It may be just one man's opinion, but I'm pretty well fed up on preachers telling the brethren that they ought to imitate the Catholics, Seventh Day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses. They tell us that we ought to copy the reverence of the Catholics, put on aoker face a few steps before we enter the meeting-house and maintain a pious stoicism until we are well away from the premises. They have not quite reached thatg point where they advocate that we dip our fingers in holy water and cross ourselves before we invade the sacred precincts. Now, I'm not minded to imitate the Catholics in anything. I do not like that well. Christians should be reverent in both thought and manner when and where holy things are involved. Neither the name of the Lord nor anything it is connected with should be treated lightly, but the long-faced reverence of Catholics is unadulterated formalism, as outward as the signs of fasting and prayer the Pharisees carried about on their disfigured faces. Whoever tries to bind anything like that on the churches may just leave me out. It might save some trouble, for I propose to stay out anyway. The idolatrous reverence of Catholicism does not impress me favorably at all. Jesus and the apostles serve very well as patterns of reverence to me without recourse to a system which is a strange and fantastic mixture of paganism, Judaism, and a little Christianity sprinkled on for its flavoring effect. I beg to be excused from sharing anybody's enthusiasm for that sort of thing. I knew a young woman who was brought up in the faith. She got tired of the gospel and joined the Episcopalians, for reasons I think she is not frank about acknowledging. She says: "Oh, they are so reverent." The reverence which is fed by a robed priest waving a smoking censor and talking Latin is not the kind the brethren are likely to become interested in, be it said to their credit. Personally, I'd be ashamed to call their attention to it as an example for them to follow.

As for the Seventh Day Adventists, they would swell with pride if they could hear some of the brethren, a few preachers of course, brag on them. We are regaled with wild tales about the liberality of these people and the zeal they display in propagating their peculiar doctrines. "We ought to give like the Adventists." We ought not to do anything of the kind. Adventism is a purely legalistic system. The members of the cult do not give, they are taxed. They pay into the church at least one tenth of their income or place themselves liable to excommunication. There is no freedom in the concern, not even to drink a cup of coffee. When somebody tells me that I ought to do like the Adventists, I'm likely to tell him to "go join them yourself if you want to." I'm not interested. Surely, Christians ought to imitate instead of parroting the Bible. We claim to be a Bible people and a Bible speaking people. Of all things, we are seriously exhorted to imitate Jehovah's Witnesses and trample about from house to house with tracts and, I suppose, play a few records to long-suffering, if impatient, housewives. We are told to behold what these Jehovah's Witnesses have accomplished along this line. They have succeeded admirably in getting a multitude of doors slammed in their faces and generating a general reputation for being dupes and fanatics. They are not very welcome in the life of any community and are noted neither for the number nor the size of their permanent assemblies. It will not do Christians any good to act enough like them to become identified with them in the minds of the public. It is a profit-making system anyway. They peddle tracts and books to make money for somebody. The Adventists are about as bad in this respect. They often conceal their identity to sell their doctrinal books at a handsome price. Some of their activities add up to false pretenses. The general public is not greeting door-knockers and religious tract peddlers these days with a holy kiss. They are identified as cranks and extremists and sect propagandists, off-brand at that. And we are supposed to imitate them! It makes my white hair turn red to think about it.

Our problem is to get the New Testament before the people and impress upon them the importance of following its teaching. Both right and expediency argue that the danger of being classified as sectarian propagandists should be eliminated as far as is possible. Much good has been accomplished by a judicious use of literature, written by faithful and well-informed men. If we did not think so, we would cease publication at once. It is largely a local problem and zeal and wisdom should be combined in the solution of it. If handing a stranger a tract arouses hostility instead of interest, harm rather than good has been accomplished. The use of a little intelligence should determine to whom it should be handed. Even pearls can be scattered in the wrong places. I would not give a man a cup of coffee.
ADVANCING BACKWARDS

CLED E. WALLACE

We have come a long way since instrumental music was first introduced into the worship of churches of Christ. The first efforts along that line were of a very cautious, apologetic nature. The innovators grew bolder and the tide of innovation swept in until for awhile it looked as though the opposition would be completely overwhelmed. Many churches that opposed the organ were small and despised. They were held up to scorn. Even David Lipscomb was caricatured in the Christian Standard as an old woman with a broom trying to sweep back the tide of the ocean. Stalwart defenders of the inspired order in worship as well as in doctrine were bold, fearless and persistent. They had the facts of New Testament teaching on their side and they made the most of it. They were invincible in debate, and the fear of them after a time made debates unpopular with the players on instruments. They resorted to guile and the popular vote to carry forward their schemes of innovation. "By their smooth and fair speech they beguiled the hearts of the innocent" and assured them that the controversy was not over fundamentals but mere incidents and that instrumental music was to be classed with other things as song-books, baptisteries, black-boards, pews and carpets. Many preachers took the stand that they could preach for either side and whether or not organs should be used in worship should be left to each church.

The independence of the congregation, accepted by all, was urged as a good reason why such a congregational arrangement could use an organ if it wanted to. The opposition urged with good reason that a congregation had no right to introduce an unscriptural practise whether it be the lighting of tapers, the burning of incense, infant baptism or instrumental music. A church of Christ must observe the things the Lord commanded and could not revolve itself into a legislative assembly. Taking this impregnable stand, faith-ful adherents of the divine order in things, withdrew from congregations which introduced the organ and started worship elsewhere. They were denounced as factionists and trouble-makers by a class of innovators who boasted that they were possessed of an abundant supply of "the Spirit of Christ." The champions of loyalty drew on them the sword of the Spirit the sharp end of which drew blood after this fashion: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of "stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them." (Rom. 16:17) Of course the champions of innovations immediately set up a cry of "making tests of fellowship" and the like. The appeasers all went digestive and the lines were drawn. The ones who caused the trouble by introducing the unscriptural practices have always considered themselves very innocent and lamblike, although in a multitude of instances they bullied themselves into power.

The opposers of innovations fought with a zeal born of deep conviction and made substantial gains. The tide began to turn in many sections of the country. At the beginning, able and devout men had warned that the organ merely opened the flood-gate for even more shocking departures from the truth. Time has amply shown that they were dead right in their contention. The introduction of the organ was a surrender of the only principle which could make a full restoration of the New Testament order possible. Today the majority of the digressives are more concerned with appeasement moves and pleasing the sects, or being like them, than they are about the identity of the New Testament church. The organ crowd is generally very tolerant of sectarian doctrine and practises, even if the Christian Standard does blow a blast on the old Ram's Horn occasionally. It is significant that nobody of any great note on the organ side is burning up with zeal to affirm that the New Testament authorizes the use of instrumental music in the worship of God.

Churches that still sing and do not play are numerous enough, and strong enough, and going forward fast enough, to attract the benevolent attention of "the conservatives" among the digressives. A national unity movement has been launched to bring about a cessation of hostilities. The idea seems to be, as far as I am able to observe from this distance, to just call the fight off and fraternize. Let bygones be bygones and leave it to the churches to use, or not use instrumental music as they may independently determine. The national unity movement is calling for a stalemate with no winners and no losers. Is it possible that this fight has been going in a circle and we are right back where we started when the organ first crept in? Brother Witty, not to say anything about Brother Murch, seems to think so, or more accurately seems to hope so. They are in for more shocks than they have already received, God being our helper. If we can now make peace on such terms, then the digressives have been right all the time and we have been wrong all the time. If the organ is a matter to be determined by the congregation, like where we shall order our song-books, or where we shall build a meeting-house, then the fight should have stopped right where it started and a little before. If the issue has not changed, then the sort of appeasement this unity movement calls for is a surrender to a smooth digressive ruse. It will not work. We are not going to advance backwards, even if Brother Witty and others are shouting for a retreat in a way that tickles the ears of digressive leaders.

The first ripe fruits of the Witty-Murch movement have been plucked and tasted in a pre-millennial church in Louisville, Kentucky. An innocent bystander might conclude it sounds good, even if he doesn't know, how it tastes, judging by the way S. S. Lipscomb, E. L. Jorgenson, and Don Carlos Janes are smacking their lips over it. They are doing their best to, in fact over-doing their act, to persuade us to take just one little bite of the forbidden fruit. I warn you, just one bite, and we are goners. You cannot even take a wee nibble without springing this digressive trap. Jorgenson and Janes are already in, and I'm wondering at the peculiarity of the prudence that is holding Claus Witty back. The next bite, according to the rules, ought to be his. I have already paid my respects to some of Brother Janes' lip-smacking in the Christian Standard and the Firm Found-
dation, which Brother Showalter also took a healthy crack at, and now I'm tuned in to the same sort of thing in the Christian Standard with S. S. Lappin furnishing the lip muscle, must have been a sweet morsel that he bit off. He smacks his lips to the tune of a whole page of fine print in the Christian Standard. His delight is unbounded. Of course everybody knows by now that Brother Lappin is a digressive and always has been. The Highland church in Louisville called him for a meeting. Sister Lappin was with him, which is not a point I'm criticizing. A preacher should take his wife with him when he goes away from home, occasionally, or oftener if possible. They both had a good time with the Highland church, judging from this remark by Brother Lappin:

"Mrs. Lappin was with me through the series, not as a soloist, but as my companion, and was used repeatedly by Brother Jorgenson: in special songs. She and I are agreed that in no engagement during our two years together have we had more royal and loyal co-operation and response than at Highland. Not once in homes, in private or in public has any controversial note been sounded. I have preached the same sermons I have used in Christian churches for years and without a word of alteration. Brother Jorgenson and I and Don Carlos Janes, who is a member at Highland, have gone over every point at issue between 'Christian Churches' and 'Churches of Christ' (judging by the squirm of my conscience when I write it thus, it must be a sin; I write it here: one has to stand and live; and some have stood in Babylon); and all our converse has been to stress agreements and emphasize the weighty things of the Kingdom-righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."

