossing him the rope, if you should say, “save yourself,” he would know at once what you meant. Then, in the kingdom of God, let us act wisely and obey every command of our Lord, that we may be acceptable unto him at his coming.

The apostle Paul addressed a letter to the Philippian church in which he said, “Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.” (Phil. 2:12.) In the parable of the householder, the Lord said, “For the Son of man is as a man taking a journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch.” (Mar. 13:34.) Work is not confined to the citizens of Christ’s kingdom alone, for Jesus said, “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” (Jno. 5:17.) When the apostle Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit, was fully convinced that the Gentiles should have an opportunity to hear the gospel and come into the kingdom, he went to the house of Cornelius and began his sermon by saying, “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” (Acts 10:35.) The parable of the labourers in the vineyard begins as follows, “For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard.” (Matt. 20: 1.) Thus the idea of work in the church is presented prominently in many passages of the New Testament.

We should always realize that there are two opposing powers at work in the world, namely, the power of Christ which is working for the salvation of souls in eternity, and the power of Satan which is working for the destruction of the human race in eternal punishment. Christ’s mission was to wrest men from the power of Satan, and save them from their sins. When he delivered to the apostles their marching orders, he said “Go ye into all the world.” If going, they were to make war on everything that was calculated to destroy the kingdom of God. Thus the gospel is an aggressive message. Christians who serve the Lord, wage an aggressive warfare upon sin.

The New Testament reveals to us a perfect character in the person of Jesus Christ. All who have heard his voice and are endeavoring to follow him, are making an effort to live in harmony with his teaching. Paul says, “Only let your conversation (manner of life, conduct,) be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel.” (Phil.1:27.)
Christians must present a solid front, or be perfectly united. They must also strive together, which indicates that they must be going int the same direction. A church divided into warring factions cannot accomplish the good that it should accomplish. Writing the church at Thessalonica, Paul said, “But we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more; and that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing.” (1 Thess. 4:10-12.) From the foregoing Scripture we learn that a Christian cannot be a loafer, neither can he be a meddler in other men’s matters; but he must be quiet, labor with his hands and walk honestly or be consistent.

Christians must show the proper respect for one another. “Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another.” (Rom. 12:10.) They must do good unto all men. “As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” (Gal. 6:10.) It is the solemn duty of every member of the church of Christ to manifest the proper love for one another. Christ said, “A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.” (Jno. 13:34, 35.) And Paul says, “Let brotherly love continue.” (Heb. 13:1.)

The Paramount Task of The Church

In a model congregation every one will appreciate the fact that the preaching of the gospel to the lost, is the main work of the church, and will to the extent of his ability, endeavor to get the gospel to the lost. He will understand from the teaching of the New Testament, that there is a human and a Divine side to the plan of salvation. God has assigned to man a certain work to perform. When Christ sent the apostles into the world, he committed unto them the word of reconciliation. There was a time when man was hopelessly lost in sin. He “was without God and without hope in the world.” Jesus Christ came from heaven, and died upon the cross that man might make friends with God again. The gospel message is God's power to deliver man from sin, and place him in covenant relationship with God. When we think of reconciliation, we naturally turn our attention to Christ and the work which he did in providing salvation to sinful man. Paul says, “And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.” (2 Cor. 5:18, 19.) It is therefore the duty of Christians to preach the gospel, or sow the seed of the kingdom, and God will give the increase. To the church at Corinth Paul said, “I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.” (1 Cor. 3:6,7.) The church is said to be the “pillar and ground of the truth,” (1 Tim. 3:15,) which is another way of saying that the church is the means by which the light of Divine truth is to shine unto all the nations of the earth.

How this work is to be done, is left largely to the judgment of those who compose the body of Christ, so long as they see to it that the work is done through the church. The church rests “upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building filly framed together grow-eth unto a holy temple in the Lord:in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” (Eph. 2:20-22.) How long are we to honor Christ in this Divine institution, the church? Paul answers, “Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.” (Eph. 3:21.) Hence, until the angel Gabriel shall declare that “time shall be no more,” this Divine arrangement will stand, and through it we are to glorify Jesus Christ. It is therefore the duty of every individual member of the church to do what he can for the conversion of the world.