It seems to me that Brother Lappin's conscience is squirming over the wrong thing. It should squirm over the fact that he advocates, condones and apologizes for unscriptural innovations which has brought about and still perpetuates the division he deplores. The kind of a truce he advocates and demonstrated in the Highland meeting will be about as effective as removing a mole when the diagnosis reveals a ruptured appendix. I take it that he, Jorgenson and Janes decided that the organ was a little the opposition to "a little thing" like an organ. One would think they would be willing to surrender this feather-weight that has caused so much trouble, and remove a real obstacle to peace but not they! The prospect of doing without it immediately gives it great weight! Janes and Jorgenson fell for this line and it was not a long fall at that. When they get right down to the weighty things of the Kingdom, they have Christ on David's loyal throne on earth ruling the nations with a literal rod of iron! It is significant that this Unity Movement has drawn its sympathizers among us. My opinion 'is that a general defection, will prove to be so slight as to be extremely painful to the conspirators who are trying to work this scheme and leave them considerably disillusioned and embarrassed. Jorgenson and Janes are by no means models of loyalty in the eyes of the brethren aside from this Louisville venture of recent date. When they start something out of the ordinary, brethren generally are apt to conclude that they are setting an example which it will be good not to follow. Brother Jorgenson recently went to New Castle, Pennsylvania and contacted Brother Holly. The reception he got did not exactly inflame him with satisfaction. He called up Dr. Plum, an elder of the congregation in East Liverpool, Ohio. The result did not make him feel any better. He complained bitterly of the "Wallace influence" in these parts. I take it as a compliment. Whateverywhere and wherever the "Wallace influence" is, it is dead against the "Boll, Jorgenson, Janes influence. We are not premillennialists and have no compromises to offer for the gladdening of digressive hearts. Some of these enemies of peace, you know, the "Wallace influence" is, are with contentment over the Witty, Murch, Lappin influence. Brethren are not advancing backward in marking them in the way of "influence." It looks like it won't be long now until their chief welcome will be in digressive churches.

Brother Lappin gives credit to whom credit is due. He informs us that the committee

"In which James DeForest Murch and Claud Witty are active, has done something, at least; they are responsible for this fine meeting we have had at Highland Church in Louisville; in which the old Jerusalem gospel has been preached, in which glorious music has been enjoyed without an instrument and to which preachers as well as elders and deacons of both 'Churches of Christ' and 'Christian Churches' (if I were a Catholic I would cross myself) have come to rejoice together and repent of former un-brotherliness. I hope the fraternal gesture may be oft repeated."

If Brother Witty is jointly responsible with Brother Murch for the Highland church calling a digressive preacher to do the preaching in its meeting, he is also using his influence for what it may be worth to get other loyal churches to do the same thing. We are set against this. "Witty Influence" should be branded and we see it, there is no quicker way on earth to make digressive churches than to call digressive preachers for meetings. Is this what Brother Witty is working for? And he thinks the Lord is ashamed of us for not working for the same thing! He evidently does not know the mind of the Lord in this matter. Maybe Brother Lappin should go ahead and cross himself. His organ came from the Catholics. The issue is not a question of "former" or present "un-brotherliness" as Brother Lappin chooses to call it. It is a question of loyalty to God with some of us evidently have more convictions on the matter than Brethren Witty, Jorgenson and Janes seem to have.

Brother Lappin states his appraisal of the issue in these words:

"Highland Church of Christ and her sister churches of the same faith and fellowship are anti-anti-sin, anti-satanism, anti-Satan. Thus far-and no farther-do I go. I maintain that the local church of the New Testament is free; it appears to me that certain leaders have been in error in that they would dictate to the local church what to do in the matter of peace. The local church is, and I and Don Carlos Janes, who is a member at Highland, and Janes and I and DeForest Murch and Claud Witty, are jointly responsible with Brother Witty for what it may be worth to get other loyal churches to do the same thing. We are set against this. "Witty Influence" should be branded."

In the first place it is a misrepresentation of the churches generally to hold up the Highland church as typical. That particular church is pretty much of a parish church among "her sister churches of the same faith and fellowship" which has no word ofnote to be the point of departure.

In the first place it is a misrepresentation of the churches generally to hold up the Highland church as typical. That particular church is pretty much of a parish church among "her sister churches of the same faith and fellowship." Its "fellowship" with Brother Lappin has not improved its reputation among "her sister churches.

Brother Lappin's idea seems to be that because "the local church of the New Testament is free" it has the right to use instrumental music and join up with the societies if it wants to and that with impunity. Other "free" churches are not "free" to dub a "free" church digressive, condemn it and have nothing to do with it in the way of "fellowship," even if it is digressive! This is carrying freedom a little too far. It gives digressive churches unrestricted freedom and puts the others in a strait-jacket in reference to any effective stand they may care to take against corrupting the worship of God. Of course Brother Lappin does not consider that instrumental music is a corruption. Others do, and his little dissertation On "free" (Continued on page 7)
MY VIEWS ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

MORE FRUIT FROM THE UNITY(-?) MEETINGS

JOHN T. LEWIS

In the Christian Standard, October 18, 1941, James DeForest Murch has a long article giving what he calls: “My Views on Instrumental Music in Worship.” The following statement was blocked off and put in middle of his article.

During one of the panel discussions held in connection with the National Unity meeting at Columbus, O., last May, Brother Murch made an extemporaneous statement of his views on instrumental music in worship. So many requests were made for it in written form that the accompanying manuscript has been prepared. Before publication it was submitted to brethren of both groups for criticism and is thus a fairly accurate reproduction of the Columbus statement.

If there was any criticism offered by either “group” to Brother Murch’s “views,” it is conspicuously absent in the above statement. What conclusion did Brother Murch expect his readers to draw from the statement? Were his “views” acceptable to “both groups” in “the panel discussions”? If I have not the truth, on this or any other subject, I want it, and if I have the truth I want the other fellow to have it. And I think I know the editor of the Bible Banner well enough to believe these are his sentiments. Therefore I am publishing Brother Murch’s views, accepting whatever truth he may teach, and pointing out the errors with which his article is replete. And if I am not hoping against hope, I hope the Christian Standard will give its readers my article. It will, if it is not afraid for its readers to see the truth.

We now come to Brother Murch’s article.

Since some writers in our brotherhood papers have intimated that I have neither convictions on the use of musical instruments in worship, nor regard for the authority of the Holy Scriptures, I wish to make this statement: I believe that the Bible is the divinely revealed and inspired Word of God, and that the New Testament is our rule of faith and practice in the church of Christ. We cannot hope for abiding unity unless we come together upon the Word of God.

I accept the second paragraph, in the above, as the absolute truth about the word of God, and as stating the only possible ground of Christian union—“Coming together upon the word of God.” As to the first paragraph, I believe the “writers in our brotherhood papers” who declare that I have no convictions on the use of musical instruments in worship are absolutely right, and I offer, as evidence, the following from Murch’s article.

It is my usual practice to worship with my brethren in Christ who sing with the aid of instruments of music. On occasion I worship with brethren who are opposed to such aids. I sincerely believe that brethren in both groups perform acceptable worship unto the Lord, and my conviction is based upon the teaching of the Word of God. If I should say, “it is my usual practice to attend prayer meetings; but upon occasions” I attend dances, the brethren would have a perfect right to say that I had no convictions in the matter, and it would not change the truth for me to declare, “I sincerely believe that brethren who do both are living acceptable lives before God.”

Brother Murch next declares:

A study of the Bible on this subject shows that worship in the Tabernacle, in the Temple and in the New Testament church was conducted both with and without musical instruments.

This is a bald assertion with no foundations of truth in it. Therefore Murch offered no Scripture to sustain it. Of course he knows some people do not know the difference between assertions and the truth. If “a study of the Bible” shows that worship in the New Testament church was conducted both with and without musical instruments, then that is the end of all controversy on that subject. But that “a study of the Bible” shows this, I deny in toto, and demand proof. And it will take more than the example of Jorgenson and the “Highlands” church of Louisville, Kentucky, to convince me.

The next paragraph from Brother Murch’s article follows:

In the Tabernacle, prior to David’s introduction of instruments of music, worship was acceptable to God. When they were introduced into the Tabernacle they were specifically called “musical instruments of God” (1 Chron. 16:42), indicating their acceptability.

Brother Murch is right when he says David introduced “instruments of music in the tabernacle worship.” Of course the tabernacle worship was acceptable to God, “prior to David’s introductions of instruments of music, because it was the worship God himself had prescribed. In Deuteronomy 31:19, God commanded Moses to write a song and teach it to the children of Israel. Singing therefore was commanded by God both in the tabernacle and temple worship. In 1 Chron. 23:5, we read: “And four thousand were door keepers: and four thousand praised Jehovah with the instrument with which I made, said David, to praise therewith.” David did not try to justify his introduction of musical instruments into the worship on the ground that they were aids to the singing, just as the song Moses wrote was an aid to the singing. He declared that he made them to praise Jehovah therewith. And no where in the Old Testament were the instruments of David ever said to be aids to the singing.

But Murch and his “group” claim that the instruments are aids to the singing just as song books are aids. The naked truth is, when you sing, and play an instrument of music, in the worship you are offering two kinds of music to God. If He commands one kind, and you offer two kinds, there is no question, or doubt, about your adding one kind. Read Amos 6:1-6, and see what God said about David’s instruments.

But we go on with Murch’s rambling.

When Solomon dedicated the Temple, 2 Chron. 7:6 says that “the priests waited upon their offices: the Levites also with instruments of music of the Lord, which David the king had made to praise the Lord, because his mercy endured forever, when David praised by their ministry.” Note again that musical instruments used in worship are specifically said to be “of the Lord.” The divine record further indicates that the Lord was pleased with worship. In this connection it may be observed that God would never approve that which is inherently wrong, immoral or degrading in worship.

The Psalms which were used in the praise services of the Temple are filled with references to singing both with and without musical instruments. A number of the references of both types are express commands which are understood to be given by inspiration of God.

Thus, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, we can say that the use of instrumental music in worship is Scriptural and acceptable to God.

The reader will notice that all the scriptures Brother Murch quotes from the Old Testament declare that David made the instruments to praise the Lord with; but no where declares that he made, and used instruments as aids to the singing. Therefore, when Murch and his “group”
use instruments of music only as aids to the singing they are not even operating under the Old Testament.

"The divine record further indicates that the Lord" tolerated many things under the old covenant that were not His will. He tolerated kings instead of judges; He tolerated the law of the land for any wrong that the instruments that David made to praise Him with. But "the divine record further indicates that the Lord" was pleased with none of those things. In Hosea 13:11, we read: "I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath." In Matt. 19:8, Jesus Christ said: "Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it hath not been so." In Amos 6:1-6, God pronounces a "woe" upon all who "invent for themselves instruments of music, like David." Brother Murch ought to know that God was tolerant with those people because they were living in the moonlight age of the world, and under a covenant dedicated with the blood of animals. The acme of Brother Murch's reasoning (?) is reached in the following: "In this connection it may be observed that God would never approve that which is inherently wrong, immoral or degrading in worship." Now Brother Murch, is there anything "inherently wrong, immoral or degrading" in water or milk? How about putting those things on the Lord's table, as aids to the "fruit of the vine"? Would that be a sin? Brother Murch also says: "A number of the references of both types are express commands which are understood to be given by inspiration of God." If "both types" of music, vocal and instrumental, were "commands of God" under the old covenant, then let Brother Murch and his "group" find "express commands of God" for "both types" under the New Covenant-that will end all controversy.

We now take up Murch's arguments (?) in the New Testament.

In the New Testament, we will readily agree, a new order was set up. The ritual and sacrifices of the temple were gradually displaced as no longer essential, though many of the Jewish disciples for any cause; He also tolerated the new order and the giving of thanks and holy submission in the fear of God. This is nowhere expressed in their writings. The writer of the Hebrew letter and other New Testament writers specifically mention certain temple rites, ceremonies and practices that are no longer effectual or that are superseded, but nowhere in this category is instrumental music mentioned. They continued to use the Psalms of the old order in distinctively Christian worship. Several of these Psalms specifically refer to the praise of God upon musical instruments. The use of instrumental music in New Testament worship was no more of an "innovation" to the early disciples than the use of prayers or the reading of the Old Testament Scriptures. It had been a practice common to their worship for centuries.

There are five outstanding Scriptures in the New Testament definitely mention the use of music in worship-Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; 1 Cor. 14:1-15; Rev. 14:1-5; and Rev. 15:1-4.

Let us examine each one carefully.

Eph. 5:19 is taken from a context concerned primarily with personal Christian conduct. The worship of the Christian assembly is not under discussion. The text deals with the acceptable worship of the individual Christian. The apostle is saying: "Let the husband go to his wife in harmony with God. The husband is to sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord," and is a phrase extracted from a sentence beginning with the eighteenth verse and closing with the ninth verse. The context of the sentence is contained in the words, "Be ye filled with the Spirit." The apostle Paul is saying in effect: Let your worship be the expression of a heart that is right with God. The methods of expression are Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing, and making melody in the heart, the giving of thanks and holy submission in the fear of God.

That portion of the passage which refers to music in worship mentions "psalms," with their references to instrumental music there, for its acme, psalmo, means "sing plucking the strings." Notice how the apostle is thus reminiscent of the temple praise services. These definite allusions to the customary use of instrumental music in worship leave the burden of proof resting on all those who insist that the use of instrumental music in worship in the New Testament order is sinful, and, therefore, unacceptable to God.

That this was the accepted meaning of the word when Paul wrote it is attested by over seventy Greek lexicons, including Trench, Strong, Woodehouse, Liddell and Scott, Thayer. Among the scores of other modern Greek scholars who are on record in agreement with this translation are: A. T. Robertson Richard T. Elliott, J. B. Rotherham, Benjamin W. Bacon, M. B. White, A. H. Cruikshank, I. P. Posegate, Max L. Margolis and Richard Gottheil, to say nothing of the ancients.

The primary emphasis here (as throughout the passage), is upon the spiritual aspect of worship. The singing to be acceptable, must involve "making melody in the heart to the Lord." The primary adoration is concerning the indwelling of the Word of Christ in the heart of the Christian. This indwells soul expresses itself in teaching and admonishing by means of Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs and in singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.

The primary admonition is concerning the indwelling of the Word of Christ in the heart of the Christian. This indwells soul expresses itself in teaching and admonishing by means of Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs and in singing with grace in the heart.

Outside the suggestion of the use of Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs for purposes of teaching and admonishing, the passage is almost identical with Eph. 5:19 and the observations concerning instrumental music and spiritual expression already given in that connection are applicable here. Those who hold that the passage eliminates instrumental music from worship must first prove their case.

First Corinthians 14 has definitely to do with the conduct of the Christian assembly. The primary question under discussion is the use of tongues in the assembly. In Paul's argument he is questioning their worth, unless they result in edification. Paul introduces musical instruments as a further proof of what he is saying: Verse 7, "And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harp-ed?" In Verse 9, he makes the application, "So likewise, ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?" A little later in the same discussion concerning the right to singing in worship when he says (V. 15), "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding." In mentioning pipes and harps he was referring to instruments commonly used in worship. The word "and," which introduces Verse 7, links it inseparably with the discussion of worship in the assembly.

In Revelation 14 and 15 we are given a picture of the New Testament church functioning as a perfect institution. We have sometimes differentiated between the church on earth and the church in heaven by designating the former "the church militant" and the latter "the church triumphant," but Scripturally speaking they are one and the same. If they are one, how can we have no hope of eternal life? The church in heaven is the perfection of all that Christians have striven for throughout the centuries in the church on earth. In Rev. 14:4-5, we are given the picture of the ultimate in church worship. There, to the accompaniment of "the voice of harpers, harping with their harps" the 144,000 "sang as it were a new song before the throne." "And in their mouth was found no guile: for they were without fault in the sight of God." Again in Rev. 14:1-4, "them that had gotten the victory over the beast...stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God (cf. 1 Chron. 16:42 and 2 Chron. 7:6)." And
they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb; . . ."
(See also Rev. 5:8-10.)

This we see that instrumental music, while neither Scripturally commanded to be used nor prohibited from use in
the New Testament, as it will be on the assembly of the saints, is Scripturally recognized as acceptable to God.
It may also be observed that there is nothing in the use of instrumental music in Christian worship which is
subversive of the gospel; no disloyalty to Christ, no substi-
tution of ordinances or no perversion of ideal worship in
spirit and in truth.

After all, the basic consideration in acceptable wor-
ship is not methods of worship or aids in worship, but rather the
spirit of worship.

When Christ had finished his immortal conversation with
the Samaritan woman at the well of Sychar, He said, “Woman,
believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither be
in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father
. . . but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true wor-
shippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.”

Then and to emphasize and elucidate He continued, “God
is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in
spirit and in truth” (John 4:19-24).

I doubt whether the brethren and the members of our homes or in
the public assembly of Christians, whether with instru-
ments of music or without them, we must have hearts attuned to God, and from their aepnts praise Him with the
mouth and sing a psalm in understanding Only God can de-
terminate whether their worship is acceptable. Let us, there-
fore, employ ourselves, not in vain discussions as to orders
and methods and aids, or the casting of brethren or various
minds or varying tastes and convictions, but rather, seek-
ing a closer walk with God, growing in grace and sub-
mittung ourselves one to another in the year of our
messied Master.

I want to go on record as saying that I would never
advocate the introduction of a musical instrument in a con-
gregation which was conscientiously opposed to its use. If
the enumeration 01 me instruments would bring peace to a
troubled congregation, I would advocate its removal. If ut-
terore, my mind is open to try any device that would use of
instrumental music in worship is sinful. If we were thus
convinced that it is sinful I would unhesitatingly give up
my present practice.

I am publishing all 01 brother Murch’s articles because
I am not afraid for the readers of ‘The Banner to sed
the arguments (?) the digressive measures for the use of
“instrumental music” or ala to their smsg. Again, since
brother Murch intimates, in the last two sentences of his
article, that he is an honest truth seeker in this mat-
ter, I want to make the following suggestions, and ask:
Would you be willing to debate the music question with
Brother E. Wallace, Jr., editor of the Bible Banner? I
ask this question, and making this suggestion, without the
knowledge or consent of Brother Wallace; but I know him well enough to believe that he would be glad to meet you in public debate any time or any-
where it can be properly arranged. It would be a great
opportunity for you to get your views on instrumental
music before the people. Just think what a great opportu-
nity you would have to bring all those “Greek Lexicons”
and show us what they teach on “instruments of music”
in the New Testament worship. As a gospel preacher, and
seeker after unity among God’s people, you cannot af-
ford to let such an opportunity pass. It would be interesting to
me to hear you tell about the kind of worship the
church will have in heaven. Therefore I shall look forward
with pleasure for a meeting and bringing you in the
truth as early as it can be arranged. Don’t disappoint me.
Of course you will have no fear of meeting, in discussion, the
editor of a paper that you declare to be on the “lunatic fringe” of
religious journalism.

I had become so enthusiastic over the possibility of
meeting, and hearing Brother Murch give, and defend, his
“views on instrumental music in worship,” I was about
to forget his article.

I believe it is absurd to say that “the Jewish disciples
under the new order continued to participate without re-
 buke from the apostles,” in the temple worship. If they
did, they worshiped with the Jews who believed Jesus
Christ was an imposter, they used instruments to praise Je-
hoovah with, not as aids to the singing, they burned in-
cense to Jehovah, and continued to observe the Pass-
over. That combination may suit Murch and his “group”;
but those who read papers on the “lunatic fringe” of
religious journalism & are those who read papers on the “lunatic fringe” of
religious journalism of re-
ligious journalsim and early Jewish disciples, did observe some of
the Jewish ordinances. They could circumcise their chil-
dren as a family mark; but the Gentile Christians could not circumcise theirs, because that would have brought them
under the law, and forced them to do what Brother Murch
says the Jewish disciples did, worship with the unbeliev-
ing Jews. They made and kept certain Jewish
vows; but that is a long way from saying they worshiped
with the unbelieving Jews.