We are inclined to become discouraged when we preach the gospel and men seemingly pay little or no attention to it. But Paul says, “Let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.” (Gal. 6:9.) If we are believers in Christ, we should take Paul for our example, and with the armor of God on, march out under the banner of our King, and unsheath the “sword of the Spirit,” and “fight the good fight of faith.” To the church at Corinth Paul wrote, “We having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak; knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you. For all things are for your sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redown to the glory of God.” (2 Cor. 5:13,15.) The last message that Christ sent to his followers reads, “And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is a thirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” (Rev. 22:17.) It is the duty of every faithful preacher of the gospel to continue to preach the word of God, and it is unfortunate, or will be in the judgment, for that man who hears the word of God, and turns a deaf ear to it. So if a preacher should go through life preaching the gospel, and should succeed in saving but one soul in eternity, he would be a greater success in the estimation of heaven's king, than the man who might gain the whole world and lose his soul in the end. So regardless of the effects that the word of God may have on the hearts and lives of men, on we go stating the principles of the Christian religion, and insisting that men must hear the Lord, obey him, and walk in all of his commandments and ordinances.

The Duty of Edification

Another item of Christian work is that of edification. The use of the word “edify” in the New Testament may be seen by the passages in which the word is found. Without going into a detailed discussion of the word, let me say that it means “to build up, to strengthen.” In every church organized according to the New Testament pattern, will be found a group of men called elders, whose duty is to “feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being examples to the flock.” (1 Pet. 5:1-3.) Paul gives us an example as to how it was done. “Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men. See that none render evil for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men.” (1 Thess. 5:14, 15.)

Paul and Barnabas, two of the greatest missionaries that ever lived, converted people, and then taught them to observe the ordinances of the Lord. After they had preached the gospel in Derbe, “they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith,
and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.” (Acts 14:22.) To establish and have a strong New Testament church, the commands of the gospel must be proclaimed over and over. There is nothing that strengthens one’s faith in Christ, like hearing again the first principles of the gospel. That man who becomes an effective worker in the church, does so by hearing the Gospel, and being rooted and grounded in the faith. He will not fail to grow in Christian service, by attending upon all the ordinances in God’s house. He will turn to the history of the Jerusalem church, and see how that congregation “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread and in prayers.” (Acts 2:42.) Then in order to learn what each congregation was to do, he will read Paul’s letter to the Hebrew Christians which says, “Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God.” (Heb. 3:12.) Again: “Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.” (Heb. 10:24, 25.)

Thus he will be impressed by the fact that to serve God acceptably, he must be a regular attendant at the place of worship.

The Work of Benevolence

Not only must Christians be built up in the holy faith of the gospel, but they must look after the poor and needy. The orphans must be fed and clothed. James tells us that “Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.” (Jas. 1:27.)

Then in our worship to God, we must recognize the fact that God is the object of our worship, and we can approach him only through his son, Jesus Christ. To the woman of Samaria, Christ said, “God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.” (Jno. 4:24.) God has set up a standard by which we must measure ourselves in every act of worship. The conscience is not a sufficient guide here. One of the finest characters that was converted under the preaching of inspired men, was the Ethiopian officer, who had charge of the treasury of queen Candace. It is recorded of him prior to his conversion, that he had journeyed from his homeland to Jerusalem, nearly one thousand miles, “for to worship.” I know he was a good man, or he would not have made that long journey in a chariot, travelling at the rate of about five or six miles an hour, to worship Jehovah.

Now in passing I might say, that there was a time when the Jews could worship at Jerusalem. But that age ended when Jesus Christ died upon the cross. Now, in order to be acceptable in the worship of Christ we must measure ourselves in every act of worship. One to be acceptable to God must be in the family of God. And every item of worship, must be authorized by the word of God.