Brother Murch says: “The worship of the Christian
assembly is not under discussion” in Eph. 5:19, and Col.
3:16. I would like to know how they could “speak one to
another,” if they were not assembled, as they were taught
to do in Eph. 5:19, or how could they “teach and ad-
monish one another,” as they were taught to do in Col.
3:16, if they were not assembled? Again if psallo means
“singing the strings,” as Brother Murch says it does, what kind of “strings” would we have to “pluck”
to obey the command? And how could we obey the com-
mand without “plucking the strings”? Brother Murch’s
“spiritual aspect” cannot do away with the “strings,” if
we have to “pluck” them. Brother Murch, are the “strings,”
we “pluck” in singing, the vocal cords? Or are they thefiddle and banjo kind? You must bring your strings,
and carpenter lines, along with all those “Greek Lexicons,”
to that debate. You will need them to lasso Wallace with.
He is from the West. If you tie him up, I feel sure we
will all want to change from the debates to the Murch-
Witty (?) unity meetings. If that should happen I
would want a front seat in your “panel discussions.”

Brother Murch says: “The use of instrumental music
in New Testament worship was no more of an “innova-
tion” to the early disciples than the use of prayers or
reading the Old Testament without the Old.” It is true that
a practice common to their worship for centuries.” All
you will have to do to see the fallacy in the above state-
mation, is just to substitute “burning incense” for “instru-
mental music.” Burning incense “had been a practice
common to their worship for centuries,” and it was au-
thorized by Jehovah, and not by David. Therefore, ac-
cording to Brother Murch’s logic (?) we have more authority
for burning incense in the worship than we do for the
use of instrumental music.

Referring to Eph. 5:19, Brother Murch says: “Those
who hold that the passage eliminates instrumental music
from worship must first prove their case.” Shades of
Aristotle! Just as well say: “Those who hold that”
Matt. 26:29 “eliminates” water or milk from the Lord’s
table “must first prove their case.” We can prove any-
thing to be acceptable to God by such fallacious reasoning.
I think Brother Murch knows this, and he was only ap-
plying to the cedulity of Witty’s “group” in their “panel
discussions.”

What Murch says about 1 Cor. 14:7, reminds me of
the Methodist who practice sprinkling for baptism; when
they find the word sprinkle, they shout here it is! So
Brother Murch found “pipe or harp,” in 1 Cor. 14:7, and
declares here are your instruments of music in the
workship! If he had quoted verse 6, he would have not
only found pipes and harps in his worship (?) but the trumpets
also. Get all these instruments in, Brother Murch, and you can prove the orchestras your “group” use in the worship are scriptural. At least you can say: “The burden of proof rests upon the other group” to show they are not scriptural, that might have some weight in your “panel discussions.”

Finally, I believe it is both unscriptural and unreasonable to say, “the church on earth, and the church in heaven, are one and the same.” If “the church” is in heaven, then all the faithful of the patriarchal age, all the faithful of the Jewish age, all the infants and idiots of all ages, as well as the baptized believers, must be in it. Whereas “the church on earth” is made up only of baptized believers. Therefore it is apart from the issue to talk about the worship of the church in heaven. Brother Murch knows as much about “the worship of the church in heaven” as I do, and that is absolutely nothing. Maybe he can talk better on those subjects than he can on other subjects.

ADVANCING BACKWARDS

(Continued from page 3)

churches is a begging of the question. We are not dictating to the churches when we protest that no congregation has any right to introduce an organ into its worship, in the absence of divine authority, and if it does so, it should be marked for what it is and loyal disciples of the Lord should be warned against it. When churches consider themselves “free” to act up contrary to the Scriptures, I for one am not willing to concede them immunity to either criticism or rebuke. They certainly have no claim to my “fellowship” or that of another congregation, if I or they, conscientiously believe them undeserving of it. We are “free” too. The more. I think of it, the more thoroughly convinced I am that a lot of this “unity” talk we are hearing and reading about is an effort to break down opposition to instrumental music in worship. Should the “fraternal gesture” Brother Lappin enthuses over “be oft repeated,” what will be the natural and inevitable result? Will churches that use the instruments give them up? Certainly not! Churches that do not use them will gradually, if not more quickly, conclude that they might as well have them too, if they want them which they probably will. The truth is that these gentlemen who are making “the fraternal gestures” are not as much opposed to the organ in worship as they ought to be, to give any sharp point to their opposition. The promoters of these “fraternal gestures” ought to be able to see this if they are not as dense in their upper ends as some of them are in their middles. I am convinced that the digressive side of this delightful “fellowship” does see it and are enjoying an internal elation as rapt as some old codger about to win a tight checker-game. I have no time for checker games with these gentlemen. I propose to shoot it out with them on the basis of what the New Testament teaches.-C. E. W.

FED UP ON IT

(Continued from page 1)

New Testament if I thought he were going to throw it in the waste-basket as soon as my back was turned and maybe while I was standing looking at him. There is another angle worth thinking about. Were I to invade a tract-infested community and wanted to do good and at the same time escape the odor of sectarian identification, I might turn the trick by giving some honest soul a New Testament, instead of another tract. Brethren should wisely use every effective means in getting the knowledge of the truth to as many of the wandering stars of current humanity as possible, but these fellows who do not miss an opportunity to brag on Adventists and Jehovah’s Witnesses and exhort us to imitate them, ought to change records.

A FALSE REPORT

CLED E. WALLACE

Dr. C. B. F. Young, of New York, Doctor of Philosophy, Electrometallurgist, and a few other things I do not care to mention just here, is circulating a false report on me. The good doctor must be a very busy man but he has found time to use the mails to inform various and sundry ones that he is “sincerely trying to be a Christian.” He has some “cold facts” which must be pretty hot stuff judging from what he claims for them. After all of the he-said, she-said, that occurred on the character of the editor of the Bible Banner. He wants everybody to know he has them for the glory of God. Since he is “sincerely trying to be a Christian” surely a feeling of personal resentment toward the editor because he has “felt the unmerited lash of his unscrupulous pen” can have nothing to do with the doctor’s activities along this line! The doctor may have something new in his files, but I doubt it. I do not want to cause the editor any undue embarrassment, but I’m inclined to challenge the doctor to bring on the hot stuff. We are pretty good when it comes to taking care of “cold facts.” That is one reason the doctor lost his job as president of the Christian Leader, after its subscription list “swunk up” to less than half the size of the Bible Banner.

But that is not what I started out to kick about. The doctor is circulating a false report on me that I cannot allow to go uncorrected. He says in a letter to the editor which has now become public property because he has circulated it all over the nation, he says, somewhat: “I understand that your earthly brother and my brother in Christ, Brother Cled, has his M.A. degree, and I am sure he appreciates it.” There is nothing to it and I'm not guilty as charged. I did hang around Baylor University for a few years and they finally bestowed upon me a Bachelor’s degree to get rid of me. Since I'm under pressure, I also admit that I visited the Expression Department often enough during those years that the authorities decided that I expressed myself well enough to justify them in granting me a diploma, I believe they called it. I humbly agreed with them and accepted it, and I think I still have it tucked around somewhere at home. I never carry it around. Even doctors can be quite human and a sense of glory of God. Since I’m under pressure, I also admit that I visited the Expression Department often enough during those years that the authorities decided that I expressed myself well enough to justify them in granting me a diploma, I believe they called it. I humbly agreed with them and accepted it, and I think I still have it tucked around somewhere at home. I never carry it around. I never carry it around. I never carry it around. I never carry it around.

I went into conference on the matter. The upshot of it was that we decided we’d rather have some more children than some more degrees and by the time I could have been finished I also. Get all these instruments in, Brother Murch, and you can prove the orchestras your “group” use in the worship are scriptural. At least you can say: “The burden of proof rests upon the other group” to show they are not scriptural, that might have some weight in your “panel discussions.”

Finally, I believe it is both unscriptural and unreasonable to say, “the church on earth, and the church in heaven, are one and the same.” If “the church” is in heaven, then all the faithful of the patriarchal age, all the faithful of the Jewish age, all the infants and idiots of all ages, as well as the baptized believers, must be in it. Whereas “the church on earth” is made up only of baptized believers. Therefore it is apart from the issue to talk about the worship of the church in heaven. Brother Murch knows as much about “the worship of the church in heaven” as I do, and that is absolutely nothing. Maybe he can talk better on those subjects than he can on other subjects.
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churches is a begging of the question. We are not dictating to the churches when we protest that no congregation has any right to introduce an organ into its worship, in the absence of divine authority, and if it does so, it should be marked for what it is and loyal disciples of the Lord should be warned against it. When churches consider themselves “free” to act up contrary to the Scriptures, I for one am not willing to concede them immunity to either criticism or rebuke. They certainly have no claim to my “fellowship” or that of another congregation, if I or they, conscientiously believe them undeserving of it. We are “free” too. The more. I think of it, the more thoroughly convinced I am that a lot of this “unity” talk we are hearing and reading about is an effort to break down opposition to instrumental music in worship. Should the “fraternal gesture” Brother Lappin enthuses over “be oft repeated,” what will be the natural and inevitable result? Will churches that use the instruments give them up? Certainly not! Churches that do not use them will gradually, if not more quickly, conclude that they might as well have them too, if they want them which they probably will. The truth is that these gentlemen who are making “the fraternal gestures” are not as much opposed to the organ in worship as they ought to be, to give any sharp point to their opposition. The promoters of these “fraternal gestures” ought to be able to see this if they are not as dense in their upper ends as some of them are in their middles. I am convinced that the digressive side of this delightful “fellowship” does see it and are enjoying an internal elation as rapt as some old codger about to win a tight checker-game. I have no time for checker games with these gentlemen. I propose to shoot it out with them on the basis of what the New Testament teaches.-C. E. W.
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New Testament if I thought he were going to throw it in the waste-basket as soon as my back was turned and maybe while I was standing looking at him. There is another angle worth thinking about. Were I to invade a tract-infested community and wanted to do good and at the same time escape the odor of sectarian identification, I might turn the trick by giving some honest soul a New Testament, instead of another tract. Brethren should wisely use every effective means in getting the knowledge of the truth to as many of the wandering stars of current humanity as possible, but these fellows who do not miss an opportunity to brag on Adventists and Jehovah’s Witnesses and exhort us to imitate them, ought to change records.
In a recent number of the Christian Standard Brother Murch states his "views on instrumental music in worship." He is advertised as the "literary editor" of the Standard Publishing Company. Also he is Brother Witty's co-worker in the Unity Movement.