Not only that, but when we approach God in worship, our minds must be centered on things above. God, Christ, the church and spiritual matters will be placed far above matters of a temporal nature, and we will enter into the spirit of worship, and worship God as the truth directs.

Church Finance

Church finance is a problem ever with us. It is best solved by forgetting all assessments, pledge cards, advertisements, shows, suppers, and such like and preaching the truth. Any church which cares to follow the advice of Paul in 1 Cor. 16:1-2 can have sufficient funds to carry on its work from the voluntary, free-will offerings cheerfully given by those who love the Lord. If sufficient funds cannot be raised in this way then the church program should be curtailed.

Away back in the last century some anonymous writer read Mark 11:16, “Make not my Father’s house a den of merchandise” and wrote the following prayer which is worthy of a place in The Bible Banner.

A New Version

0 Lord, I come to Thee once more: But pardon if I do not kneel before
Thy gracious presence, for my knees are sore
With so much walking. In my chair instead
I’ll sit at ease and humbly bow my head.
I’ve labored in Thy vineyard, Thou dost know,
I’ve sold ten tickets to the minstrel show;
I’ve called on fifteen strangers in our town,
Their contributions to our church put down;
I’ve baked a pot of beans—for Saturday’s suppers,
An old-time supper it is going to be;
I’ve dressed three dols, too, for our annual fair;
I have no time to sit down and pray;
I have no time to mend my husband’s clothes;
I have no time to tend my household goods;
I have no time to visit the needy, or to do right;
But Thou, 0 Lord, considering all our cares,
Will count them righteous, also heed my prayers.
Bless the bean supper and the minstrel show,
And put it in the hearts of all to go.
Induce the visitors to patronize
The men who in our program advertise;
Because I’ve chased these merchants till they hid
Their contributions to our church put down;
I have no time to teach them to do right;
Increase the contributions to our fair,
And bless the people who assemble there;
But Thou, 0 Lord, considering all our cares,
Will count them righteous, also heed my prayers.
Increase the contributions to our fair,
And bless the people who assemble there;
But Thou, 0 Lord, considering all our cares,
Will count them righteous, also heed my prayers.

Church Music

Old timers can remember when all churches except the Catholics refused to have the dulcimer, flute, cornet, organ, piano, handsaw and all kinds of music in the places where they fell down to worship. Some others not so old can remember when it was no trick at all to get an article opposing choirs, roves, special numbers and other entertainment in the church in most any of our gospel papers. Such articles do not make for a big literature business from those who are flirting with the ideas thus condemned hence some papers now discontinue them. ... (this is meant to be an insinuation). I got a good hearty abdominal laugh out of the following and at the risk of provoking mirth among some who haven’t laughed in public since this little article first appeared in print fifty years ago, I here reproduce it.

“Attending services recently in a church where the worship is of a highly aesthetic kind, the choir began that scriptural poem that compares Solomon with the lilies of the field, somewhat to the former’s disadvantage. Although never possessing a great admiration for Solomon, nor con-
sidering him a suitable person to hold up as a shining example before the Young Men’s Christian Association, still a pang of pity was felt for him when the choir, after expressing unbounded admiration for the lilies of the field, began to tell the congregation through the mouth of the soprano, that “Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed.” Straightway the soprano was reinforced by the bass, who declared that Solomon was most decidedly, and emphatically not arrayed. Then the alto was also to make it as her opinion that he was not arrayed, when the tenor, without a moment’s hesitation, sang as it had been officially announced that “he was not arrayed.” When the feelings of the con-
gregations had been harrowed up sufficiently and all sympathy were all aroused for poor Solomon, whose numerous wives allowed him to go about in such a fashion, even in that climate, the choir, in a most cool and compact manner, informed us that the idea they intended to convey was that “Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.”

“These what? So long a time had elapsed since they had sung of lilies that the thread was entirely lost, and by ‘these’ one naturally concluded the choir was designat-ed. Arrayed like one of these? We should think not, in-deed. Solomon in a Prince Albert or a cutaway coat? Solomon with an eye-glass and a mustache, his hair cut pompadour? No, most decidedly Solomon in the very zenith of his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

“Despite the experiences of the morning, the hope still remained that in the evening a sacred song might be sung in which he could not excite our sensibilities or leave the impression that we had been listening to a case of slander. But again off started the nimble soprano with the laudable though rather startling announcement, I will wash. Straightway the alto, not to be outdone, declared she would wash; and the tenor, finding it to be the thing, warbled forth that he would wash. Then the dee-cheested basso, as though calling up all his fortitude for the plunge, composed largely of young people had banners printed in more liberal terms today. This is a step in the wrong direction and may lead to untold evil.

The tendency in the church is to leave the “old paths.” Many congregations now tolerate things that they did not tolerate a few years ago. Things come gradually. Congregations need to be on guard all the time to keep out of a questionable nature.

I read of a “lecture week,” a “preachers meeting.” I wonder just where that may lead. A few years ago I was holding a meeting in Texas, and I met a preacher who was getting ready to take his congregation to the Carlsbad Cavern. Now there is nothing wrong in taking a trip individually or collectively. However this congregation composed largely of young people had banners printed and were traveling as a group of high school students would travel going to a ball game, With banners streaming and horns tooting they were going to announce “here comes the church of Christ.” The set-up did not have the right sound to me. Again we read to two or three congregations getting all of their young people together for a young people’s meeting.

In some congregations I find groups of young people fully organized secretaries and treasuries. The church has but very little to say about their activities. They spend their money in the name of the class. The elders have no oversight of their work.

A few years ago I held a meeting in a city where there were several congregations. One of those churches had a group of young people operating under a denominational name. It was discussed pro and con while I was there by the different preachers of the town. The class was fully organized, doing much work, and was overshadowing the church. If you talked to one of those young people, he was a member of the “Class,” but said nothing about being a member of the Church. I thought then the set-up was dangerous; now I am fully persuaded it was. That church has since had a division and the class figured largely in the division.

Do we have a missionary society? The average church member would say, no. The fact remains that we have the equivalent. A few months ago I was away from home in a meeting. A “one man missionary society” blew into town and began to work. The brethren were asked to let him preach on Wednesday night. It was agreed to let him preach, but he was not to take up a collection. After two or three days the “missionary society” left town with more than fifty dollars. As far as I have been able to ascertain nearly all of this amount went to the individual. Some subscribed a dollar a month. If he could find enough sympathetic church members, he could build up a pretty good pension system. As a result of this visit the church in its next business meeting decided that no preacher or agent passing through town can preach for the church unless it is decided that he is sound and not after the people’s money. The purpose is to guard the church from false teachers and money getters. No man has a right to act as a missionary agent for the churches. The one man financial agent “for the Lord,” canvassing the brotherhood, are as unscriptural as the missionary society of many men.

We read weekly of a congregation having a lectureship. The name of the thing does not sound right. Do we read of the apostles and early evangelists attending a lectureship? This group gathering of preachers leads in the wrong direction. It leads to preacher control of the affairs of the church. It leads to shaping the policies of the church. The elders have the oversight and should never give it over to a preacher combine. Lectureships are getting very numerous and are becoming a part of the program of many congregations. I am fearful that they could lead us away from the “Old Paths.”

As readers of the Bible Banner know, I have been engaged in meetings in California for the past three months. Enroute home last week, I was called by long distance telephone from Albuquerque, New Mexico, back to Los Angeles to funeral of R. L. Smith, a warm personal friend, and a leading spirit in the Central Church in Los Angeles. I have not been able to make editorial observations concerning the Cause in California and will withhold comment until the September Bible Banner.