This is the reason he gave for writing the article: Because "some writers in our brotherhood papers have intimated that I have neither convictions on the use of musical instruments in worship, nor regard for the authority of the Holy Scriptures:" Therefore he wrote in self-defense to let the readers of "our brotherhood papers" know he is not yielding one inch of ground to Witty and his crowd. It must be rather embarrassing to Brother Witty's "views" as written in the Standard. Brother Murch to come out so boldly on this matter while Witty is trying so hard to convince the brethren that he is making progress in his collaboration with Murch in the Unity Movement, unless he has passed the embarrassment stage.

Since the use of mechanical instruments is a matter of conviction with Murch, and since he has undertaken to defend his practice by argument, it seems to me that Brother Witty ought to ask for space in the Standard to reply to him. If the Standard will not give him the space, he should reply to Murch in the next unity meeting. Witty is half-owner of those unity meetings, and the brethren know he could reply to Murch if he wanted to. Why does he not do it? Are his views on instrumental music the same as Murch's? How can he expect any cooperation from Witty? He is half-owner of those unity meetings, and the brethren know he could reply to Murch if he wanted to. Why does he not do it? Are his views on instrumental music the same as Murch's? How can he expect any cooperation from Witty?

Brother Murch's "views" as written in the Standard are not arranged as systematically as one would expect a "literary editor" to arrange them, but I shall consider them in the order he gave.

In the Old Testament

1. He says that instrumental music in the tabernacle and temple was acceptable unto God. If that proves that such music is acceptable in Christian worship, it also proves that animal sacrifices and burning incense are acceptable in Christian worship, for both of these were in the tabernacle and temple worship.

2. He quotes a part of I Chron. 16:42 and II Chron. 7:6 to prove that the mechanical instruments in the Mosaic worship were "of the Lord." Under the old covenant they were "of the Lord" in the same sense that divorce and re-marriage (Deut. 24:1-3), polygamy (II Sam. 12:21), and the kingly government (I Sam. 8:22) were "of the Lord." God tolerated all these things under the law of Moses because of his great mercy and their hardness of heart, but he was never pleased with any of them and registered a protest against them all. That protest against the introduction of mechanical music under the law is recorded in Amos 6:5. In the very passage that Murch quotes to show that the instruments of music were "of the Lord" (II Chron. 7:6), God gave the reason why he tolerated such: "because his mercy endureth forever."—not because he was pleased with them any more than he was pleased with the kingly government and polygamy.

3. Again he says reference is made in the Psalms to instruments of music in the worship. The Psalms make reference to burning incensed and dancing. Why exclude that?

4. After his discussion of the instruments in the Old Testament, he concludes: "Thus, so far, as the Old Testament is concerned, we can say that the use of instrumental music in worship is scriptural and acceptable to God." Would it not be a little more "literary" for a "literary editor" to say in that sentence that "the use of instrumental music in worship was scriptural and acceptable to God," rather than is? Does the "literary editor" see any difference between is and was?

If all agreed (which I do not) that God had authorized specifically mechanical music under the law, that still would not be scriptural authority for its use in Christian worship; for as Murch says, "In the New Testament, we will readily agree, a new order was set up."

In the New Testament

In making his approach to a few passages in the New Testament, Brother Murch has this to say: "There are five outstanding Scriptures in the New Testament which definitely mention the use of music in worship—Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; I Cor. 14:14-15; Rev. 4:1-5, and Rev. 15:1-4.

These five passages are no more "outstanding" than some others which mention vocal music in worship, but since he bases his contention for the use of mechanical instruments in worship on these passages, I shall examine them one by one.

Eph. 5:19 — "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord."

Of course the reader can see that the English translation of this verse does not make even the remotest reference to mechanical instrumentation. But Brother Murch says that the Greek word psallo which appears in this verse means "sing plucking the strings"; that is, mechanical music inheres in the word psallo. Well, let's see about that.

1. About 150 men who represented the cream of the scholarship of their generations gave us the King James and Revised versions of the New Testament. There is nothing in either of these translations to indicate that the idea of mechanical instrumentation inheres in the word psallo. If playing on a mechanical instrument had been any part of the New Testament meaning of this word, these scholars would have so translated it in at least one of its five New Testament appearances, or would have merely Anglicized it. In all five passages where it occurs they translated it so as to carry no idea of mechanical instrumentation. Does the "literary editor" of the Standard think he knows more about the New Testament meaning of this Greek word than the 150 scholars mentioned?

2. No commandment of the New Testament can be obeyed short of any and every act that the meaning of that commandment requires. If instrumental music inheres in the word psallo, we cannot psallein without such
music. But Brother Murch admitted in the outset of his article that one could worship God acceptably without mechanical instrumentation. Even a tyro in logic, much less a “literary editor,” ought to be able to see the inconsistency between his admission that he can worship “without” the instruments and his claim that such instruments inhere in the term “psallo.”

3. That the word “psallo” as used by, the apostle, primarily means to pluck, or cause to vibrate, is admitted by all. But the point of the controversy is: What is to be plucked or caused to vibrate? and how is the melody to be made? The verse under consideration plainly states that the “heart” is the instrument to be plucked or caused to vibrate; that the “heart” is the instrument of melody. This verse also says that the vibration or melody is to be created in the heart by speaking in songs, or singing. Therefore by God’s law of exclusion this melody cannot be made in the human heart, except by singing. Every kind of music, except singing, in which the heart is plucked or caused to vibrate, is excluded from the worship by the same law. God said psallo—make that melody by speaking in song. Read the verse again, Brother Murch, please.

Col. 3:16. He quotes this verse and says that all he said about Eph. 5:19 is also applicable here. Well, I hardly think so. Because the verb “psallo” does not appear in this verse. The noun “psalmos,” meaning psalm, appears, but not “psallo.” I wonder if the “literary editor” knows the difference. If Murch will read this verse carefully, I think he will be able to see that the purpose of this music is to teach and admonish one another in the word of Christ. Just how a man could do that on a fiddle would be difficult to explain. What fact or warning or command or promise of the gospel can any man learn on a fiddle or horn or organ? I can understand how a man can be taught and admonished by the words of a song, but I do not understand how anyone can be taught the word of Christ by the tones of a pipe organ. And that is exactly what Paul emphasizes in the next “outstanding Scripture”: notice it.

I Cor. 14:7-9. “And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction upon the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.”

It would not be charitable for me to express my opinion of a “literary editor” who does not know any better than to try to use this passage in defense of mechanical music in worship. How, on earth did Murch get that job as “literary editor” of the Standard Publishing Company? In this passage Paul is forbidding their speaking words in a tongue or language that could not be understood, and he uses the sound of pipe and harp as an illustration to show how silly and useless it is to speak in a tongue when nobody knows what is spoken. He opposed “tongues” at Corinth on the ground that the “words” could not be understood; he would not even sing in a language in which the words could not be understood (v. 15). Can a “pipe or harp” speak “words easy to be understood”? The same objection that Paul raised against “tongues” can be raised against “pipe or harp”; neither could utter “words easy to be understood.” The Scriptures demand that there be “teaching” in the music authorized for the church (Col. 3:16). When Murch becomes able to teach the plan of salvation or any other gospel truth on a “pipe or harp,” or when he can make a fiddle talk and speak “words easy to be understood,” then there will be some sense in his “pipe or harp” argument. I wish he would name one gospel truth that he or anyone else ever learned on a “pipe or harp.”

Rev. 14:1-5; 15:1-4. Murch concludes from these passages in Revelation that there are harps in heaven, and his point is that it is right to use them in worship today because heaven contains “the ultimate in church worship.”

In the symbolic expressions of the book of Revelation several things are said to be in heaven, which Brother Murch would hardly indorse in church worship. Seven lamps of fire burning (Rev. 4:5). Is that a “heavenly picture of the ultimate in church worship”? Should we return to the lighting of lamps and burning of candles? Golden bowls full of incense (Rev. 5:8). Should we burn incense in church worship? Bowls of wrath poured out on the earth (Rev. 15:7). Does Brother Murch advocate pouring a few of these bowls of wrath out of the church on to the earth now?

Murch closes his article with this statement: “My mind is open to any Bible proof that the use of instrumental music in worship is sinful. If I were thus convinced that it is sinful I would unhesitatingly give up my present practice.” If Brother Witty believes it is sinful, and if he believes Murch is sincere in the statement, it is his duty at the next opportunity to try his dead level best to show Murch that it is sinful. Will he do it in the next unity meeting? Will he ever reply to Murch’s article? We shall wait and see. If he does not believe that Murch is sincere in the statement, then he has no business hobnobbing with him any longer.

I cannot understand why a man as open-minded to any Bible proof, as Murch claims to be, is unwilling to discuss the issue in public and orderly debate with an opponent present to show him the mistakes in his reasoning. He will debate the question when no opponent is present, but he will not debate the same question when there is anybody around with an opportunity to reply to him; and yet he claims that his “mind is open.” That is strange.

THE ROBERTS-WALKER DEBATE

The debate came as result of a challenge by Mr. Walker (Seventh Day Church of God—so called). The Canon City congregation accepted the challenge and secured Luther G. Roberts, of Amarillo, Texas, to do the work. Mr. Walker affirmed that we are to keep the Seventh day Sabbath, and the last two nights Mr. Roberts affirmed that we are to meet on the first day, the Lord’s Day, to observe the Lord’s Supper.