In order to get back on due schedule, two issues of the Bible Banner will appear this month—the July and August numbers—only a few days apart. These issues will be sixteen pages each. The September number will be the regular twenty-four pages. As explained before the only existing emergency was the extensive travel of the editor and the necessity of issuing the Bible Banner by long distance, or “remote control.” The indulgence of the subscribers has been greatly appreciated.—Foy E. Wallace Jr.
“THE HALF HAS NEVER YET BEEN TOLD”

STOY PATE

We have heard of the wisdom of Solomon, and have
gone to the Bible to read about it. The queen of Sheba, in
southern Arabia, having heard of the wisdom of Solomon,
came to Jerusalem in all her pomp and glory to see him.
When Solomon had answered all her questions, and when
she had seen the house which he had built for the glory of
his kingdom, “there was no more spirit in her,” and she
confessed that, though she had doubted the stories which
had been told her, the half had not been told. I had heard
much about those so-called “Unity Meetings” promoted by
Witty and Murch; so I went to the one held in Lexington,
Ky., to see for my self what was being done. Since I have
heard what was said, and have seen what was done, I am
convinced that the half has never yet been told of these
“Love Feasts.” In this short article I will not be able to
tell half what I saw or heard, but I want to mention some
of the high points.

“A Love Feast”

I had heard that these were “Love Feasts” that they
were having, but I did not realize that there was so much
truth in it, until I saw it for myself.

Murch said: “This is a courting proposition.” In har-
mony with that Bro. Adamson told about a boy who could
define the word “love” to his girl friend, but said: “If
you will come over a little closer I will demonstrate.” Ex-
pressions like these were common: “Remember we are
brethren,” “This fellowship is wonderful.” Yet the Christian
Church would not give up a thing for unity, but wants us
to recognize them as they are, and to fellowship them as
they are. I wonder if those preachers of the church of
Christ will fellowship them when they get home as they
did in this meeting. If they do, the Christian Church has
gained what they were working for-fellowship with out
giving up any of their innovations.

Debate Was Ridiculed

Notwithstanding the fact that Solomon said: “Debate
thy cause with thy neighbor” (Prov. 25:9) this was ridi-
culed in this meeting by preachers of both churches. Al-
though the prophets, preachers and apostles debated much,
these time-servers are unwilling to debate. Much was
said about the Restoration Movement, but very little was
said about the debates of those pioneers. If Solomon said it
was mentioned it was not endorsed. Possibly they thought
it worked then but will not work now. Virgil L. Elliott
of Christian Church said: “The slogan of those pioneers,
we speak where the Bible speaks, and are silent where
the Bible is silent,” worked in their day, but possibly won’t
work now;” S. S. Lapin of Christian Church said a lot
against debate in his speech. Then S. H. Hall got up and
said; “I’ve never heard such a masterful address.” He
further stated that brethren ought to settle their differences
behind closed doors. W. R. Walker (of the Christian
Church) followed Bro. Hall and two times said he agreed
with Bro. Hall about debates. Bro. Witty came along and
agreed with all of them. Murch said that Bro. Witty was
called “Bishop of Detroit,” and accepted it in good grace.
So if the “Bishop of Detroit” says they are right about
debating, I guess that settles it.

Premillennialism

The meeting was held in the meeting house of the
church of Christ, Hanover and Cramer Avenues. This is
a premillennial church with a premillennialist preacher,
Homer Rutherford, who was one of the chairmen of the

“Convention.” E. L. Jorgenson, a premillennialist, was
one of the song directors, and he sang premillennial songs,
to the seeming delight of most all. He was using his book,
and S. S. Lappin, with his long-tail coat, said it was the
best book he had seen. Homer E. Sala of the Christian
Church said: “The Lord in his own good time will establish
the kingdom.” I found out that the loyal churches in Ken-
tucky had no part in this meeting. It was really a meeting
of Christian Church and the Premillennialists, and their
sympathizers in church of Christ. It was the rankest thing
I ever saw, and I even felt out of place there as a spectator.

Instrumental Music

The preachers of the Christian Church were bold in
teaching what they stood for. They said plenty in favor
of having the instrument in the worship. Two or three
preachers of the church of Christ said a little against hav-
ing the instrument in the worship, but they never touch-
ed the hem of the garment. From what I could learn Bro.
Witty had instructed his boys not to say any thing that
would be antagonistic. He was afraid if they really got
down to brass tracks, and met the issue, that they would
break up this “sweet fellowship.” The truth suffered at
this meeting.

Special Numbers

Loyal brethren have opposed the Christian Church for
having special numbers in the church to entertain. It
seems that our premillennial brethren are about to catch
up with the digressives. If the Christian Church does not
drive too fast, the premillennialists will catch up, and what
a “Love Feast” they will have then! E. L. Jorgenson had
Homer Rutherford and another man singing solos. Then
one night Jorgenson brought his chorus and sang several
numbers to entertain the audience. This was a choir
with another name, but a choir just the same. Jorgenson
said he would take his chorus and sing for a man that
preaches like S. S. Lappin, of the Christian Church. The
Christian Church is about to win these premillennialists it
seems.

---

Result Of “Conference”

This meeting was called a “conference by both par-
ties. There was a lot said about delegates to this con-
ference.” Murch said one thing had been accomplished •
this meeting-the desire for unity. I wonder why they have
been meeting, if they just now desire unity. Possibly it was
for the purpose of courting a while. I believe if they keep
courting that some of our brethren will marry the digres-
sives.

A Statement Concerning “Complete Christian
Hymnal” To All Who Have Purchased Cloth-
bound Books

Marion Davis

Due to defective workmanship in the binding of the
cloth covered board Complete Christian Hymnals of the
first edition, we are replacing all copies with new ones.
If you happened to get one or more of these defective
books, and will return them to us, we will be glad to
replace them. Please write us for directions on how to
return them before shipping, if have more than a dozen
to return.

THE MARION DAVIS CO.
Fayette, Alabama
OLD MANTUA--"Man-chu-ay"

C. A. NORRED

About one mile south of the little village of Van Alstyne, Texas, is a deserted spot the old settlers called Old Mantua. Mantua sprang up in connection with the wave of immigration which poured into that section about the time of the opening of the Texas frontier. About 1846 Brother J. P. Wilmeth, an early day surveyor, began preaching among the settlers in that section. From these gospel labors there arose a congregation, which in later years came to be known as Old Liberty Church. The first meeting was held in the spacious home of Carroll McKinney, a "broad-minded Methodist." The old building in which this service was held is still standing. After meeting about from house to house for some time the congregation decided to erect a meetinghouse. In as much as the little village of Mantua had begun to form the members thought it well to build there. Accordingly, in 1854 the meetinghouse was erected at Mantua.

But we move into the gist of the story when we observe that Old Mantua was built for stormy times. At first the friends of the simple New Testament order entertained the conviction that their duty to the unsaved world was that of giving it the gospel in word and in deed. Gradually there arose, though, the notion that the church was to take the world for Christ. Naturally this grandiose outlook could make the accomplished results of the past appear very trivial and the things hoped for could become enormous. In the excess of this enthusiastic expectation there began to be more and more pronounced the feeling that the enlarged success hoped for would necessitate a more liberal attitude of compromise with public demand. Naturally, though, this spirit of change was gradual in its growth. In 1849 these friends of change had foisted upon the churches the Missionary Society. Then in 1858 there began to appear the practice of using the organ in the public worship of the congregations. To be sure, these changes met with intense opposition. In an effort to weather this storm of antagonism the friends of the new order organized the paper known as the Christian Standard. This paper, which appeared in 1869, immediately began to address itself to the work of pleading for the changed order. To catch the full significance of the work of the paper, though, we should observe that the paper addressed itself to a particular way to the young people and to work in the Sunday Schools. In the very nature of things, Mantua fell in the path of this influence. And which way did Old Mantua go? The answer to this question reveals many very significant things. Some excellent Christians declare that the organ was never used at Mantua. However, an elderly Christian woman declared to me that she could remember that one was used there when she was a little girl. Very naturally I was somewhat bewildered at this conflicting testimony of evidently trustworthy persons. But I felt that I had found the clue to the explanation when the woman, now a member of the First Christian Church at Van Alstyne, remarked that organ was "a little organ in the Sunday school." So the organ began in the Sunday School. When we talk with persons who went through the troubled times we are now reviewing we find that the church members in that day were accustomed to make a distinction between the church and the Sunday School. There prevailed, too, a disposition to tolerate things in the Sunday School which were thought of as improper for the church. Thus the use of the organ became not uncommon in the Sunday Schools. The result was that element in the churches was indoctrinated in favor of the new order and given leadership in that direction. A dear old grandmother at Mantua was accustomed to say "I don't have long to go. If it will make them (young people) more interested and cause them to come to church it will not hurt me to listen to the Organ." And then something else came along! With the passing of time a railroad passed through the country and passed a short distance to the east of Mantua. Soon many began to insist that the place of meeting should be moved to the railroad and to this point where Van Alstyne was forming. One writer even asserts that in 1891 the church did move to Van Alstyne and at that time its name was changed to First Christian Church. Although I dislike to contradict, I have evidence that the statement is not correct. Brother M. V. Hinton, one of the elders in the church at Van Alstyne working after the New Testament pattern declares that although in the year just named a group of persons did pull off from Mantua and start a new congregation in Van Alstyne, the old church at Mantua continued to carry on for some years as she had done.