Mr. Walker made about the usual arguments, and did about as well as most of them do. This was Brother Roberts’ first debate, though Walker said he did not believe it. Brother Roberts did a very splendid work, and the church was more than pleased with his defense of the truth. He was well prepared to meet every question raised by Mr. Walker. Truth will never suffer in Brother Roberts’ trust. The small congregation in Canon City has been strengthened by this work. M. C. Cuthbertson.
AM I A PASTOR?
- LUTHER G. ROBERTA
(Amarillo, Texas)

Much is being written just at the present about the "pastor system." Statements are made such as the following: "Many of these gentlemen are typical modern, not-ancient, pastors"; "These modern pastors are job hunters and job holders; they do not 'labor with their hands, like Paul did'"; "Not every preacher, however, located with a church is a pastor, modern or ancient." These statements are from an article by Brother L. L. Brigance in the Gospel Advocate, July 24, 1941. Brother Brigance is a good writer, and a good man, sound in the faith, and a good friend of mine. I liked him while attending his classes, and I still like him. But why does not Brother Brigance, or someone else; tell us who is the modern pastor, and who is the Paul-like preacher. Does one have to make tents at a place where he, preaches, to scripturally preach for a church for some length of time, or may he be Scriptural in his work, and not work with his hands, manual labor, while preaching for a congregation three or more years? Paul was not a pastor, though he preached for a church some years regularly, because he worked with his hands between sermons. Is a preacher a pastor because he preaches for a church on Sunday, and teaches, and does other work for the interest of the church through the week, though he does not do manual labor?

Brother Brigance describes some of the things connected with my life while I am working with a church full time, though I am not doing manual labor. I get my hair cut about every other week. I use some oil to keep my hair in place. I shine my shoes, as I was taught in Freed-Hardeman College to do, before I get up to preach on Sunday mornings. I have my clothes cleaned and pressed. I try to wear ties and socks that are neat and clean. The color of the clothes I wear is not gaudy, but usually of some shade of blue or gray. Does this make a man a "pastor"? Then Brother Brigance and other teachers in Freed-Hardeman College are preacher pastors, for I know that they wear such clothes, and are usually well-groomed, and have nice homes with modern conveniences. I heard Brother Brigance say that he could not sleep well at night if his shoes were not placed side by side in order before he retires. Too "meticulous"? Not in a school teacher; if done by a preacher, preaching for a church every Lord's day, it is?

I live in a nice, but not luxurious home, with modern conveniences, electric lights, fan, radio, gas stove, telephone, floor lamp, etc. Delivered at our doors are the morning and afternoon papers; also delivered by mail are six or eight gospel papers, and some literature urging me to recommend to students various colleges supported by the brethren, where some of our preachers make tents to preach the gospel. Milk is delivered to our house. When my wife does not do our washing we take it out to be washed, and bring it home, to be ironed. We wear our clothes ironed, my suits are cleaned and pressed "cash and carry," as I buy groceries except when some "traveling preacher," who does not do work with his hands for his meals, chances to drop in, and we call the grocer to deliver some extras for the travelling preacher visitor. I ride about a town of 54,000 population in a car. A brother, without my request, keeps it washed. He was a Baptist when I moved here, and I have baptized him. I visit the sick, in homes and hospitals. I visit indifferent members, prospective members, and new members of the church who have moved to town. I preach many funerals, and circule many miles to and from cemeteries several miles from down town. Occasionally I go to the mountains for a week or two, on a vacation; and usually preach on Sun-days for some small congregation, like teachers in colleges do every Sunday. Then sometimes I get time off, with the assistance of college presidents, to visit the colleges and get the benefit, graciously given, of lectures and classes, and am entertained in nice homes, with modern conveniences, of the teachers and one time in the home of the president of the school. Does this make me a pastor?

Is it right for a travelling evangelist (or a college teacher-preacher) to be well groomed, have their suits pressed, shoes shined, live in nice homes with modern conveniences, but if a local evangelist does the same thing it is wrong and makes him a modern pastor? We should, at least, be fair.

Our services on Sundays are as follows: Radio program of fifteen minutes from 9:15 to 9:30; classes at 9:45; 10:45 a.m., the song service; the sermon from 11:15 to 11:50, I gain help from other men through their writings, just like I gained some help from attending classes in school, where the teachers taught with "help gleaned from the works of far abler and more industrious men," such as Campbell, Lipscomb, McGarvey, and others. On Sunday evenings, the preacher usually teaches a class for young people, and preaches immediately following. I usually preach forty-five minutes, some would like shorter sermons. Through the week from one to three classes are taught in the Bible, besides personal teaching that is done.

Now to the question: What is wrong with any or all of this? Is it wrong, and does it make one a pastor? I can tell you where some of us learned that it was Scriptural to do such work: It was at Harderman, Abilene Christian, and David Lipscomb colleges. If it is wrong for preachers to locate with a church and do this work, is it not wrong to prepare them for such work in the Bible colleges?

It seems that Brother Rowe, whom Brother Brigance quoted, was placing the blame on the colleges, acting as incubators to turn out the preachers prepared to take over the churches. He says, "Colleges sprung up in every direction; teachers by scores, rushed to the colleges; in a short time hundreds of pastors, without age or experience" were turned out. If there is blame to be placed on the preachers for taking to the churches, is there no blame, no censure to be borne by the colleges who turned them out with "the diploma in hand for the most inviting churches"?

I agree with what Brethren Brigance and Goodpasture say about the preacher who "takes charge of the congregation to run it-elders, deacons, and members— as it pleases and profits him," that he is a hireling, a usurer, and should be disciplined. There may be some of this type, but the things described in some of the articles do not make a person a pastor, nor even a preacher. There are abuses and misuses of the work God has given preachers, and elders, and others to do. Shall we advocate discontinuing a Scriptural work on account of such abuses?

There is too much of fighting the straw-man, and beclouding of the issue in the things that are being said and written on "The Pastor System." Why not be specific so that the teaching will benefit the churches, if it does not help the preachers. But to teach against a thing that all churches and preachers deny practicing is not going to help anybody.
DEALING IN PERSONALITIES

CLED E. WALLACE

While I was in Barrackville, W. Va., my friend, and also a friend of the Bible Banner and its editor, Dr. J. S. Church, came over to see me from nunured, W. Va. Dr. Church is a dentist and a good one. Some years ago when I was in a meeting in Hundred, his home was mine for the duration of the meeting. I finds time to cultivate an active interest in the church and its work. He buys books which are considered of most interest to preachers and he reads them and keeps informed on matters affecting the cause of Christ. He is also a good song leader. It would be a fine thing if more men in the church would inform themselves as Mr. Church has done. A little, or more, of that sort of information is badly needed in many places. He likes to have preachers around, at least some of them, and possibly that is one reason that some of us like him. While I was in Barrackville, there were several other preachers shelling the woods and towns thereabouts.

One day Dr. Church and his wife, as good a woman as he is a man if not better, invited a bunch of us over for lunch. The guests included W. H. Bankes, his son Walter, Fred Dennis, Oliver Johnson, Chester Gray, and Herman Trueax. These men are well-liked and doing a lot of good in that part of the vineyard. They even looked good to me across Sister Church's big dining room table. I don't think I said one harsh word on the whole visit. And I don't think even Grover Brewer could have found any fault with the coffee.

Brother J. F. Ice lives at Barrackville. He has suffered a severe physical ailment since he was fifteen years of age but has managed to live to the ripe age of seventy-three inspite of great suffering. He has reared a family, they are acquaintances generally, it might improve their manners some-

And I do not think even Grover Brewer could have found any fault with the coffee.
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In The New Millennial Harbinger, edited by Bro. Claud F. Witty, a serial—"Bow Denominationalism Was Doomed In One Town"—written by Bro. Benjamin Franklin, who died more than sixty years ago, is being reprinted. The fact that it comes from that great writer and preacher guarantees it to be an interesting series. I have read and enjoyed the first installment, which is but an introduction to what is to follow. But the preliminaries revealed in the first article tell us that the members of various churches in a certain town—the town of Unity—decided to do something about denominational division. So they had a meeting. I suppose we might call it a "Unity Meeting"—and decided to do something about it. Their decision and course, however, were entirely different from the course followed in the more recent "Unity Meetings" that have been stayed by Claud F. Witty of the church of Christ and James DeForest Murch of the Christian Church.

In the unity meeting of Franklin's serial, the member of various churches deplored the divided state in their town. They lamented not only the unnecessary expense of maintaining so many different meeting houses but also the many evils that grew out of such a denominational set up. After views regarding the matter had been exchanged, they passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That after the first day of January, 1853, we will not contribute one farthing to the support of our respective ministers, till they determine the Scriptural basis of Christian union, that may unite upon it themselves and ourselves with them; after which, we will support one of their number as our pastor, and send the other five to preach Christian union so far as they are able, to all the children of God throughout the world, and sell the five surplus meeting-houses, and appropriate the proceeds to the support of our poor brethren."

This serial by Benjamin Franklin, for which this resolution formed the background, is being printed in The New Millennial Harbinger with editorial endorsement. Concerning this serial, Bro. Witty says editorially:

"Just imagine all the preachers in a town being told that they must get together and agree on a Scriptural basis of Christian unity or starve. How they fuss and fume, threaten and complain, but it does them no good. The churches all stand firm. Everytime the preachers try to get their congregations to relent and restore their salary, they are told that there is just one way to get back on the payroll. Find the Scriptural basis for a United Church. Week after week the preachers meet and try to melt their denominational names and creeds into a New Testament Church: but it cannot be done. At last they see the light, and cheerfully give up all that is peculiar to their respective denominations and become one in Christ."