But the new church at Van Alstyne began to adopt more and more the ways of the new order and soon went over bodily to the digressives. In the fall of 1939 I interviewed Brother Sam Pattie, introduced to me as "The Chairman of the Board of The First Christian Church." Pretty soon in our conversation I inquired: "When did the church here introduce the organ?" His reply was: "About forty years ago during a meeting held by Brother Lockhart of Greenville." (This shows that for several years the church there did not use the organ.) When I asked why the organ was introduced he replied: "They just wanted it, and put it in and that is all there was to it." When I asked if any were opposed to it, he said: "About two families. But one of them got over it and came back." Later an elderly member of the First Christian Church informed me that the persons objecting were principally members of the Wilmeth family. (It should be recalled that it was a Brother Wilmeth who planted the church in that section!) Yet in front of the meetinghouse of the First Christian Church is a large sign bearing the claim that that church was started in 1846 and is the oldest Christian Church in the state. The truth is that the church started there in 1891. Further, it did not assume the use of the organ until something like forty years ago. Yet they claim to be the oldest Christian Church in the state! But what of Old Mantua? Well, she capitulated with time. Many members moved to other places. Too, the coming of the railroad had shifted the center to Van Alstyne. At last the remaining members concluded it wise to disband. In as much as the church at Van Alstyne had adopted the use of the organ the members at Mantua cast their membership with Elmont Church, about four miles west of Van Alstyne. Eventually the last remaining structure disappeared from the old site and the place became a memory. But Old Mantua is more than memory; for its history is a moving lesson against departing from the way of the Lord. Such changes generally come gradually and almost imperceptibly. Too, it is not uncommon that such changes are begun among the young and in the work of the Sunday School. But fairness will not permit us to charge such departures to the young. The blame lies with older persons who so take advantage of the young and special blame lies on Christians who permit such to occur. One young need the very best but we need to see to it that any work undertaken among them is true to the Book. Otherwise the history of Old Mantua will be repeated,
DANGERS EMANATING FROM CHRISTIAN COLLEGES

(Cont. From Page 3)

history of modern digression. Soon after the restoration movement was launched in America, Alexander Campbell founded Eethany Coll in Virginia to advance the cause of Christ, to fight denominations and to guard against digression. For a time the school served these purposes well. Numbers of preachers went out from it to hold the Sword of the Spirit in successful combat with denomenationalism and infidelity. But eventually she drifted gradually at first, then more rapidly departed into a kind of liberalism, then into digression and finally into rank modernism where she stands today. This process was repeated in "The College of the Bible," Lexington, Kentucky. The institution was once praised over by such men as John B. Bowman, Robert McFarland and the great J. W. McGarvey. But in spite of the mark of these great men this school followed Bethany College down the same road to spiritual ruin. Hundreds of preachers have gone out from these schools, corrupted in doctrine and practice, to sweep the Christian Church into the digression that grips them today. These two schools have helped to bring about the very thing they were founded to prevent.