So Bro. Witty finds the experiment very interesting. And since he has thus given editorial indorsement to the serial, it has touched the spring of my curiosity and started me to wondering. Another Unity Movement is now in progress. Bro. Claud F. Witty of the church of Christ and James DeForest Murch of the Christian Church are the promoters of it. Instead of involving a few weeks, it has involved several years. Four National Unity Meetings have been held in various sections of the United States. What has been the purpose of these Unity Meetings? To unite the two bodies known as the Church of Christ and the Christian Church. What progress has been made? Not even the men who are promoting it have been able to reach unity. As far as we know, Witty and Murch are as far apart after four National Unity Meetings and several years as they were before the movement started. If they are any closer to each other, we have no list of the things on either side that have been given up. But what I am wondering about is this: Why not try the plan in Franklin's Serial on Murch and Witty? Since Witty has indorsed it editorially, he should be willing to have it tried out on him. And, personally, I have an idea that results would occur before the passing of a few more years and a few more National Unity Meetings. Let the congregation for which Murch preaches and the congregation for which Witty preaches resolve that "they will not contribute one farthing to the support of their respective ministers, till they determine the Scriptural basis of unity and unite upon it themselves." Paraphrasing the statement of Bro. Witty: "Just imagine Murch and Witty being told they must get together and agree on a Scriptural basis of Christian Unity or starve." There might be some more fussing, fuming, threatening and complaining, but if their congregations would do that and "stand pat," they might get some results. Perhaps the preachers would "try to get their congregations to relent and restore their salary," but let them be told that "there is just one way to get back on the payroll," and that is to reach unity themselves on a Scriptural basis, that others may do likewise. I wonder how long it would take Murch and Witty to get together.

If this plan worked successfully on preachers of various churches in the town of Unity, it has possibilities if tried out on Murch and Witty. And if Bro. Witty can indorse the plan for the solution of division among various denominations, and he has done so, why does he not suggest it to the congregations for which he and Murch preach? Bro. Witty, will you propose this plan to the congregation for which you preach? Will you suggest to Murch that he propose it to the church for which he preaches? Let us know what you think of this plan. Perhaps it would be a good thing to give some consideration of this in one of the unity numbers of the Harbinger. I await with interest the reaction of Bro. Witty to the plan he has indorsed. I hope my curiosity doesn't kill me while I am waiting.
WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., October 14, 1941, The Bible Banner, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dear Brethren:

The statement below, headed: "Winston-Salem, N. C." appeared in the Christian Ledger, September 16th; and since it is so misleading, our brethren, of Goldfloss Street Church here in Winston-Salem, decided that we were entitled to space in the same paper, to refute such a glaring misrepresentation of facts. So, we sent a statement to Brother Rowe, and asked that he print it; but notwithstanding we have written him several times, he has failed, so far, to grant our request.

We therefore will appreciate your printing this brief note in the Bible Banner and follow it with the statement he printed for the faction now meeting at the Y. M. C. A.; and following that, print the statement we sent, in order that the public may not be misled.

It will be noted that our statement is signed by five of us who have been leaders in our assembly for several years.

Fraternally, Jno. W. Kurfees.

September 16.

"Winston-Salem, N. C."

There are 20 or 25 members meeting in a class room of the Y. M. C. A. Brother Winston W. Tyues preaches for the church here; he preaches for Statesville and Warner's Chapel every other Sunday and Warner's Chapel is 20 miles from Winston-Salem. The Sunday he preaches for them, he preaches at 9:30 for Winston-Salem and then goes on--out of town gives his services free and will preach a radio sermon. He also teaches the Bible class every Wednesday afternoon. These brethren need help to meet the radio cost. The leader of this new work is H. L. Knight of 2641 Peachtree Street, Winston-Salem, to whom help may be sent for the radio work.

Brother Tyues is a graduate of Freed-Hardeman College. In a short meeting for this group, held last summer, he baptized nine. The brethren hold him in highest esteem as one who is out for the good he can do.

Winston-Salem, N. C., September 23, 1941, Editor, Christian Ledger, 434 Elm Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dear Sir:

In your issue of September 16 we notice a statement headed "Winston-Salem, N. C."

Since this statement contains such a glaring misrepresentation of facts, that it is due the public, and especially due our loyal brethren here in Winston-Salem, that a correction be made in your columns.

Therefore, we, the undersigned leaders in our congregation, respectfully request that you give the following correction the same prominence in your paper, that you gave the statement referred to.

In the first place we have a loyal congregation of brethren, with four men, who met in a meeting house of our own at '719 Goldfloss Street.

During 1940 we engaged the services of Winston W. Tyues, of Belle, Mo. He came and preached for us once a month, and held one series of meetings.

We kept him nearly one year, when we decided that, because of certain circumstances, it would be best to let him go.

So notwithstanding, nothing had been said as to how long he was to be with us, the leaders in our assembly decided that he only lacked two months of having been with us a year, we would pay him up for the entire year, and dismiss him, as we did.

Because of this dismissal, a few of our members became dissatisfied, formed themselves into a faction and because they could not dictate how things should be carried on in our assembly, they went out from us, and began meeting at the Y. M. C. A.

The writer of the statement, to which this is a reply, says, in speaking of the man Tyues: "In a short meeting for services at another place, and in which nine were baptized, was held in our meeting house on Goldfloss Street, in the summer of 1940, while he was preaching for us."

Furthermore, the statement that Winston W. Tyues is a "graduate of Freed-Hardeman College" is also untrue; and if anyone wishes to verify this statement, we respectfully refer them to N. B. Hardeman, Henderson, Tenn.


WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., July 10, 1941, Mr. Winston W. Tyues, Clermontos, N. C.

Dear Bro. Tyues:

As one of the principal leaders in Goldfloss Street Church, for a number of years, it is my judgment that a few things need to be said. I shall endeavor now to say: and I trust you will give them serious consideration.

Our congregation was moving on in 'a most excellent way, fully united, and the spirit of brotherly love was manifested on every side in our years.

But, unfortunately, some people came among us who proved to be trouble makers, instead of peace lovers.

Then it was that trouble began. They began to criticize the leading brethren of this work, and the other of our affairs. They did not charge us with doing anything unscriptural in our work and worship; but began to complain at our humble circumstances and to make light of our location and church building, etc.

You, of course, remember how all this kind of talk went on for a time, while we were explaining to them that we were doing the best we could, considering our financial circumstances; and that we hoped some day to have a better location, but not at that time, but for other quarters; neither did we approve of begging others to assist us, when we could meet there and worship God in a manner acceptable to Him.

Well, you have to remember, all this criticizing continued, and grew worse and worse, until finally a faction began to develop in our midst.

You will also remember talking this all over with myself and family, in our home, and that there in the presence of us all you held us, your hand and solemnly vowed that you would not take sides in a church "fuss," as you termed it. You said: "I'll leave first. I will not take sides in such a case."

You did all this, too, of your own accord and not at the suggestion of any one.

Not only did you make that solemn pledge in the presence of myself and family, but Sister Addie Darnell says she made the same declaration to her and family, in their home.

But, notwithstanding, you had pledged yourself not to take sides in such case, you did take sides with the faction, even going so far as to promise to preach a sermon for them in defense of certain things they were clamoring for.

Thus, your taking sides with, and upholding a faction, the very thing you had solemnly declared you would not do, is, as you will know, the reason for your dismissal from our congregation, as our preacher.

The four men, who had been appointed to look after the business affairs of our congregation, discussed the matter among themselves, and decided that, under all the circumstances, the best course to pursue would be to pay you up in full for the year, which they did, and let you go; thinking that by so doing they might prevent division in the church.

But, lo! to their surprise, and the surprise of us all, you held us, your hand and solemnly vowed that you would not take sides in a church "fuss," as you termed it. You said: "I'll leave first. I will not take sides in such a case."

You did all this, too, of your own accord and not at the suggestion of any one.

Not only did you make that solemn pledge in the presence of myself and family, but Sister Addie Darnell says she made the same declaration to her and family, in their home.

But, notwithstanding, you had pledged yourself not to take sides in such case, you did take sides with the faction, even going so far as to promise to preach a sermon for them in defense of certain things they were clamoring for.

Thus, your taking sides with, and upholding a faction, the very thing you had solemnly declared you would not do, is, as you will know, the reason for your dismissal from our congregation, as our preacher.

The four men, who had been appointed to look after the business affairs of our congregation, discussed the matter among themselves, and decided that, under all the circumstances, the best course to pursue would be to pay you up in full for the year, which they did, and let you go; thinking that by so doing they might prevent division in the church.

But, lo! to their surprise, and the surprise of us all, with your continued assistance, the faction grew and multiplied; and finally decided to deliberately divide the body of Christ, which for years had loved and labored together at 719 Goldfloss Street, converting and baptizing more people than any other loyal congregation in one hundred miles of our place.

Yes, the faction withdrew and we learn they are now meeting for services at another place; and, behold, we are informed that you are preaching for them.

As one of the principal leaders in Goldfloss Street Church, for a number of years, it is my judgment that a few things need to be said. I shall endeavor now to say: and I trust you will give them serious consideration.

Our congregation was moving on in 'a most excellent way, fully united, and the spirit of brotherly love was manifested on every side in our years.

But, unfortunately, some people came among us who proved to be trouble makers, instead of peace lovers.

Then it was that trouble began. They began to criticize the leading brethren of this work, and the other of our affairs. They did not charge us with doing anything unscriptural in our work and worship; but began to complain at our humble circumstances and to make light of our location and church building, etc.

You, of course, remember how all this kind of talk went on for a time, while we were explaining to them that we were doing the best we could, considering our financial circumstances; and that we hoped some day to have a better location, but not at that time, but for other quarters; neither did we approve of begging others to assist us, when we could meet there and worship God in a manner acceptable to Him.

Well, you have to remember, all this criticizing continued, and grew worse and worse, until finally a faction began to develop in our midst.

You will also remember talking this all over with myself and family, in our home, and that there in the presence of us all you held us, your hand and solemnly vowed that you would not take sides in a church "fuss," as you termed it. You said: "I'll leave first. I will not take sides in such a case."
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But, lo! to their surprise, and the surprise of us all, with your continued assistance, the faction grew and multiplied; and finally decided to deliberately divide the body of Christ, which for years had loved and labored together at 719 Goldfloss Street, converting and baptizing more people than any other loyal congregation in one hundred miles of our place.

Yes, the faction withdrew and we learn they are now meeting for services at another place; and, behold, we are informed that you are preaching for them.