One does not need to be a close observer to see the beginning of the same process in our own ranks today. It is a well known fact that there has been some premillennialism and other false doctrines taught in some of the colleges, and from some of them students and teachers have gone out to join the ranks of Premillennialists, Digressives, and miracle claimers.

IV. The Danger of College Domination of the Churches

Students and alumni are usually loyal to their school, but sometimes to a degree that is greater than their loyalty to the Lord and His church. Hence three things (1) through recommendations of older students, young and untired graduates of the school are often placed in positions of trust and responsibility where they hurt the Cause; (2) the school is sometimes placed in the budget of the church; and (3) in any controversy the preacher, his judgment swayed by "the school spirit," is likely to champion the cause of the college against the cause of Christ. A college preacher ring is likely to be built up and thus the schools become a dominating force in hundreds of congregations.

How can these dangers emanate from the schools? Emanate means to flow out. And the dangers flow out with the preachers that go out. Perhaps a hundred young men have matriculated in the various Christian colleges this year, with the intention of being full-time preachers of the gospel, an excellent purpose if for the right motive. But place these same young men, for mental and spiritual development, under teachers who are soft, compromising, worldly, and unsound, and not all but many of them will be developed in that direction.

"POTHER AND CONFUSION"

(Cont. From Page 1)

ize an organ to help us in our expression of praise. Any critical study of the history makes it reasonably certain that the early Christian worship must frequently have dispensed with singing as well as any instrumental accompaniment. The idea seems to be that disciples may either sing or play if they want to and may dispense with both if they care to. There is "notoriously" no authority for the instrument and only a little "casual" authority for singing. This is quite a jump from Paine's discovery of the meaning of "psallo," the Christian Standard got so excited over a few years ago, and which inspired courage for a few debates. "Psallo" was "supposed to furnish mandatory authority for the instrument. A counter-attack or two made "psallo" as unfit for digressive uses as a crucifix in an orthodox Jewish synagogue. Digressive strategy has now simmered down to "The New Testament notoriously lays down no authoritative order or style of worship." Since there is no authority for the organ, they will seek to discredit what authority there is for singing, so it will not look so bad to use the organ without any authority. That is all that Dr. Kershner's effort amounts to. Since there is "no authoritative order or style of worship" go ahead and do as you please whether it is authorized or not. This is digression reduced to its simplest terms. It would be a good subject for discussion in the next Unity Meeting. Brethren Murch and Witty ought to each make a speech on it, and publish it in the papers.

"In one or two casual passages, singing is mentioned." He almost got rid of it didn't he? Why, the word "Psallo" appears five times in the New Testament. If a man wants to get around the weekly observance of the Lord's supper, he says that it is only casually mentioned that disciples met on the first day of the week to break bread. Regular observance is therefore unnecessary and may be done on any day of the week. If baptism as a condition of remission of sins is distasteful, instances can be invented or produced where it was impossible for a man who wanted salvation to be immersed. Dr. Kershner thinks such circumstances may have been times when the early disciples could not even sing. There might have even been times when they could not meet or observe the Lord's supper. It is often true today in the case of individual disciples due to unusual circumstances. Therefore, what? If circumstances make it impossible at some time to do what the scriptures clearly teach, then all may all the time feel free to offer strange fire which God has not commanded. If some cannot always sing, then all may always play, although it is not true. But if God has authorized the one and has "notoriously" omitted mention of the other. If circumstances make it impossible For some to be immersed or to attend the Lord's day meeting, then all may be sprinkled, or go fishing or visiting on the Lord's day. Paul affirmed our negative for us when he said: "Learn not to go beyond the things which are written." It seems to me that the Christian Standard ought to be just a little bit ashamed of itself.
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