As one of the principal leaders in Goldfloss Street Church, for a number of years, it is my judgment that a few things need to be said. I shall endeavor now to say: and I trust you will give them serious consideration.
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ed; and you my brother, will have to answer to the Lord for the course you are pursuing.

If you have the cause of Christ at heart, you should at once, right-about-face, and say to those brethren "You have pursued a wrong course;" and so have I by encouraging you: and I now advise each of you to return to Goldfloss Street Church, and ask its forgiveness for what you have done; and may God forgive each of us, is my prayer.

If you will act as a Christian should and give them that kind of advice, Goldfloss Street Church, I feel sure, will forgive both you and them; and we will ask the Lord to do likewise.

No other course, on either your part or theirs, will meet God's approval: if the Bible means what it says. I have talked with a number of our brethren, and feel sure I have expressed the sentiment of all. I wanted you to know our feeling about these things, and I want all those brethren who left us to know also; and I shall, Lord willing, furnish them a copy of this letter.

I shall be glad to hear from you regarding these matters.

Sincerely and fraternally, Jno. W. Kurfees.

Clemmons, N. C., July 14, 1941.

Dear Bro. Kurfees:

I am willing and feel sure that the other brethren will be glad to meet with you and discuss our differences. Two rules should govern.

1. That all things be done in love.
2. Let all things be done in decency and order.

(Signed) Winston W. Tynes.

Winston-Salem, N. C., July 18, 1941, Mr. Winston W. Tynes, R. F. D., Clemmons, N. C.

Dear Bro. Tynes:

Yours of the 14th is received. I note you say: "I am willing and I feel sure that the other brethren will be glad to meet with you, and discuss our differences." To what "differences" do you have a reference? I said nothing about "differences" in my letter to you.

I made certain charges against you, in my former letter, and it is entirely up to you to acknowledge or deny said charges.

If you acknowledge them, all well, and good. (An honest confession is good for the soul.)

But, if you desire to deny said charges, and wish to make your denial before an audience at Goldfloss Street Church, I shall be glad to face you there, and prove by honorable witnesses, every charge I have made against you.

However, it is my sincere desire and wayer, that you act in this matter, so as to set yourself right with God, and the whole church at Goldfloss Street.

I know of no better plan than the one I suggested in my former letter; namely: Go to each member, who "went out from us," and acknowledge your mistake, giving them the advice I suggested.

Of course, I know it will be humiliating, to some extent, for you to do this, but you should not let that deter you from pursuing the right course.

You are a young man, with your life before you; and if you wish to succeed as a true gospel preacher, you should, at all times, acknowledge mistakes and rectify them so far as possible.

This is the only course that will be well pleasing to God.

I am an old man now. My race is nearly run; and I assure you that I have no other motive, in advising you to pursue the course I have outlined, except for your own good; and to restore the unity for which Christ so earnestly prayed, and which had prevailed for years in the church at Goldfloss Street.

Praying that you may act wisely in this matter; and that God may over-rule it all to His own glory.

Shall be glad to hear your decision.

Sincerely, your brother, Jno. W. Kurfees.

After all of these events and correspondence the following report appeared in the Christian Ledger Oct. 28, 1941:

"Winston-Salem, North Carolina"

"Different brethren and sisters came into the city from different parts of the country, and after diligent search located a congregation meeting in the outskirts of the city where they worshipped for a time; but seeing the great need of making efforts to carry the message to other parts of the city, deemed it wise to begin work in another locality to build up an influence so as to carry the message of life to as many as possible. This being the purpose, there was no factious feeling whatever toward the old congregation. When they saw the great need, they secured the use of a room at the Y. M. C. A., in which to meet as a center whence the influence could go out into other parts of the city. This was without any intention whatever of hindering the work in any way in any locality. They will be most happy to cooperate with other brethren to spread the pure gospel in this city of 80,000 people."

The above report attempts to leave the impression on the public that there is no division, but the facts are that there is a division, caused by this faction and was led by the young preacher. These facts are being published that the truth may be known to all the brethren.
JORGENSON-LAPPIN UNITY

(C. A. Taylor, Louisville, Ky.)

Last night I talked with George Roehrs, who is, and for 25 years has been, a member of the Highland Church of Christ, Louisville and he says that he heard S. S. Lappin extend “the invitation,” during his meeting at the Highland church, and that Lappin stated that those who were invited to come forward, should and could choose which congregation they preferred, either the Highland congregation or Bro. Swann’s congregation. Bro. Swann is the “pastor” at the Edenside Christian church located about 3 blocks from the Highland meeting house. There can be no doubt about this matter for George Roehrs is dependable.

George used to be faithful and did not approve the 1918 withdrawal, but now says he approved having Lappin hold their meeting. I am now convinced that the Highland congregation has departed, or soon will depart, fully from the faith.

PREMILLENNIUM PARADOXES

TED W. McELROY

Although I am just a tender youth (at least my age and feet are tender), I am considering (not seriously) compiling a book. I am going to give this book the title “Paradoxes.” and use as material the millenary writings of Brother Charles Roberson, of Abilene. I could begin with a quotation. from his book, which he staved “What Jesus Taught,” but Jesus didn’t teach all of it. In that book brother Roberson wrote on the subject of the millennium; and what he wrote. he finally admitted was “susceptible of being interpreted” to teach the false doctrine of premillennialism. Brother Wallace sagaciously remarked that it “was not susceptible of any other interpretation,” and I will just say that it was the premillennialism heresy with or without interpretation, either way you prefer to take it.

Since it has been pointed out that he had taught the false theory in his book, brother Roberson has gone on many excursions on the subject. each time giving it a new twist. On each excursion he presents a new “paradox,” and if he continues maybe I’ll have to use several volumes to give a complete view of his contradictions. He is always trying to fix up what he said in his book, without admitting he was wrong when he wrote it. He appears to want to put the blame for his mistake upon his readers, indicating from time to time that their powers of interpretation were out of line.

Another thing that has me baffled, is the use of the words premillennialism and millennial etc., the fact is that the word changes its form so much and so rapidly, that I am always fearful of using an obsolete form. The only thing stable about the word seems to be the “mill” part, and every one knows by this time that there is nothing stable about the doctrine. Brother Roberson has worked on the “mill,” he has prefixed, suffixed, affixed, and never quite fixed, the “mill” with Greek, Latin, English, and now he is trying history. He reminds me of the proverbial bee in the tar bucket, the more he wiggles the worse his predicament. Why doesn’t he quit wiggling and just say: “brethren I was wrong about the “mill” when I wrote my book, but I know better now.”
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Old Testament Studies

Contains Twenty-Six Lessons In The Old Testament, Prepared For Use In All Bible Classes And Home Study

Is the Old Testament hard for you to understand? When using a course of study too hard for the average student, it is difficult to build up class attendance and interest. These lessons are not difficult to understand. They are designed to make it easier for the student to acquire a knowledge of the events of the Old Testament, and to remember the things "written for our admonition."

A short historical background is given at the beginning of each lesson, followed by a series of questions with the Scripture reference for the answer after each question. The answers to the questions are found in the Bible; it is strictly a study of the Bible.

Many of the questions are worded so as to give information in addition to that called for in the questions. For example the following question is taken from one of the lessons:

6. How was Gideon's army of thirty-two thousand men reduced to three hundred?

Ans. Judg. 7:27

Notice that the question itself reveals three things: (1) that Gideon was the leader of this army; (2) that he originally had thirty-two thousand men; (3) that his army has reduced to three hundred men. Then the Scripture reference tells how it was reduced. This is a valuable feature; it saves time for both pupil and teacher; it makes the answer easier to remember because the question itself carries a part of the information found in the answer to the question. Thus many of the questions are instructive as well as the answers.

New Testament Studies

Contains Twenty-Six Lessons In The Life Of Christ-And New Testament History, Prepared For Use In All Bible Classes And Home Study

Some have attended weekly Bible classes for years and still do not have a very thorough knowledge of the consecutive events in the life of Christ and the history of the early church. This is often due to the poor arrangement of the lessons in the outline used. Why continue to use a course of study that helps so little? These lessons make it easier for one to learn and to remember the greatest and most important events of all history.

Each lesson contains an explanatory background and a series of questions. A Scripture reference for the answer follows each question. Answers to the questions are found in the Bible; it is strictly a study of the Bible.

The questions are written in the language of the average student. They are not shortened and abbreviated at the expense of clearness. They are so plainly stated that the student gets the answer at one reading of the Scripture reference. This is important; if the questions in a course of study are not worded properly, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the student to see the connection between the question and the answer given.

These lessons provide an excellent means for promoting Christian education in the church and in the home. They are designed to help the student acquire a knowledge of the great and lasting truths of the New Testament. Systematic education in the life of Christ and His church would remove much of the present day unrest, make home life happier, and the church stronger in the faith.

Bible Topic Studies

Contains Twenty-Eight Lessons On As Many Bible Subjects, Prepared For Use In All Bible Classes And Home Study

These lessons have been used by Bible classes since 1932, and have grown in circulation and popularity each year. Scores of letters have been received from teachers who have used this book; they commend it highly. Harris J. Dark says, "This book is the best I have seen in its field."

These studies were prepared in view of the needs of the preacher, the personal worker, the lecturer, and the Bible class.

Teachers have found this book to be of great help in guiding their classes into a knowledge of just what the Bible says on religious questions, rather than what men have said about these subjects.

Those who teach by the lecture method have found these studies to be a thought provoker and time saver in the preparation of lectures on many subjects.

The Christian worker knows the value and the need of an inexpensive guide that will help the honest inquirer in his private study of the fundamental topics of the Bible. Christian workers have found Bible Topic Studies to be the long-wished-for booklet to place in the hands of those who really want to know the truth.

In the compilation of Scripture references the preacher will find material for a series of sermons on many subjects.

The scriptural answers to about seven hundred questions on twenty-eight of the most important Bible subjects should be of great help to any Bible student.

ORDER THESE BOOKS NOW AND MAKE YOUR BIBLE STUDY MORE PROFITABLE AND YOUR CLASS-WORK MORE INTERESTING

Cecil B. Douthitt

403 Wallace Ave.

Louisville, Ky.